

O



INTRODUCTION: COMPARING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION (GCE). CRITICAL ANALYSES OF GCE'S CONTESTED TERRAIN

*Introducción: comparando la Educación para la
Ciudadanía Global (EpCG). Análisis críticos desde el
disputado ámbito de la EpGC*

Greg Misiaszek *

1. INTRODUCTION: GCE FOR LOCAL TO PLANETARY PEACE

This special issue focuses on the contested terrain of Global Citizenship and its Education (GC/E), with the contributing authors providing critical, rigorous analyses of citizenship and models from diverse perspectives, theoretical framings, methodologies, and spheres of citizenship/education (e.g., local, national, global-regional, global) for the goals of what Lynette Shultz (2007) of the University of Alberta, has named *Radical* and *Transformationalist* GC/E models. For this writing, utilizing Shultz and the work of other GC/E scholars (Ali Abdi, Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, James A. Banks, Lynn Davies, Ratna Ghosh, Carlos Alberto Torres, and many others), I have utilized the label of *critical GCE* models in their goal of dialectic, democratic, and transformative aspects of teaching global citizenship. Critical GCE models have the goals of the three *global commons* named

* Beijing Normal University (China).

by Carlos Alberto Torres (in press), UNESCO Chair of Global Learning and GCE (UCLA), as universal, humanistic goals that must exist for GC/E to be successful. These global commons are 1) sustainable development education, moving from diagnosis and denunciation to action and policy implementation, 2) global peace, an intangible cultural good of humanity with immaterial value, and 3) the discovery of ways that people who are all equal manage to live together democratically in an ever growing diverse world, seeking to fulfil their individual and cultural interest. It is also important to note that critical GCE models counter the third type of global citizen Shultz (2007) named as *neoliberal* global citizen as defined as the following:

In the neoliberal perspective, the role of the individual as an entrepreneur in the private sector is a privileged position. With the government role focused on creating space for free market expansion, particularly in areas not traditionally market friendly (p. 250)... Change is created in the interstices of self, other, and the social context and facilitated by a global economic system. (p. 251)

The global liberal aspects, economics without concern for economic justice, and change solely for hegemony based on economics, all are opposite and counters the humanistic solidary aspects of GCE and the global commons in which Torres discussed. As critical pedagogues teach the contested terrain of globalization (from below and from above), teaching and research must focus on discussing what pedagogies of GCE are successful for empowerment to end oppressions, not sustaining, intensifying, and widening global hegemony. The scholars in this special issue have tackled this goal from various angles, all of them providing unique, right and important analysis of GC/E research towards this goal.

My own research on GCE focuses on environmental pedagogies, with particular focus on *ecopedagogy*, which is ground in the popular education models of Paulo Friere and Latin American-based pedagogies for transformation (GADOTTI, 2008B; GUTIÉRREZ & PRADO, 1989; KAHN, 2010; MISIASZEK, 2011). Although there are many framings of ecopedagogy, I focus on ecopedagogies that grounds teaching to better understand the often politically hidden connections between social conflict. I have argued that there are inseparable connections between GCE and ecopedagogy with the following reasoning (MISIASZEK, FORTHCOMING (2017)):

GCE and ecopedagogy are seen as essential elements to understand and respect socio-environmental connections in different contexts. Ecopedagogy goes hand in hand with GCE's aim to foster understanding of the roots of social problems within cultures. Both have the same overall transformational goal to end the world's oppressions and I argue that both are needed together to achieve this end. (MISIASZEK, 2015, pp. 280-281)

In bring in my own research, I want to highlight the argument that Torres (in press) has made, which is common by critical GCE pedagogies, that it is impossible to be successful at one or two of the global commons, without all three of them being successful. The holistic nature of the increasingly connected world, Martin Luther King's statement

that “injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere” is increasingly true as we become increasingly globalized. This holistic view that everyone is each other’s fellow citizen is even widened in ecopedagogy by Moacir Gadotti, Founder and Past Director of the Paulo Freire Institute, São Paulo, and others (GADOTTI, 2008B; GADOTTI & TORRES, 2009) with the framing of planetary citizenship in which Earth, as a holistic being, is a citizen. In my own research, I have found that, to be successful especially in an increasingly globalized world environmental pedagogies must be taught, discussed, and problem-posed through and between the, often conflicting, citizenship spheres in which people are a part of – from local to state to national to globally regional to global to planetary, and all the spheres between them (MISIASZEK, 2011, 2016).

In similar fashions of the connections between ecopedagogy and GCE, the authors of this special issue have written on the complexities upon the necessary connections between GCE and other fields, foci, and *glocal* politics of GC/E, when they analyze successes and failure with GCE policies, implementation, administration, and within learning spaces. In the following paragraphs, I have provided very brief summaries of their work, with some analysis within my constructs of critical GCE influenced from other scholars’ work inside and outside GC/E. The following four themes emerged when I read them: (1) GCE as pedagogical tools for peace; (2) constructing transformative GCE models by problematizing GCE as oppressive pedagogies; (3) GCE implementation and policy analysis over diverse locations, and (4) global transfers of knowledges, pedagogies, and “beneficial” outcomes. It is important to note that these themes were my own interpretations from my reading of the articles holistically as a single journal issue, others will most likely find other foci of the issues separately and the issue holistically.

2. GCE FOR LOCAL TO PLANETARY PEACE

In *Citizenship and Convivencia Education in contexts of Violence: Transnational Challenges to Peacebuilding in Mexican schools*¹ Diego Nieto and Kathy Bickmore discuss the importance of educators critically teaching the complex “conflicts’ transnational dimensions” which are too often ignored classrooms in the location of their research, Mexico City, as well as these dimensions are too frequently ignored throughout the world. With their argument that due to neoliberal citizenship models systematically hiding oppressive transnational dimensions, teachers often avoid discussion on the global politics of violence which, in turn, places all the blame of violence at the individual to national levels. It is important to note that peace education does not have the goal to end conflict – humans will always have conflict from our differences -- but rather the end of violence from conflict such as physical, mental, sexual, verbal, and environmental violence (Harris & Morrison, 2003). Truly understanding and respecting our differences, as well as our

¹ *Educación Ciudadana y Convivencia en contextos de violencia: Desafíos transnacionales a la construcción de paz en escuelas de México*

commonalties, between the world's societies, despite the distances, is essential towards peace from local to planetary levels. Without discussions of the politics in which globalization affects societies locally, diminishes students and teachers' ability to fully understand the reasons for violence and decision-making ability to help end it through actions (i.e., praxis).

An important question here is if teachers are not acknowledging global dimensions out of avoidance or ignorance, which generates several larger teacher education issues. *Authentic dialogue* in learning spaces, as defined by Freire (2000) in which both students and teacher(s) are freely able to discuss their concerns and understands to problem-pose the politics of oppressions, is essential to understand the root causes and effects of oppressions, and each other. Especially at the more local and individual levels, Freire would tell us that this the lack of discussions of the global dimensions is a clear example for controlling pedagogies of the oppressed by a-politicizing the teaching of reasons for violence so that the true sources of violence are hidden (FREIRE, 2000). Without critically knowing the sources and politics of the violence, I would argue, that peacebuilding cannot be successful. From the work of Franz Fanon (1963) and Albert Memmi (1991), we can better understand how violence is not so much from the oppressed uprising, for this is the actual acts, but rather it is caused by the oppressions from the oppressors. For GCE to be successful with an ultimate global common goal of peace, it must be within critical, dialectic spaces of learning toward the end of oppressions for all which is the only path to peace. Nieto and Bickmore's article provides a wonderful analysis of teachers from three marginalized schools in Mexico City, offering promising instances of dialogue and collective actions lessons that address equity through conflict issues, as windows of possibility for development of democratic peacebuilding agency in the face of pervasive transnational social conflicts and violence.

3. PROBLEMATIZING GCE AS WESTERNIZATION AND WEAKENING NATIONS

In my reading of two articles by Young-Hee Han and the other by Armando Alcántara Santuario, I have found strong analysis on the issues of making sure GCE models are contextually transformative and empowering. *Challenges and Tasks of Global Citizenship Education in East Asia: Assimilation Policy of Multicultural Family Students in South Korea* by Young-Hee Han offers discussions on the differences of how the East and the West frame citizenship, with an overall issue I frequently reflect upon with myself, colleagues, and students, especially as a professor at Beijing Normal University – Is GCE a primarily a Western type of citizenship and, if so, is it another tool for Westernization, either directly or indirectly? The second article by Alcántara Santuario, discussed the need for socio-historical analysis of Latin American pedagogical traditions in constructing citizenship education both within this region and globally.

In reading Young-Hee Han's arguments, one must first understand the differences between global citizenship and other types of sub-global citizenship. Wing On Lee, past WCCES President and Professor at Open University of Hong Kong,² has discussed that the largest ideological difference between national and global citizenship is that the former focuses on homogeneity and the latter praises on heterogeneity (Misiasek & Misiasek, 2016). For some, focusing on cultural differences directly leads to weakening national and sub-national (e.g., community, city) levels of citizenship; however, most critical GCE scholars would counter this "weakening" argument.

The ideals of multiculturalism must be within national citizenship for successful GCE; however, this does not mean weakening or ending national citizen and its teaching. Carlos Alberto Torres has stated that GCE can only work if it adds value to national citizenship. It is only within strict assimilation teaching of national citizenship in which GCE cannot succeed within. Without the appreciation of differences between cultures (i.e., multiculturalism), assimilation education models marginalizes persons of "other" cultures and/or ethnicities "in both their community cultures and in the national civic culture because they could function effectively in neither" (Banks, 2001, p. 6). With the shared global and national goal of "social unity", Han discusses the needs and possibilities of social unity within the collectionist and Confucian nation of South Korea to work towards to "promote cultural diversity and suggest an inclusive framework of global citizenship education."

The article by Armando Alcántara Santuario, entitled *Civic education and citizenship education in Mexico: A global and comparative perspective*,³ concentrates on these same issues, with particular attention to determining the possibilities of building empowering GCE models through the analysis of civic "and citizenship education developed in Latin America and Mexico over the past two decades." With the historical understandings as an essential aspect of any critical pedagogy or educational analysis (APPLE, AU, & GANDIN, 2009; GADOTTI, 1996), Alcántara Santuario provides a critical socio-historical analysis of the politics of citizenship education in determining what are the possibilities of successes and failures of GCE models.

4. GCE POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION: SPACES AND BARRIERS IN EUROPE, MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

There are three articles in this special issue that provide some of the essential analysis of GCE implementation at various levels of schooling. In examining what is happening in at the district level in the United States, Laura C Engel, Jessica Fundalinski, and Tess Cannon have written the article *Global citizenship education at a local level: A comparative*

² World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES)

³ *Educación cívica y educación ciudadana en México: Una perspectiva global y comparada*

analysis of four U.S. urban districts. Their study offers rich contextualization of GCE and global competency initiatives in the decentralized national system of the United States, looking at four cities. In the same line of critical reasoning by Moacir Gadotti (2008a) in the *Earth Charter* on planetary citizenship framings for the United Nations' Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD), GCE curricula, pedagogies, resources and all else should be contextually fluid, not rigid within top-down structures. Although the scholars provide "practical opportunities for researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners to share practices in global citizenship education across different local contexts within the federal U.S. system", their findings can be contextually lent and borrowed throughout the world, especially in decentralized national systems.

With analysis of primary schools in ten European Union nations, Massimiliano Tarozzi and Carla Inguaggiato "focus[ed] on national governmental agencies, encompassing two main bodies (Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Ministries of Education) and their political discourses, arguing that the gap between the two traditions." In *Implementing GCE in EU primary schools: The role of ministries between coordinate and parallel action*, Tarozzi and Carla Inguaggiato analyzes the implementation of GCE policies, with the problematized notion of "policy" (BALL, 1990; DYE, 1992, 2012)⁴, as documents that "actually" affect what happens in the schooling settings. Determining the complexities of determining what affects teaching and all other aspects of schooling is too often oversimplified, with the two scholars critically mindful in their analysis of this important determination through their interviews and selection of policy documentation. They remind us for the need of critical-based deconstruction of politics (*politics* as defined by Paulo Freire (1985, 2000)) to determine what affects, including and outside of official policy documents, how GCE succeeds or fails and problematizes what is GCE "success" and "failure"? In their study of GCE within the ten nations and the EU overall, their focus is on policy documentation but also questioning what affects it, including which documents to include in their analysis and why? In their rigorous and thorough analysis, they argue for the crucial need for detailed "national strategy[ies], highly participated by several actors and phased along an implementation planning." Their article provides rich descriptions of these two factors, as well as other crucial factors that affect GCE within primary schools, through rich, theoretical analysis, which can be contextually lent and borrowed to nations inside, but also outside of the EU.

Within the diverse Ibero-American context, Alma Arcelia and Ramírez Iñiguez's article *The meaning of citizenship in social inequality contexts: Guidelines for a comprehensive education*⁵ critically analyzes Ibero-American citizenship framings and pedagogical models which form a contested terrain of possibilities of empowerment but

⁴ References provided within Tarozzi and Inguaggiato's article.

⁵ *El significado de la ciudadanía en contextos de desigualdad social: Pautas para una educación incluyente*

also processes that sustain and intensify oppressions. In their analysis, the aspects of oppressive and empowering aspects of Ibero-American citizenship is viewed both locally within the Ibero-American region and within the global sphere. Through their research of experiences within this region, Arcelia and Iñiguez discuss, in depth, how citizenship education either increases inclusiveness in relation to social in/equality. They critically problematize the needs of different spheres of citizenship to help end oppressions, especially in a World in which intensifying neoliberal globalization that has both widened and increased inequalities.

5. GLOBAL SOUTH TO GLOBAL NORTH TRANSFERS (AND VICE VERSA): KNOWLEDGES, PEDAGOGIES, AND “BENEFICIAL” OUTCOMES

There are two articles in this special issue which I view as problematizing transfers of the Global South and North, with one article on GCE in Eritrea and the second article on international service learning projects. I will begin with the article on Eritrea’s higher education system by Samson Maekele Tsegay. Tsegay does a masterful job on writing upon the crucial connections between critical pedagogies and GCE within higher education institution in Eritrea. In his article *The role of higher education in nurturing global citizenship in Eritrea*, he provides the reader rich analyses on how critical teaching practices are needed to prepare students to become global citizens. His work in this special issues helps to fill in a large gap of the lack of research on teaching global citizenship in Eritrea. In the complex and sometimes trying contexts of Eritrea, Tsegay provides a thorough comparative education analysis on implementing GCE models from the perspectives of Eritrean students and teachers. The need for critical, democratic and dialectical GCE models to increase and deepen student praxis to act through globally widened reflections, emerges from his analysis of the higher education teacher and student voices. As a Eritrean citizen, Tsegay provides us with an in-depth analysis of the higher education pedagogies in a nation in which there is a severe lack of international research upon, and little-to-no research on GCE within Eritrea.

If GCE is to be successful – if we are to end oppressions anywhere through better understanding each other and oppression throughout the world - I argue it critical global citizenship must be successfully taught everywhere or it will ultimately fail. Martin Luther King’s previous quote can coincide with this statement. Tsegay provides us with excellent analyses from one of the many areas of the world that needs to be better understood, by not shallowing comparing it on how it differs and must be changed to coincide to global North’s models, but also what can the Global South teach the Global North - both globally and locally in terms of GCE initiatives, practices, and possibilities for transformation. For this last aspect, this is especially true with what we can learn from Global South to Global North transfers of knowledge and pedagogical tool, which is too often, unfortunately, dismissed by the Global North.

In Yulia Nesterova and Liz Jackson's article *Transforming Service Learning for Global Citizenship Education: Moving from Affective-Moral to Social-Political*, the idea of service learning, with special focus on the unequal relationships between Global North and the Global South in such programs as it relates back to problem-posing who actually benefits and the possible transformative goals which are often missed in practice and sometimes ignored. These possibilities of transformation in teaching through *reading the world*, in the Freirean sense, which service learning projects need, I and other scholars would argue is pedagogies grounded in with the goal of students' and teachers' conscientização (JONES [MISIASZEK] & ARRIES, 2009), from the Freirean tradition (2000). There is vast amount of research on service learning; however, there is a lack of critical analysis within this research topic (JONES [MISIASZEK] & ARRIES, 2009). To clarify, the questions on service learning I view as essential are the following: Who benefits from service learning projects?; What are the transformative goals and actual outcomes of these projects for all who are involved to better understanding of one another's self and societies?; How does these projects lead to, or not, students' praxis?; and, Are there transfer of knowledges both South to North, and vice versa?

Nesterova and Jackson gives a critically rigorous analysis in answering these and other important questions through the tenets of critical GCE models to construct a more empowering service learning model. Such a model has the emphasis of the "student/global citizen as an autonomous, political subject, shifting the focus of concern from the 'affective-moral' to the 'social-political' dimensions of GCE." Their work builds upon the research needed in both the areas of critical GCE and service learning models, as well as deconstructing the connections between them which are essential. I would argue that their article helps to connect the many "utopian" mission statements of service learning projects as being empowering for both the students and the communities they "serve" to actually reach this goal beyond words - to have the pedagogical practices and, even more important, the empowering, transformative outcomes for all who are involved.

6. HIDDEN GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: POLITICS OF LOCAL TO GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

There are two articles in this this issue that highlight the issues of unveiling the politics of globalization as essential in GCE and the teaching of other spheres of citizenship. The first is María Matarranz and Teresa Pérez Roldán's article *¿Política educativa supranacional o educación supranacional?: el debate sobre el objeto de estudio de un área emergente de conocimiento* which delves into the question of educational governance within the global sphere. The second article by Cecilia Peraza Sanginés is on the challenges and possibilities of critical GCE's implementation within conservative citizenship models in Mexico.

I will begin with Matarranz and Pérez Roldán's article. It is important to note the

difference between the concepts of *government* and *governance*; because when we talk of the politics of globalization we are discussing governance, not government (HARTLEY, 2003)⁶. As David Hartley (2003) pointed out in his article *Education as a global positioning device: Some theoretical considerations*, neoliberal economics plays a strong role in global governance, in that:

any emerging ‘new’ convergence of educational governance within and between nation-states would be consequential upon the need for capitalism to effect new forms and practices which would ensure accumulation and legitimation, nationally and globally” (p. 446).

Matarranz and Pérez Roldán discuss the hidden soft power upon education from the global sphere, and the complex and often contradictory aspects of these issues when we construct GCE and education for “development.” The following passage from Czempiel (1992) is used by Harley (2003) to distinguish governance from government.

I understand ‘governance’ to mean the capacity to get things done without the legal competence to command that they be done. [...] Governments exercise rule, governance uses power. From this point of view, the international system is a system of governance. (CZEMPIEL, 1992, P. 250)

From this definition from Czempiel and aspects from Matarranz and Pérez Roldán’s article, an essential need, I argue for, is to determine the politics of governance, of decision making abilities outside of established forms of government. In the same way that global citizenship does not have a formal legality as national citizenship does, global governance does not have a direct system of government to address concerns, but are rather very complex and often systematically hidden phenomena of politics which can certainly be felt locally but are difficult to pinpoint their sources of influence. There are definite reoccurring sources of local oppressions from the global sphere, general hegemonic sources can be pointed to but pinpointing them is difficult and these sources benefit from such difficulties (KELLNER, 2002; STROMQUIST & MONKMAN, 2002; TORRES & SCHUGURENSKY, 2002). Despite such difficulties, this determination of sources is essential in teaching global citizenship and citizenship education in all spheres (local to planetary), to unveil the contested terrain of global governance, within critical pedagogies to problem-pose global governance is essential when we speak of all spheres of citizenship, including global citizenship.

In Cecilia Peraza Sanginés’ article *Interpretations of education for global citizenship in the Mexican reform of the upper secondary education*,⁷ the author compares and contrasts how “discussion revolves around the gap generated between a progressive

⁶ “...within the international system there is no government (only governance), within national systems, there is government, but it is beginning to take on the appearance of governance, in the form of the new public management.” (p. 441)

⁷ *Interpretaciones de la educación para la ciudadanía global en la reforma de la educación media superior en México*

official pedagogical discourse and a conservative educational system.” Their analysis and discussions grounded in problematizing how globalization has affected national citizenship, tries to unveil the complexities and common barriers of implementing critical-based pedagogies, such as critical GCE models, within educational systems that resists. In reading their article, the essence of the contested terrain of the processes of globalization which can either be empowering or oppressive, “from above” or “from below” (KELLNER, 2002; STROMQUIST, 2002), is an important analysis when understanding the politics of GCE implementation. As Carlos Torres (2009) indicates this contested terrain with the plural term of globalizations, GCE models also form a contested terrain which have opposing political ideologies (ABDI, SHULTZ, & PILLAY, 2015; SHULTZ, 2007). Rigorous empirical research is essential to determine the politics of GCE implementation is essential, between what is stated and what the pedagogies actually are in learning spaces, and unveiling the politics of answering the questions of *why*? In the same way that you cannot have neutralized Freirean Pedagogy that is devoid of dialectic, problem-posing the politics of education, society, and the environment (APPLE & AU, 2009; FISCHMAN, 2009; GADOTTI, 1996), you cannot have apolitical GCE with a meaningful label of being “critical” with the expectation that it will be transformative. As Sanginés has attempted, the need to understand the countering politics of critical GCE, I argue, is essential research in its development but also in the practice of it to better understand and determine what changes are necessary in its implementation and practice.

REFERENCES

- ABDI, A. A., SHULTZ, L., & PILLAY, T. (Eds.). (2015): *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education*: Springer.
- APPLE, M. W., & AU, W. (2009): *Politics, Theory, and Reality in Critical Pedagogy*. In R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education* (Vol. 22, pp. 991-1007): Springer Netherlands.
- APPLE, M. W., AU, W., & GANDIN, L. S. A. (2009): *Mapping Critical Education*. In M. W. Apple, W. Au, & L. s. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 3-20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- BALL, S. J. (1990)_ *Politics and policy making in education : explorations in policy sociology*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- BANKS, J. A. (2001): *Citizenship Education and Diversity*. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 5-16. doi:10.1177/0022487101052001002
- CZEMPIEL, E.-O. (1992): *Governance and democratization*. In J. N. Rosenau & E.-O. Czempiel (Eds.), *Governance without government: Order and change in world politics* (Vol. 20, pp. 250-271). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press.
- DYE, T. R. (1992): *Understanding public policy* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- DYE, T. R. (2012): *UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC POLICY* (14TH ED. ed.). Upper Saddle River: PEARSON.
- FANON, F. (1963): *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.

- FISCHMAN, G. (2009): Un/taming Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed. In M. W. Apple, W. Au, & L. s. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 232-239). New York, NY: Routledge.
- FREIRE, P. (1985): *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. South Hadley, Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- FREIRE, P. (2000): *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- GADOTTI, M. (1996). *Pedagogy of praxis: A dialectical philosophy of education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- GADOTTI, M. (2008a): Education for sustainability: A critical contribution to the Decade of Education for Sustainable development. *Green Theory and Praxis: The Journal of Ecopedagogy*, 4(1), 50. Retrieved from <http://greentheoryandpraxisjournal.org/?p=313>
- GADOTTI, M. (2008b): *Education for sustainable development: What we need to learn to save the planet*. São Paulo: Instituto Paulo Freire.
- GADOTTI, M., & TORRES, C. A. (2009): Paulo Freire: Education for Development. *Development and Change*, 40(6), 1255-1267. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2009.01606.x
- GUTIÉRREZ, F., & PRADO, C. (1989): *Ecopedagogia e cidadania planetária. (Ecopedagogy and planetarian citizenship)*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- HARRIS, I. M., & MORRISON, M. L. (2003): *Peace education* (2nd ed.). Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.
- HARTLEY, D. (2003): Education as a global positioning device: Some theoretical considerations. *Comparative Education*, 39(4), 439-450.
- JONES [MISIASZEK], L. I., & ARRIES, J. (2009): Searching for Conscientização: Mentoring Field Work in International Service Learning. *Reconstruction*, 9(1).
- KAHN, R. (2010): *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, and planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy movement* (Vol. 359). New York: Peter Lang.
- KELLNER, D. (2002): Theorizing Globalization. *Sociological Theory*, 20(3), 285-305.
- MEMMI, A. (1991): *The colonizer and the colonized* (Expanded ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- MISIASZEK, G. W. (2011): *Ecopedagogy in the Age of Globalization: Educators' Perspectives of Environmental Education Programs in the Americas which Incorporate Social Justice Models*. (Ph.D.), University of California, Los Angeles, Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3483199)
- MISIASZEK, G. W. (2015): Ecopedagogy and Citizenship in the Age of Globalisation: connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the planet. *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 280-292. doi:10.1111/ejed.12138
- MISIASZEK, G. W. (2016): Ecopedagogy as an element of citizenship education: The dialectic of global/local spheres of citizenship and critical environmental pedagogies. *International Review of Education*, 1-21. doi:10.1007/s11159-016-9587-0
- MISIASZEK, G. W. (Forthcoming (2017)): *Educating the Global Environmental Citizen: Understanding Ecopedagogy in Local and Global Contexts*. New York: Routledge.
- MISIASZEK, G. W., & MISIASZEK, L. I. (2016): Global Citizenship Education and Ecopedagogy at the Intersections: Asian Perspectives in Comparison. *Asian Journal of Education (journal of Seoul National University School of Education)*, 17(Special

- Issue), 11-37.
- SHULTZ, L. (2007): Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 248-258.
- STROMQUIST, N. P. (2002): *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- STROMQUIST, N. P., & MONKMAN, K. (2002): *Globalization and education : integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- TORRES, C. A. (2009): *Globalizations and education: Collected essays on class, race, gender, and the state*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- TORRES, C. A. (in press): Global citizenship education: Theoretical and empirical foundations *Oxford Encyclopedia of Educational Research*.
- TORRES, C. A., & SCHUGURENSKY, D. (2002): The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspective. *Higher Education*, 43(4), 429-455.