



**Israeli teachers make sense of global citizenship education in a divided society-
religion, marginalisation and economic globalisation**

Goren, Heela; Maxwell, Claire; Yemini, Miri

Published in:
Comparative Education

DOI:
[10.1080/03050068.2018.1541660](https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2018.1541660)

Publication date:
2019

Document version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):
Goren, H., Maxwell, C., & Yemini, M. (2019). Israeli teachers make sense of global citizenship education in a divided society- religion, marginalisation and economic globalisation. *Comparative Education*, 55(2), 243-263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2018.1541660>

**Israeli teachers make sense of global citizenship education in a divided society- Religion,
marginalisation and economic globalisation**

This paper is published in *COMPARATIVE EDUCATION*, 55(2): 243-263.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03050068.2018.1541660?journalCode=cced20>

**This is a post-print (i.e. final draft post-refereeing) version according to SHERPA/ROMEEO
(date: 7 September 2018)**

Claire Maxwell
University of Copenhagen
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Øster Farimagsgade 5, Bld. 16
DK - 1353 Copenhagen K
cm@soc.ku.dk

Israeli teachers make sense of global citizenship education in a divided society- Religion, marginalisation and economic globalisation

Heela Goren, UCL Institute of Education, University College London, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL, +44 (0)20 7612 6000; Heela.Goren.17@ucl.ac.uk; <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2234-0199>

Claire Maxwell (corresponding author), UCL Institute of Education, University College London, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL, +44 7977140575; claire.maxwell@ucl.ac.uk; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1266-8011>; @maxwell_claire

Miri Yemini, School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel. +97236407116; miriye@tauex.tau.ac.il; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5633-6473>

Word count: 8,503 (excluding references)

Declaration of interest statement - No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Heela Goren is an MPhil/PhD student at the Department of Education, Practice, and Society at the UCL Institute of Education. Her research interests include global citizenship education, comparative education research, sociology of education, and the way social context shapes educational trajectories and outcomes.

Claire Maxwell is a sociologist of education, whose work seeks to elucidate how the desires of dominant social groups intersect with policy imperatives and historical configurations of education to shape the ways in which the concept of 'elite education' is articulated, experienced and re-negotiated. Her work interrogates the intersections between private/state education provision, national/international curricula and credentials, and the practices of elite groups as well as national and global middle classes.

Miri Yemini is a Comparative Education scholar at Tel Aviv University. Dr. Yemini's research interests include globalisation of and in education; global citizenship education; internationalisation; intermediaries in education and the global middle class.

Israeli teachers make sense of global citizenship education in a divided society- Religion, marginalisation and economic globalisation

Abstract

Global citizenship education (GCE) has recently been promoted by national education systems and supranational organisations as a means for facilitating social cohesion and peace education. We examined the perceptions of GCE held by teachers from the three main education sectors in Israel: secular-Jewish, religious-Jewish, and Palestinian Arab, and found stark differences in the way teachers from each sector interpreted the term. For marginalised groups (Palestinian Arab), GCE is seen as offering a way of securing a sense of belonging to a global society. For already well-resourced social groups (Jewish secular), GCE is viewed as a way of promoting global futures. Meanwhile, for the Jewish religious minority in Israel, GCE is seen as a threat to national identity and religious values. Our findings cast doubt on the unifying potential of GCE, and we conclude by calling upon scholars and policy makers to examine unique obstacles facing GCE in their various contexts.

Keywords: Global citizenship; divided society; marginalised groups; belonging; religious education, Israel.

Introduction

Over the last few decades, Global Citizenship Education (GCE) has become a widespread curricula offer in schools (and other educational institutions) around the world, and, concurrently has sparked a vast scholarly interest (Gaudelli, 2016; Myers 2016). This phenomenon can be understood as a form of internationalisation within education – both as a specific form of provision, but also as heralding an outward orientation in the purpose of education more broadly. Processes of globalisation, flows of immigration and technological developments demand and facilitate an engagement with the wider world (Authors 2017). In divided and highly diverse societies in particular, GCE is often presented as a tool which holds potential for peace education, through the creation of a common-ground for a shared conception of citizenship.

GCE is defined and justified by different policy actors by drawing on a relatively wide set of rationales - from a utilitarian view that concentrates on providing students with the skills necessary for traversing in a global society, to a more values-based approach that seeks to promote inclusion and empathy towards others (Oxley and Morris 2013). Another way of distinguishing different forms of GCE is through using Andreotti's (2014) conceptualisation of 'soft' versus 'critical' GCE in which 'soft GCE' is understood as learning passively about the world and global processes, while 'critical GCE' encourages learners to challenge structures of power and reflect critically on the role of western societies in perpetuating many of the challenges experienced in different parts of the world.

GCE is subject to opposition, as it is perceived by some as threatening to nationalist narratives of belonging and formal citizenship (Bowden 2003), which may or may not be central to the fragile process of nation building. In countries with diverse populations and those experiencing a high influx of immigrants, GCE is often implemented for the purpose of providing migrant students with a citizenship model that does not exclude them, in order to promote their sense of belonging and foster integration (Engel and Ortloff 2009). Recently, neo-nationalism has been on the rise particularly in Western Europe, where right-wing parties with anti-immigrant agendas have been steadily gaining power, alongside growing calls to reconsider countries' membership in the European Union. Partly to counteract such trends, but also due to the founding principle of these organisations, the European Union and the United Nations (through UNESCO) have both been

major catalysts for the development and promotion of GCE, so as to provide a certain sense of community beyond national borders, and endorse universal human rights - a major component of GCE. In 2014, UNESCO announced its 2030 sustainable development goals, which specifically refer to GCE as one of the organisation's main priorities for the coming years (SDG target 4.7)¹.

In countries experiencing what appear to be intractable conflicts or those with notably diverse populations, GCE is sometimes integrated into the curriculum with the purpose of creating a common model of belonging, to which all students can relate to (Reilly and Niens 2014). This model of citizenship is usually more inclusive than the traditional citizenship curriculum, which often equates birthright, ethnicity or religion with belonging and citizenship. This is one of the reasons that GCE is usually associated with peace education and democratic education, which is promoted by UNESCO to tackle violent extremism.

Israel provides an important case study for examining the challenges of teaching citizenship within a context that continues to experience what appears to be an intractable conflict situation. Currently, in Israel, citizenship is strongly linked to being 'Jewish' and the Jewish religion, and yet over twenty percent of the Israeli population are Muslim². Additionally, alongside this ethnic/religious conflict, the country is also experiencing increasing internal clashes between secular and religious Jews, as well as religious and ultra-orthodox Jews (Cochran 2017). Each of these groups feels it has a claim to determine the character of Israel, its laws, the rights and responsibilities of its citizens, and the educational landscape (Al-Haj 2005). The highly divided nature of Israeli society is further manifested by a very segregated education system – comprised of three main sectors: the public-secular Jewish education sector, the public-religious Jewish sector, and the public-Palestinian-Arab education sector (Benavot and Resh 2003). This study offers a comparative insight into how teachers from the different sectors perceive GCE and how these perceptions are shaped by contextual factors.

In the Israeli education system, each sector conceptualises citizenship differently and holds different beliefs as to who 'deserves' to be a citizen and who should be excluded from this form of belonging (Agbaria, Mustafa, and Jabareen 2015; Cohen 2017). The idea of embracing any sort

¹ <http://en.unesco.org/gced/approach>

² Annual CBS [Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics] report, 2016

of inclusive form of citizenship education is therefore very contentious given the strong stances taken across the various sectors of the education system (Cohen 2017). Thus, even though Israel as a nation and the Israeli education system in particular have taken great strides towards internationalisation (Authors, 2018), GCE remains a contested concept which is unlikely to be embraced by the education system as a whole, and certainly not by the current right-wing, nationalist government.

Our work is focused on examining the possible ways in which GCE is being embraced by the Israeli education system and also exploring how further opportunities for this could be created. Critical to this endeavour are teachers. Teachers have been shown to be central in shaping the way GCE and related concepts are taught to students - with or without an official policy in place (Authors, 2016; 2017a). The identity of the teachers, their dispositions towards GCE, and the background of the students as well as the ways teachers perceive their students' future all effect teachers' understanding of the term and their inclination to bring it into their classrooms. These factors therefore determine the form and pedagogical approaches taken in relation to GCE, and open up or close down possibilities for Israeli students to engage with the concept and future imaginings it could facilitate.

Global citizenship education: Driving, shaping, and opposing forces

The rise of GCE

Unsurprisingly, international and supra-national organisations which focus on solving global problems and promoting global actions through education have shown interest in and contributed vastly to the expansion of GCE provision around the world (Stein, Andreotti, and Suša 2016; Tarozzi and Torres 2016). In fact, the establishment of the UN in itself as well as the publication of its universal declaration of human rights are often mentioned as milestones in the development of the very concept of GCE (Russel and Suarez 2017). The UN has also played a significant part in the spread of GCE, particularly since the publication of the United Nations Secretary-General's Global Education First initiative in 2012, which named GCE as one of its chief priorities³.

³ <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/>

Many studies support the claim that while national citizenship education remains an important tenet of nearly all formal education frameworks, numerous countries have already begun incorporating aspects of GCE into their curricula (see Moon and Koo 2011; Ramirez and Meyer 2012; Rapoport 2010; Oxley and Morris 2013). This trend may stem from the promotion of GCE by the UN, as mentioned earlier. Most recently and perhaps most notably, UNESCO embraced GCE as one of its sustainable development goals for its 2030 agenda and framework for action⁴. UNESCO's approach to GCE, detailed in Sustainable Development Goal 4.7, encompasses many of the prevalent approaches to the concept of global citizenship, but concentrates particularly on the '...need to foster the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and behaviours that allow individuals to take informed decisions and assume active roles locally, nationally and globally'. The organisation could therefore be said to (understandably) be more concerned with universal values and promoting empathy, tolerance and sustainability, than in the individual, more utilitarian-based benefits of GCE. UNESCO also connects GCE to the prevention of violent extremism, 'supporting countries seeking to deliver education programmes that build young people's resilience to violent extremist messaging and foster a positive sense of identity and belonging [through global citizenship education]' (opcit).

Despite the seemingly uniform type of GCE promoted by UNESCO and other supra-national organisations, the manifestations of GCE in different countries, areas, and even schools is highly variable, with large gaps existing between policy and practice, and between different practitioners in the field (i.e. teachers and school principals) (see Authors2017b for a review).

The role of national and social context in shaping understandings of citizenship, global citizenship and belonging

Where state-wide policy regarding GCE exists, it is often framed in terms of the benefits of GCE for the specific country and the particular difficulties it could help ameliorate, and not in universal terms as UNESCO suggests (Authors 2017; Bromley and Cole 2016; Johnson and Morris 2013). In many national contexts, GCE is framed in neoliberal terms, referencing the global economy and work force and the importance of the ability to thrive in global settings on both a national and

⁴ <http://en.unesco.org/gced/approach>

individual scale (Cho and Mosselson 2017; Pais and Costa 2017; Torres 2015). In conflict nations, or ethnically diverse countries, for example, GCE is often articulated in terms of enabling social cohesion and facilitating peace education (Pashby 2018). One interesting case that illustrates this point is that of Northern Ireland, a post-conflict nation with a diverse population and competing narratives of national identity. Gallagher's (2005) study of the integration of GCE into the Northern Irish curriculum found this initiative to be motivated by a need to assist students transcend the problematic lack of a consensual definition for what constitutes Northern Irish citizenship. Conversely, Niens and Reilly (2012), examined the de-facto implementation of the new curriculum through teacher and students' experiences and found that the expected benefits were far from realised in classroom settings. Engel's (2014) analysis of curricular reform in Spain also shows that the inclusion of GCE was driven by a large influx of immigrants and the need for an inclusive model of citizenship. These studies all speak to the relationship between citizenship and belonging, and the need for more inclusive conceptions of citizenship that do not rely on place of birth or other sets of factors to determine inclusion in the national collective an imperative in an age of migration and rising diversity (Eliassi 2016; Yuval-Davis, Anthias and Kofman 2005). These alternatives to traditional citizenship models would enable students from different backgrounds to procure the participatory capital they are usually denied (Wood 2016). Notably, not only immigrants, but also marginalised populations and ethnic or religious minorities born in the country can all feel a void in belonging and identification with the national narrative of citizenship, and these are perhaps the groups most in-need of more inclusive forms of belonging (Çayır,2015; Nordberg 2006).

The way GCE manifests itself in the classroom is not only dependent on the policy steer offered within national education policy, but also by the way teachers engage with it directly. Teachers' own biographies but also the teacher training they receive will shape students' experiences of GCE (Authors 2016; Authors 2017a; Ortloff 2011; Schweisfurth 2006). The pivotal and somewhat independent role that teachers play in bringing GCE into their classroom regardless of the way policy is articulated underpins our study - exploring how teachers conceptualise GCE and its relevance in relation to their students.

Global citizenship education in Israel.

The Israeli education system seeks to engage with ‘the international’, as can be seen through its participation in projects led by the EU and other supranational organisations, and its widespread acceptance of international standardised testing through PISA and TIMSS (Feniger, Livneh, and Yogev 2012). However, this same openness is not necessarily applied to global citizenship education or even a looser sense of globalisation or internationalisation of the curriculum.

In Israel, global citizenship education is not a recognised component of the citizenship education curriculum administered by the Ministry of Education (MOE). Only one third-sector programme promoting GCE, which is offered by the Society for International Development in Israel⁵ is recognised by the MOE. The current, right-wing government and the Minister of Education Naftali Bennet have clarified through funding and official policy that the education system should first and foremost be concerned with the development of (Jewish) students’ identities as Jews, a policy which faces strong opposition (Kashti, Haaretz 2017). However, some very recent developments, such as a document recently released by the MOE featuring future plans for ‘glocal’ education and ‘future geared pedagogy’⁶, coupled with a strong public discourse opposing the rise of religious inputs in state schools could indicate the beginning of a shift towards more globalised forms of education.

Ethnic and religious separation within the Israeli education system and broader society

Israeli society is highly divided along ethnic and religious lines. These divisions stem first of all from the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict that began prior to the nation’s establishment in 1948, and escalated further following Israel’s declaration of independence. The declaration of independence was immediately followed by the 1948 Arab-Israeli war that led to the displacement of a large portion of the Arab population. Palestinian Arabs who remained in Israel were awarded citizenship, and are referred to as Arab citizens of Israel. This term further distinguishes them from the Jewish majority and the Palestinians residing in Gaza and West Bank (Agbaria, Mustafa, and Jabareen [2015](#); Ichilov [2003](#); Peled 1992).

⁵ <http://www.sid-israel.org/en/>

⁶ <http://edu.gov.il/minhalpedagogy/mop/pedagogy-disign/Pages/future-pedagogy.aspx>

Another source of division in Israel society is the level of orthodoxy within the Jewish population. Israeli law, due to a number of historical reasons, maintains the Ultra-Orthodox Haredi sector's autonomy in matters related to education and other social services. The law therefore reinforces a systematic separation in the education system and also across other aspects of life between secular and religious Jews. All schools – across the various sectors are under the supervision of the Israeli Ministry of Education (MOE).

While the vast majority of students attend the public education system in Israel, potentially ensuring most students are exposed to the same curriculum, this is not the case in practice (Benavot and Resh 2003; Sabbagh and Resh 2014). The public education system is organised into a number of sectors: the Jewish sector, which teaches 73%⁷ of the total population and is further divided into the Jewish-secular (52% of Jewish population), Religious (18%) and Ultra-Orthodox sectors (29%). The remaining 27% of students study in the Palestinian Arab-Israeli sector, which is comprised of Arab (19% of total population), Druze (2%), Bedouin (5%) and Cherkassy (0.03%) students. These sectors each hold a certain level of autonomy, but are also monitored by the MOE. This study will concentrate on the three largest sub-sectors: the Secular-Jewish, Religious-Jewish, and Palestinian Arab sectors.

Historically, as different groups have gained differential levels of power, curricular goals and the national narratives of belonging and inclusion promoted through schools have changed, as have official perceptions of the purpose of education itself (Agbaria 2016; Lemish 2003). Pinson (2007) showed how the three main sectors vary greatly in their adherence to the official curriculum, as well as in the extent to which they are autonomous and the proportion of resources allocated to them. As demands for autonomy have increased over the years, Sabbagh and Resh (2014) argue that the sectors developed what they term a “community-specific identity” (pg. 40), which, as their study shows, shapes students’ understandings and conceptions of citizenship. Sabbagh and Resh (2014) claim, among other things, that junior-high students in the Palestinian Arab and secular-Jewish sectors tend to hold more liberal orientations of citizenship than students in the religious sector. Religious Jewish students, on the other hand, were more likely to embrace an ethno-

⁷ All statistical data was taken from the annual CBS [Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics] report, 2016

republican orientation which highlights the superiority of the country's Jewish nature over its democratic principles.

The differences in citizenship orientation discussed here are not surprising. Until 1994, Arab-Israeli students studied a different citizenship curriculum than that studied by the Jewish population (Ichilov, 2003) but in 1994, after arriving at the conclusion that citizenship education could bridge gaps in Israeli society rather than widen them, both Jewish and Palestinian Arab students have essentially studied the same curriculum (Pinson 2007). However, the unified curriculum has been heavily criticised for the emphasis it puts on a Jewish narrative shaping the state while delegitimising the Palestinian claims to nationhood (Agbaria, Mustafa, and Jabareen 2015; Al-Haj 2005; Cohen 2017; Pinson 2007). It is therefore possible and perhaps expected that teachers from the Palestinian Arab and Jewish (religious and secular) sectors would hold quite different perceptions of GCE, because of their diverging conceptions of national citizenship (Agbaria 2016; Muff and Bekerman 2017; Sheps 2016). These conceptions have also arguably been shaped by the differential goals of the education system within each sector. One instance of this relates to expectations around military service. Military service is compulsory only for the (non-Orthodox) Jewish population in Israel, and the education system, through citizenship education in particular, plays a significant role in preparing Jewish students for this service (Muff and Bekerman 2017). Meanwhile, Palestinian Arab students, while being exposed to the same nationalist, militarised curriculum, are not expected to serve in the army, and therefore the teaching around this aspect will likely be quite different.

This study emerged from previous works conducted by two of the authors (Authors 2016; 2017b; 2017c; 2018). In these studies, we examined the way teachers in an international and an Israeli school belonging to the secular-Jewish sector perceived GCE (Authors 2016), as well how the concept of global citizenship is variously perceived by teachers working in schools located in very different socio-economic neighbourhoods (Authors 2017b; 2017c). All three of the above studies contributed to our understanding of the importance of teacher agency in conceptualising and delivering GCE, and how this appeared directly related to the specific student populations they were engaging. Additionally, these studies all pointed to factors specific to the Israeli context such as the ongoing conflict and a strong sense of nationalism in the education system as directly shaping the teachers' understandings of GCE. We therefore wanted to subsequently explore

differences between the education sectors within Israel to understand better how religion and ethnicity affect articulations of, and engagements with, GCE. Our study has important implications for understanding the challenges of delivering GCE within Israel, but also, critically, in other diverse and/or divided societies, specifically those with very unequal and antagonistic relations between marginalised and dominant populations.

Methodology

Data for the study were collected through 21 semi-structured interviews with 7 teachers from each of the three sectors that are the focus for this study. Participants were recruited using the snowball sampling method. The interviewees' teaching experience ranged from 2-35 years, and their subject areas were varied. All interviews were conducted by the first author, either by Skype or in person, recorded and then transcribed in Hebrew. Relevant quotes which appear in this paper were translated to English and back to Hebrew to ensure their validity. The subject areas that teachers taught were not limited in this study to history or citizenship education, as is often done in empirical studies of GCE; this is because our research pertains to teachers' general perceptions of the concept and how it relates to students in their sector, rather than how they themselves would implement it in their classroom. Additionally, it should be noted that in order to receive a representative view of the teachers' own understandings of global citizenship and GCE, they were not provided with any definition of these terms in the interviews and answered all questions according to their own understanding of these concepts.

The main limitation to this study is a self-selection bias among the participants. The participants from all three sectors were open to being interviewed by a secular female researcher regarding issues related to globalisation and identity. Participants from the Palestinian Arab and the Religious sector noted that they did not think most teachers from their sector would agree to participate and assisted us in locating more interviewees who were more open to having this discussion. This means that although our participants provided us with rich responses, they cannot be said to be representative of their sectors. Another limitation of this study lies in the relatively small sample of teachers from each sector. However, the significant homogeneity in teacher responses found within each sector and the long, detailed nature of the discussions during the interviews have provided, we would argue, a breadth of data that was sufficient for the

development of a coding scheme and enabled us to gain and triangulate our insights between the interviews.

The interviews were analysed using grounded theory analysis, which was conducted according to the stages described by Thornberg and Charmaz (2014) and included initial (open) coding followed by focused coding and theoretical coding. Open coding consisted of the constant comparison of data and multiple readings of the interviews so as to discern meanings, motives, and interpretations. Those codes were constantly compared to the data and to each other in order to locate converging codes that could be brought together into categories. At the end of the open coding process, the most important core categories that emerged from the data were identified. In the second stage, focused coding, the core categories or ‘focused codes’ were used to sift through all of the data. This stage enabled us to validate and refine some of the categories, while others were discarded or combined. During the final stage, theoretical coding, previous research on GCE in different contexts was reviewed, while comparing the data with the literature. The analysis reveals the differences and similarities in teacher perceptions of GCE between teachers from the different sectors and suggests how these are influenced by the context of each group.

Global citizenship and the fragmented nation

Our analysis revealed that global citizenship is constructed and understood by people from different social, ethnic, and religious groups very differently. This section details the main distinctions between the sectors in perceptions of GCE, and relates these differences to the unique context of each group.

Palestinian -Arab Sector- finding new ways of belonging for a discriminated minority in an ethnic democracy

The most striking similarity among the Palestinian Arab Teachers’ interviews was their association of global citizenship with belonging to a global community, as a substitute for the void they experience in identifying with the current Israeli national narrative. The teachers in this sector spoke of different levels of belonging, particularly, they believed they and their students held strong ties to their family, local community, Palestinian nationality, and to the broader Muslim community. The fact they were Israeli citizens was described as constituting a set of rules they

needed to follow rather than offering them an identity they could embrace. Racism and lack of opportunities to thrive were suggested by five of the Palestinian Arab teachers in this study as factors that would increase their students' interest in seeking alternative identity models such that offered by the notion of global citizenship. As Mahmud put it:

In the 1990s I visited Switzerland, and in Zurich I met a French citizen who lived there, very close to France. I asked him where he felt he belonged, who he felt were his fellow citizens- and he explained that he felt closer to a German national living in Zurich than to a French national living in Paris. He said, "The French-man and I may share the same language, but he does not share my life or experience- as opposed to the German in Zurich". So, he felt like the people in Zurich wanted him there and Switzerland was the country that provided his needs and he was living well with a high quality of life... So, to me this shows that it all belonging depends on who satisfies your basic needs, lets you feel appreciated and fulfilled and wanted. If I felt that all my needs were being filled by whatever state I lived in with whichever borders it may have, and the definition of the place where I live included me and provided me with self-definition then I wouldn't care about sharing it with another people [Jewish, in this case]. But if the place where I live doesn't provide these needs and I don't feel I belong then I will look outside of it to belong, and this is global citizenship.

This quote captures what many Palestinian Arab teachers communicated in their interviews, with regards to the potential benefits of GCE for their students, particularly in terms of providing an infrastructure for belonging and the opportunities for a higher quality of life abroad. It also echoes previous research which examined Palestinian-Israeli identity models and perceptions of citizenship (Agbaria, Mustafa, and Jabareen 2015; Pinson, 2007; Rabinowitz 2001). Mahmud suggests here that a sense of belonging and fulfilment of needs is crucial to constructing one's civic identity - a point which could apply to minorities, immigrants or people excluded from a national narrative of belonging in any context (Yuval-Davis 2006).

Another Palestinian Arab teacher, Nahad, expressed a similar yet more critical and elaborate view of the antecedents that make global citizenship attractive to Israel's Arab students, connecting it to the frustration Palestinian Arabs feel about not having rights to their land, the general neglect

of the Palestinian Arab sector and its schools by the Israeli government, and structured discrimination in Israel which makes it more difficult for Palestinian Arabs to gain access to higher education and other opportunities:

So, because of [the aforementioned reasons], a lot of [my students] just leave. Sometimes they leave to get their education, they go to Jordan, they go to Bulgaria, they get licensed as pharmacologists and doctors. They are global citizens when they come back, sometimes it is just to pack their suitcases ... there is some criticism, when we need them here, but we want what is best for them... and there is a general despair here [in Israel] that is hard to ignore.

In stark contrast with the Jewish religious and secular teachers, emigration- which was broadly discussed by four of the Palestinian Arab interviewees - was not described as a threat or phenomenon that needed to be mitigated. As a result, GCE was seen as a helpful tool that could promote students' ability to navigate and thrive in global society, rather than a threat to the national cohesion. The lack of affiliation to an Israeli identification is linked to the lack of an official Palestinian state, thus Palestinian Arab Israelis' identity is not seen as bound to their geographic location, but rather constitutes an imagined community (Gupta and Ferguson 1992). Diasporas and minorities are often referred to as members of imagined communities (Suh, An, and Forest 2015), although the case of the Palestinian Arabs in Israel is much less common, as they are an indigenous, trapped minority (as per Rabinowitz 2001). The term trapped minority describes groups who are excluded from national narratives and power structures to different extents, despite feeling connected to the land and having claims to it. As Nahad mentions, the circumstances for Palestinian Arabs in Israel make emigration seem like a legitimate solution for those who wish to succeed, whether they return to their village with the skills they acquired elsewhere or not.

Palestinian Arab teachers, despite their support of GCE, were not optimistic that the Israeli MOE would adopt GCE and incorporate it as policy. Teachers in this sector thought GCE could be added to the Palestinian Arab sectors' citizenship curriculum, because while GCE arguably posed a threat to the Jewish Israeli national identity, the MOE should not have objections to Palestinian Arab students developing global sentiments. Yet, five of the teachers thought the MOE would be unlikely to invest the necessary effort to examine this possibility, and would most likely continue

to teach Palestinian Arab students the civics curriculum which did not construct their identities as Israeli citizens but rather sought to inform them of their basic rights and responsibilities. Although some scholars have optimistically outlined possibilities for a new Israeli identity that is inclusive and does not rely on Jewish symbols (e.g. Busakov 2018), most scholars believe that the status quo in Israel serves the state structures and government well and therefore it is unlikely that they will take any proactive steps towards changing it (Agbaria 2018; Agbaria, Mustafa, and Jabareen 2015; Cohen 2017). So too in our study, as Samir half-jokingly said, the only reason for the MOE to consider GCE would be that “[the MOE] could think- maybe [GCE] will make [the Arabs] leave”.

All of the Palestinian Arab teachers discussed the potential dangers that the void in national feelings of belonging left in their students, and the types of communities and ideas that they could connect with to fill that void. Mahmud, claimed that globalisation in general and online social networks specifically were causing students to sometimes be exposed to ‘the wrong ideas’ about Islamic principles and values.

You need to separate between the school and the adults in the community, and the students, in their private lives. These students are already global, they are already exposed, but there is no filter. They can connect with Muslims like them living all over the world, some of this exposure will make them want better lives, have aspirations. Some of it will take them in dangerous directions, give them wrong ideas.

Mahmud and other teachers feel that the implementation of GCE is imperative in these global times, to regulate, mediate and manage students’ understanding and exposure to the world and make them less susceptible to extremist propaganda. This directly echoes the UNESCO goals for sustainable development with regards to GCE: ‘supporting countries seeking to deliver education programmes that build young people’s resilience to violent extremist messaging and foster a positive sense of identity and belonging [through GCE]’⁴. However, constructing the role of the teacher as a mediator in GCE is quite novel; although teachers have been described as agents of GCE (Authors 2016, 2017c; Rapoport 2010; Schweisfurth 2006), the underlying assumption in this statement is that without them, students would not be given adequate opportunities to engage

with the global. This view of teachers as mediators involves a recognition that some forms of non-school-based GCE are almost passive, in that GCE is also occurring via everyday activities such as browsing the internet or watching television (as per Andreotti 2006; Jorgenson and Shultz 2012). Teachers like Mahmud, are concerned to have a role in supporting students to mediate their exposure to such uncensored material. This relates to Khatib's (2003) exploration of the global citizenship discourse adopted and utilized by Islamic fundamentalist groups, and, more recently Haines' (2012) work in which he discusses Muslim cosmopolitanism as a counter-movement to the liberal, western-oriented ideas of GCE. If these are competing narratives that Muslim students encounter, as Mahmud suggests, the implementation of GCE could be of paramount importance within this sector.

Religious-Jewish Sector - Sectarian fears of an encroaching global world

The teachers from the Jewish religious sector raised the most objections to GC as a concept and to GCE as an educational idea. Teachers from this sector felt some universal values were acceptable and could be taught- particularly if they encouraged tolerance for their own religious practices among wider populations. However, all felt that introducing the notion of 'global citizenship' would impose a homogenised world-view that would challenge both specific Jewish customs that are not universally endorsed (such as the methods of kosher slaughtering of animals for consumption), and more generally disrupt sentiments of national allegiance, as well as normalise certain rights that were not acceptable in their opinion, such as the right for gay couples to marry.

One narrative that came up in three of the interviews with religious Jewish teachers, referred to a recent media campaign (September 2017- early 2018) by the MOE, led by Naftali Bennet, the Minister of Education. The campaign was aimed at raising awareness and motivation among primary and secondary school students to study advanced English courses and focused on spoken English (as opposed to the previous focus on grammatical rules). The teachers who mentioned this campaign all referred to it as offensive to some extent and threatening for Israeli society. Abraham was particularly passionate in his objection:

I think the MOE is definitely encouraging and going in the direction of GCE.....and I think it not only needs to stop promoting it but it should actively fight against it. I heard the 'Spoken English' campaign on the radio and it said that they are going to emphasise spoken English. So they want students to know not just how to read and write so they can read articles and be smarter- but to be able to have a common language and make it easier for them to conduct business, on a skills- technical level- and on a deeper level, to feel like they are pretty much the same as any American or European. They're saying- lets cancel our student' uniqueness and turn them into global kids who happen to live in Israel.

In another reference to this campaign, Reut another religious Jewish teacher also expressed her dissatisfaction with the goals underlying this programme:

If I have to think of how GCE is already in our schools, then it would be through English classes. And I don't know if you've heard but now they are working more on spoken English then grammar- so, they aren't just saying, this world is global and we need to be able to communicate for business- [the MOE] is saying, I want to give students the feeling that they can go anywhere, fit it, assimilate- I don't understand why there isn't more of an outrage.

The religious Jewish teachers all conceded that due to globalisation, exposure to the world is inevitable, and preparing students for this world is necessary and beneficial to some extent. However, the line was drawn at giving students skills and knowledge that may make them leave the country for work or the desire to relocate for other reasons. The aspects of global citizenship that are not related to identity formation were perceived by the religious teachers to be more negotiable. For example, awareness of environmental issues was not perceived to be controversial, and seemed to them to offer a way of doing GCE without threatening more fundamental aspects of identity and belonging. This could be equated to the kind of soft global citizenship education Andreotti (2014) outlines in her typology - a form of learning about the world without engaging with issues that require critical thinking or challenge identity construction. Another form of GCE these teachers could accept was the need to teach students how to behave while abroad so that they would not reinforce negative stereotypes about Jewish peoples or Israeli tourists, who are often portrayed as acting in a rude, loud, or entitled manner (Sela-Sheffy 2006).

Global citizenship for this group was only conceived of as a positive concept when understood as representing specifically the religious and orthodox Jewish populations as part of a global Jewish citizenry. This linked to the work of missionary organizations such as Chabad (A Jewish organisation with over 3500 institutions in 85 countries), which does seek to connect the Jews of the world to their heritage and ensure there is a commitment to supporting existence of Israel – the home state of the Jews – but also Jewish unity in general. All the religious teachers therefore re-interpreted global citizenship as positive if it was focused on promoting ties to the Jewish diaspora, ensuring all Jews felt connected and could find spaces that felt ‘like home’ anywhere in the world. As David explained:

Today my students and I can go almost anywhere in the world, anywhere! In the world! Without having to give up any of our customs. We can find kosher food, even glat-kosher. We can have Shabbat dinner in Beit Chabad (the colloquial name for the Chabad community centres around the world), find a minyan (the minimum number of people required for certain Jewish prayers)- so this is our global citizenship- I can feel at home anywhere without compromise.

David went on to explain, the differences between religious Jews and secular Jews in engaging with a wider world. “Secular Jews can feel at home anywhere in the world because they don’t feel like they are compromising by eating food that is not kosher, they are truly global citizens.” While the religious teachers appeared reluctant to comment on the Palestinian-Arab population and their relationship to global citizenship, their criticism of the secular Jews was vocal, who they portrayed as belonging to a world culture rather than the Jewish collective (e.g. Yadgar 2011).

Our findings highlighted a consensus among Jewish religious teachers that GCE that promoted an acceptance of various groups’ beliefs and customs, while also promoting some universal values that were in line with Judaism was acceptable. One teacher from a religious Jewish school in Tel-Aviv was particularly candid about the way he felt GCE would be utilised in his sector:

If [the Jewish religious sector] would embrace anything related to GCE, it would be for the sake of being able to communicate to other people- “we are the children of the light, *the chosen ones*, come learn from us”. And then we would be able to spread this light to more

places. It would also open [the Jewish religion and the importance of Israel] up to a much wider audience- so if I [as a student] know English now then that's great! I'll talk to Jewish folks from the US and tell them how important it is to make Aliyah (migration of Jewish diaspora to Israel) and how important the holy land is and tell them to come join the military.

This quote could be said to embody the sort of missionary, neo-colonial, westernised discourse that is often embodied in nationalistic adaptations of GCE (Authors 2017a). An underlying (or in this case, blatant) assumption is that one culture's set of values is superior to others and that GCE can facilitate the supposed 'spreading of the light'. This sentiment was expressed by more than half of the religious Jewish teachers to different degrees, and three teachers referred to the Jewish people as "Or Lagoyim"- a source of light for the non-Jews (See Frishman 2014; Ilani 2015). The Jewish Religious teachers all stressed the point that it was important to preserve the differences between the Jewish people and others, in order to avoid assimilation or secularisation. These sectarian fears are not unfounded, as national-level steps towards liberalisation, such as GCE, has been shown to limit the control of the religious education sector and impede their mechanisms for self-preservation (Mausen and Bader 2015; Maussen and Vermeulen 2017; Scheunpflug 2015).

Secular Jewish Sector- A majority seeking further opportunities

The secular Jewish teachers connected GCE to globalisation, mobility, and work opportunities- before relating it to universal values, human rights, or sustainability and environmental issues. This is contradictory to the Palestinian Arab sector's teachers' concentration on belonging and universal values, and the religious sector's negative definition of GCE as a global -liberal trend aimed at erasing inter-personal and inter-religious differences and imposing a universal set of values. Four secular teachers referred to the inherent paradox between Israel's global ambitions and its intent to maintain students' Jewish identity, and the ways this paradox could be overcome. Yuval explained in his interview:

I think [the MOE] is teaching global citizenship- not in the purest form- not by saying the actual words but by doing things like promoting STEM subjects, which are universal. So on the one hand the education system works hard at promoting students' national identity

but it is also trying to introduce more than that through this back door- it wants to raise children who will grow up to be innovative and work in a dynamic reality in a global world and this will help them. The system is *doing* global citizenship without *saying the words*.

This quote demonstrates several points. First, secular teachers perceive STEM as a form of GCE, indicating a skills-based approach (Engel and Siczek 2017); furthermore, this form of GCE is perceived as a less controversial form because it does not collide with concepts like citizenship that are related to identity development. This focus on the way GCE can benefit students and allow them to thrive in global society was present to some extent in all of the secular teachers' responses. Itay, like two other secular teachers, mentioned Israel's status as a 'start up nation', a point of national pride that the education system aims to promote. GCE was described as one way to facilitate the development of the start-up nation, though as Itay cautions, there are also drawbacks to be considered

The start-up nation needs the international connections...but once you enable and promote these connections, people find out that they can also live [abroad][...] the system and the minister of education are saying...we need entrepreneurial kids who will open start-up companies, but what does an entrepreneur who starts a company do? He moves his company to San Francisco. Or he sells it and buys another company abroad. So economically [the system is] looking outward, but socially [the system is] closing itself and the students in, by [promoting their devotion and identification with the Jewish and Israeli struggles].

This dual positioning – of GCE in Israel as something positive but also with consequences has been discussed elsewhere (Authors 2017c). But the data generated in this study allows us to contrast how different groups in Israel conceptualise the potential benefits and drawbacks. Similar to the religious Jewish teachers, secular Jewish teachers felt that the MOE would likely perceive GCE as a threat to Israeli nationality, and would therefore need to contain its potential impact by promoting nationalistic curricular contents to attempt to mitigate the 'brain-drain' and broader, global processes of assimilation. This points to a delicate balance which they perceive as needing to be achieved in order to accommodate these somewhat conflicting national interests. The secular Jewish teachers perceived GCE to be a tool for economic advancement- whether at the national or

individual level, and they did not discuss GCE as a way to facilitate a sense of global belonging. This utilitarian, skills-based approach to GCE is quite salient, particularly in post-conflict or diverse nations, in which issues of identity can be disputed. In such contexts, educators are often left to concentrate mostly on enforcing pragmatic conceptions of GCE that are less controversial and not directly associated with identity per se (Reilly and Niens 2014).

The avoidance of the actual term by the MOE was also a recurring theme in the secular Jewish teachers' interviews. Teachers felt that the term global citizenship itself was contradictory to the national narrative promoted by the education system and explained that this narrative dictates a localized concentration on the Israeli context or the Jewish context, not leaving much room for students to identify with any broader community. As a result, any attempts at GCE would have to be done 'through the back door', as Yuval's quote suggests- through acquisition of skills in STEM rather than delving into issues of identity. As Anat explained:

The students don't learn at all about any of the horrors happening in other places in the world. Except natural disasters- because that's no ones' [responsibility], and it might even deter them from going anywhere- we don't do anything that addresses the world, not on universal Human Rights Day, not on international Holocaust Remembrance Day- the focus is only on *us*- look what *they* did to *us*- this is how Israel protects itself from hitbolelut [assimilation in a negative sense of identity loss]- by creating this differentiation... there is a price to this and we must decide how we feel about it.

Anat's observation about the nationalistic tendencies of the Israeli education system has been the focus of many studies, some concentrating on the particularistic aspects of the way the Holocaust is taught (Gross 2010; Resnik, 1999) and others on the localised nature of the history curriculum, which focuses almost completely on Jewish and Israeli history (Firer 1998; Authors 2016). However, the second sentence in Anat's quote echoes what two other religious teachers said about the acceptability of environmental issues and sustainability as being the focus of GCE. These issues seem to be perceived by teachers as neutral, 'belonging to no one' (meaning they are not to be blamed on any state in particular). Though, many would dispute such a claim, considering the large contribution of developed countries to greenhouse gas emissions, which in turn are seen as the driving force for global warming, the effects of which are often disproportionately felt by

developing countries (Mendelsohn, Dinar, and Williams 2006). Finally, as opposed to the religious teachers, The Secular Jewish teachers did not speak of religion as a platform for GC, and seemed to orient themselves to GC as part of their modern engagement with technology, travel, mobility and employment opportunities above all else.

Concluding thoughts: Sense of belonging, religion, and global citizenship education

This study examined the way GCE is perceived by teachers from schools located in the different sectors of the Israeli education system. Our findings indicate that religious affiliation and connections to others or perceived status within a country can yield very different perceptions of the notion of GCE, as well as shape the extent to which GCE is perceived as a threat or an opportunity to national schooling systems. Ultimately, three rationales for GCE can be observed in our findings: GCE for the promotion of individual as well as national interests; GCE as an alternative to national belonging (which is seen in the Palestinian Arab sector as an opportunity, and in the religious Jewish sector as a threat); and religion as a platform for GCE.

We found that teachers from each sector form very different views of GCE, which are usually based on the way they see the needs of students and their futures. Accordingly, six of the Jewish religious teachers developed a depiction of GCE as a threat, because they feel their collective identity needs to be protected, particularly to counter processes of perceived increasing globalisation. Meanwhile, the Palestinian Arab teachers associated the term mostly with making available to their marginalised students a sense of belonging and opportunities for greater social and geographic mobility, usually through moving abroad. Finally, the secular Jewish teachers saw the development of GCE provision as a positive, necessary extension to the curriculum to further their students' ability to navigate global society and promote Israel's start-up nation status.

Despite the relatively small sample for this study, our research does strengthen claims already made in previous work that perceptions of GCE are contextually sensitive (Authors 2017a; b; c), and raises some critical ideas requiring further exploration in different contexts, particularly in relation to the links between GCE and the particularistic sense belonging. Perhaps most surprising to us, was the emphasis teachers from the Palestinian Arab minority gave the notion of GCE as making available a way to fill the lack of belonging felt by so many Palestinian Arabs to the nation

of Israel. While the situation faced by Palestinian Arabs in Israel is arguably one of the most extreme examples of the exclusionary nature of national citizenship models today (see Agbaria 2018; Cohen 2017), the promotion of GCE as a way to productively generate an affective sense of belonging could be applied to many other minority groups and immigrant populations, who too are so often excluded from the national narratives of citizenship (Banks 2017; Myers and Zaman 2009; Shirazi 2018; Worden and Smith 2017). Thus, our findings feed into broader discussions of the potentiality of GCE.

Some have argued that GCE can be a part of a national political project of belonging (as per Yuval-Davis' terminology 2006) aimed at creating a form of citizenship that does not rely on social characteristics like place of birth or religion to build bonds between people across a society, but rather embeds connections between them through an agreed set values and the promotion of mutual respect (Pashby 2018; Tarozzi and Torres 2016). Yet our study suggests that some teachers can see GCE as successful in creating a more internationally or transnationally-located project of belonging, which is perhaps especially critical for those people who are marginalised within their national borders (Çayır, 2015; Eliassi 2016; Nordberg 2006; Yuval-Davis, Anthias and Kofman 2005). Banks (2017) recently termed situations in which marginalised groups do not identify with the values or other aspects of the nation-state as 'failed citizenship' and called upon schools and states to develop a model of multicultural citizenship. However, this is predicated on an underlying assumption that states aim to provide all their citizens with the opportunity to truly identify with the national collective. This is not necessarily the case in Israel (Cohen 2017), and should also be critically examined and problematised in other contexts that pertain to marginalised groups.

The relationships between religion and GCE should also be further explored, as our findings point to a complex and multi-dimensional understanding of GC, particularly among the religious Jewish teachers we interviewed. Scholarly discussions of religion and GC address them as world views that are not mutually-exclusive world-views (Levitt 2008), in that one does not need to give up one's religion in order to be a global citizen, but also in that GC includes, by definition, an acknowledgment of the legitimacy of and an appreciation for all religions and cultures (Gaudelli 2016). Empirical studies, on the other hand, often suggest otherwise, stating that in educational settings in particular, religion can negatively impact the ability to introduce certain universal

values or collide in other ways with principles associated with GC (Fontana 2015; Katzarska-Miller, Barnsly, and Reysen 2014).

Our findings support those of previous studies which showed that religious education settings can lead to sectarianism and prejudiced views of the religious other, however, they also reveal a prevalent view of religion itself *as* a form of GC. On the one hand, the religious teachers we interviewed perceived GCE as a threat to the very existence of Israel and to Jewish traditions, through its supposed promotion of universal human rights and values that do not align with the Jewish religious mandates (such as gay marriage). These assumptions underlying GCE are, in the eyes of religious teachers, incompatible with Jewish values, which as previously mentioned, place the Jewish People on a pedestal. These findings are in line with those highlighted by Fontana (2015) in her study of religious education reforms in Lebanon, Northern Ireland, and Macedonia after identity-based conflicts. Her findings indicate that religious education could have a divisive effect, reinforcing social rifts between ethnic and national groups. Nevertheless, teachers who opposed the universal aspects of GCE in our study also described religion itself as a platform for GC- a point raised mostly by the Jewish religious teachers. They felt that if their sector was to embrace any notions of GCE, they would be tied directly to belonging to a Jewish transnational community, engaging with Jews in Diaspora, encouraging Jews to migrate to Israel, and for broader missionary purposes- spreading the Jewish religion further. Such a view of religion as a platform for GC does not constitute spiritual GCE, which Oxley and Morris (2013) referred to in their typology of models of GCE. The definition of spiritual GCE relies on religious moral imperatives and values that emphasise humanism, respect for others and a holistic view of humanity; one might in fact argue that the Jewish teachers' religion-based conception of GCE is not a form of GCE at all, because it excludes anyone who is not Jewish or open to becoming Jewish. Oxley and Morris mention that many global organisations that promote GC are rooted in major world religions- but the ideals they promote are not aligned with those of liberal democracies, because their aim is to promote theocratic system of governance over secular models (as per Warburg 1999). In fact, the exclusive form of GC described by the Jewish religious teachers corresponds more with the discourse employed by counter-movements to GC such as Haines' (2012) discussion of Muslim cosmopolitanism. These similarities in the religiously-inflected narratives surrounding GC in different groups should be explored further through comparative

studies in different contexts, as they appear to greatly shape the way the concept is interpreted and taken up.

This comparative study calls into question the potential for promoting peace and social cohesion through global citizenship education, considering the stark differences in the way the term is interpreted and articulated within different contexts in a divided society. Although this is an idea which has emerged in other research conducted through case studies, theoretical explorations, and reviews (Authors, 2017b) this study has provided a more detailed account of the manifestations of these different interpretations through the cross-sector comparison of different located populations - dominant-culture, religious, and marginalised - allowing a more complete understanding of how these differences manifest themselves and how they shape conceptual understandings.

In sum, several critical issues can be inferred from our findings, all of which lead to future research trajectories that are important to explore; first, in light of the significant differences in perceptions of GC across sectors, future research as well as policy in this field would need to comparatively explore the potential obstacles to and benefits of GCE for different groups, even in the same national context, rather than attempt to implement one-size-fits all approaches which could be subject to resistance and objections for a variety of reasons. Second, GCE could be imperative for students from marginalised groups that may, in the absence of an alternative to national belonging, become susceptible to extremist groups and reject other forms of social cohesion in their search for an alternative framework of belonging. This issue is arguably of paramount importance as diversification within schools rises due to increased levels of voluntary and forced migration across numerous nations, where notions of citizenship and citizenship education do not provide appropriate frameworks of belonging for these transnational populations. Finally, the extent to which states are willing to, or aim to be truly inclusive should always be critically examined when discussing GCE, as it is often in the interest of the state to maintain the status-quo between various groups, which puts potential for GCE to deliver on its intended purpose at risk.

References

Agbaria, Ayman K. 2016. "Ethno-National Politics of Citizenship Education in Israel and the Counter-knowledge of Palestinian Teachers." In *Global Migration, Diversity, and Civic Education: Improving Policy and Practice*, edited by James Banks, Marcelo Suárez-Orozco, and Miriam Ben-Peretz, 156-176. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Agbaria, Ayman K. 2018. "The 'Right' Education in Israel: Segregation, Religious Ethnonationalism, and Depoliticized Professionalism." *Critical Studies in Education* 59 (1): 18-34. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2016.1185642.

Agbaria, Ayman K., Muhanad Mustafa, and Yousef T. Jabareen. 2015. "'In Your Face' Democracy: Education for Belonging and Its Challenges in Israel." *British Educational Research Journal* 41 (1): 143-175. doi: 10.1002/berj.3133.

Al-Haj, Majid. 2005. "National Ethos, Multicultural Education, and the New History Textbooks in Israel." *Curriculum Inquiry* 35 (1): 47-71. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-873X.2005.00315.x.

Andreotti, Vanessa Oliveira de. 2014. "Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education." In *Development Education in Policy and Practice*, edited by Stephen McCloskey, 21-31. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Authors, 2016

Authors, 2017a

Authors, 2017b

Author, 2016

Authors 2018

- Banks, James A. 2017. "Diversity and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nations." In *Multicultural Education in Glocal Perspectives*, edited by Yun-Kyung Cha, Jagdish Gundara, Seung-Hwan Ham, and Moosung Lee, 73-88. Singapore: Springer.
- Banks, James. A. 2017. "Failed Citizenship and Transformative Civic Education." *Educational Researcher* 46 (7): 366-377. doi:10.3102/0013189X17726741
- Benavot, Aaron, and Nura Resh. 2003. "Educational Governance, School Autonomy, and Curriculum Implementation: A Comparative Study of Arab and Jewish Schools in Israel." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 35 (2): 171-196. doi: 10.1080/0022027022000022856.
- Bowden, Brett. 2003. "The Perils of Global Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 7 (3): 349-362. doi: 10.1080/1362102032000098913.
- Çayır, Kenan. 2015. "Citizenship, Nationality and Minorities in Turkey's Textbooks: From Politics of Non-Recognition to 'Difference Multiculturalism'." *Comparative Education* 51 (4): 519-536. doi: 10.1080/03050068.2015.1088210.
- Cho, Hye Seung, and Jacqueline Mosselson. 2017. "Neoliberal Practices Amidst Social Justice Orientations: Global Citizenship Education in South Korea." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2017.1364154.
- Cochran, Judith A. 2017 "Israel: Divided by Religion and Education." *Digest of Middle East Studies* 26 (1): 32-55. doi: 10.1111/dome.12106.
- Cohen, Aviv. 2017. "Israel's Civic Education Wars: A Review of the Literature and Theoretical Implications." *Educational Review*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/00131911.2017.1407295.
- Davies, Lynn. 2008. "Interruptive Democracy in Education" In *Comparative and Global Pedagogies: Equity, Access and Democracy in Education* edited by Joseph Zahjda, Lynn

- Davies, and Suzanne Majhanovich , 15–33. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-8349-5_2.
- Eliassi, Barzoo. 2016. "Conceiving Citizenship and Statelessness in the Middle East and Sweden: The Experiences of Kurdish Migrants in Sweden." In *Citizenship, Belonging, and Nation-States in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Nicole Stokes-DuPass and Ramonapp Fruja, 85-110. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Engel, Laura. 2014. "Global Citizenship and National (Re) Formations: Analysis of Citizenship Education Reform in Spain". *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 9 (3): 239–254. doi:10.1177/1746197914545927.
- Engel, Laura, and Debora H. Ortloff. 2009. "From the Local to the Supranational: Curriculum Reform and the Production of the Ideal Citizen in Two Federal Systems, Germany and Spain." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41 (2): 179-198. doi:10.1080/00220270802541147.
- Engel, Laura, and Megan Siczek. 2017. "A Cross-National Comparison of International Strategies: Global Citizenship and the Advancement of National Competitiveness". *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/03057925.2017.1353408.
- Fishman, Sylvia. 2014. "Generational and Cultural Constructions of Jewish Peoplehood." In *Reconsidering Israel Diaspora Relations*, edited by Eliezer Ben-Rafael, Judith Bokser Liwerant, and Joseph Gorny, 250-271. Boston: Brill.
- Gallagher, Tony. 2005. "Balancing Difference and the Common Good: Lessons From a Post - Conflict Society." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 35 (4): 429-442. doi:10.1080/03057920500331330.
- Gaudelli, William. 2016. *Global Citizenship Education: Everyday Transcendence*. New York: Routledge.
- Gross, Zehava. 2010. "Holocaust Education in Jewish Schools in Israel: Goals, Dilemmas, Challenges." *Prospects* 40 (1): 93-113. doi:10.1007/s11125-010-9142-x.

- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1992. "Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1): 6-23.
- Gusacov, Eran. 2018. "Education for Patriotism and the Arab-Israeli Sector." *International Journal of Educational Development* 60 (1): 138-148. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.11.005.
- Haines, Chad. 2015. "Being Muslim, Being Cosmopolitan: Transgressing the Liberal Global." *Journal of International and Global Studies* 7 (1): 32-49.
- Ichilov, Orit. 2003. "Teaching Civics in a Divided Society: The Case of Israel." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 13 (3): 219-242. doi:10.1080/09620210300200111.
- Ilani, Ofri. 2015. "The Jews as Educators of Humanity: a Christian Philosemitic Grand Narrative of Jewish Modernity." In *The German-Jewish Experience Revisited*, edited by Steven E. Aschheim, and Vivian Liska, 1-14. Boston: De Gruyter.
- Johnson, Laura and Paul Morris. 2012. "Critical Citizenship Education in England and France: A Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Education* 48 (3): 283-301. doi:10.1080/03050068.2011.588885.
- Jorgenson, Shelane, and Lynette Shultz. 2012. "Global Citizenship Education (GCE) in Post-Secondary Institutions: What is Protected and What is Hidden Under the Umbrella of GCE?" *Journal of Global Citizenship and Equity Education* 2 (1): Special Edition.
- Kashti, Or. 2017. "Funding for Israeli Jewish Identity Unit Doubled Since Its Founding in 2013" *Haaretz*, November 30. <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-funding-for-israeli-jewish-identity-unit-doubled-since-its-founding-in-2013-1.5437407>.
- Katzarska-Miller, Iva, Carole A. Barnsley, and Reysen, Stephen. 2014. "Global Citizenship Identification and Religiosity." *Archive for the Psychology of Religion* 36 (3): 344-367. doi:10.1163/15736121-12341291.

- Lemish, Peter. 2003. "Civic and Citizenship Education in Israel." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33 (1): 53–72. doi:10.1080/0305764032000064640.
- Levitt, Peggy. 2008. "Religion as a Path to Civic Engagement." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (4): 766-791. doi:10.1080/01419870701784489.
- Maussen, Marcel, and Veit Bader. 2015. "Non-Governmental Religious Schools in Europe: Institutional Opportunities, Associational Freedoms, and Contemporary Challenges." *Comparative Education* 51 (1): 1-21. doi:10.1080/03050068.2014.935581.
- Maussen, Marcel, and Floris Vermeulen. 2015. "Liberal Equality and Toleration for Conservative Religious Minorities. Decreasing Opportunities for Religious Schools in the Netherlands?" *Comparative Education* 51 (1): 87-104. doi:10.1080/03050068.2014.935576.
- Mendelsohn, Robert, Ariel Dinar, and Larry Williams. 2006. "The Distributional Impact of Climate Change on Rich and Poor Countries." *Environment and Development Economics* 11 (2): 159-178. doi:10.1017/S1355770X06002890.
- Moon, Rennie. J., and Jeong-Woo Koo. 2011. "Global Citizenship and Human Rights: A Longitudinal Analysis of Social Studies and Ethics Textbooks in the Republic of Korea." *Comparative Education Review* 55 (4): 574-599. doi:10.1086/660796.
- Muff, Aline, and Zvi Bekerman. 2017. "Agents of the Nation-State or Transformative Intellectuals? Exploring the Conflicting Roles of Civics Teachers in Israel." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1746197917743752.
- Myers, John, P. 2016. "Charting a Democratic Course for Global Citizenship Education: Research Directions and Current Challenges." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 24 (55): 2-19. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2174.

- Myers, John. P., and Husam A. Zaman. 2009. "Negotiating the Global and National: Immigrant and Dominant-Culture Adolescents' Vocabularies of Citizenship in a Transnational World." *Teachers College Record* 111 (11): 2589–2625.
- Niens, Ulricke and Jacqueline Reilly. 2012. "Education for Global Citizenship in a Divided Society? Young People's Views and Experiences." *Comparative Education* 48 (1): 103-118. doi: 10.1080/03050068.2011.637766.
- Nordberg, Camilla. 2006. "Claiming Citizenship: Marginalised Voices on Identity and Belonging." *Citizenship Studies* 10 (5): 523-539. doi:10.1080/13621020600954952.
- Ortloff, Debora. H. 2011. "Moving the Borders: Multiculturalism and Global Citizenship in the German Social Studies Classroom." *Educational Research* 53 (2): 137–149. doi:10.1080/00131881.2011.572362.
- Oxley, Laura, and Paul Morris. 2013. "Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 61 (3): 301–325. doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.798393.
- Pais, Alexandre, and Marta Costa. 2017. "An Ideology Critique of Global Citizenship Education." *Critical Studies in Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772.
- Pashby, Karen. 2018. "Identity, Belonging and Diversity in Education for Global Citizenship: Multiplying, Intersecting, Transforming, and Engaging Lived Realities." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Citizenship and Education* edited by Ian Davis, Li-Ching Ho, Dina Kiwan, Carla L. Peck, Andrew Peterson, Edda Sant, and Yusef Waghid, 277-293. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peled, Yoav. 1992. "Ethnic Democracy and the Legal Construction of Citizenship: Arab Citizens of the Jewish State." *American Political Science Review* 86 (2): 432-443. doi:10.2307/1964231.

- Pinson, Halleli. 2007. "Inclusive Curriculum? Challenges to the Role of Civic Education in a Jewish and Democratic State." *Curriculum Inquiry* 37 (4): 351-382. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2007.00391.x.
- Pinson, Halleli. 2008. "The Excluded Citizenship Identity: Palestinian/Arab Israeli Young People Negotiating Their Political Identities." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29 (2): 201-212. doi:10.1080/01425690701837554.
- Poulter, Saila. 2012. "From Secular Epistemology Towards the Pedagogy of 'Inter-Knowledges.'" *Muslim Education Quarterly* 25 (3): 19-30.
- Rabinowitz, Dan. 2001. "The Palestinian Citizens of Israel, the Concept of Trapped Minority and the Discourse of Transnationalism in Anthropology." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (1): 64-85. doi:10.1080/014198701750052505.
- Ramirez, Francisco, O., and John W. Meyer. 2012. "Toward Post-National Societies and Global Citizenship." *Multicultural Education Review* 4 (1): 1-28. doi:10.1080/23770031.2009.11102887.
- Rapoport, Anatoli. 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. doi:10.1177/1746197910382256.
- Reilly, Jacqueline, and Ulrike Niens. 2014. "Global Citizenship as Education for Peacebuilding in a Divided Society: Structural and Contextual Constraints on the Development of Critical Dialogic Discourse in Schools." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 44 (1): 53-76. doi:10.1080/03057925.2013.859894.
- Resnik, Julia. 1999. "Particularistic Versus Universalistic Content in the Israeli Education System." *Curriculum Inquiry* 29 (4): 485-511. doi:10.1111/0362-6784.00143.
- Russell, Susan G., and David F. Suárez. 2017. "Symbol and Substance: Human Rights Education as an Emergent Global Institution." In *Human Rights Education: Theory, Research, Praxis* edited by Monisha Bajaj, 251-266. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Sabbagh, Clara, and Nura Resh. 2014. "Citizenship Orientations in a Divided Society: A Comparison of Three Groups of Israeli Junior-High Students—Secular Jews, Religious Jews, and Israeli Arabs." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 9 (1): 34-54. doi:10.1177/1746197913497662.
- Scheunpflug, Annette. 2015. "Non-Governmental Religious Schools in Germany: Increasing Demand by Decreasing Religiosity?" *Comparative Education* 51 (1): 38-56. doi:10.1080/03050068.2014.935577.
- Schweisfurth, Michele. 2006. "Education for Global Citizenship: Teacher Agency and Curricular Structure in Ontario Schools." *Educational Review* 58 (1): 41–50. doi:10.1080/00131910500352648.
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2006. "Detachment and Engagement: Israelis' Everyday Verbal Representations of 'the Israeli Person' and the Contest for the Right to Condemn a Collective Identity." *Social Identities* 12 (3): 325-344. doi:10.1080/13504630600744179.
- Sheps, Stephen. W. 2016. "History and Civics Education in Israel: Reflections from Israeli Teachers." *Critical Studies in Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/17508487.2016.1263966.
- Shirazi, Roozbeh. 2018. "Between Hosts and Guests: Conditional Hospitality and Citizenship in an American Suburban School." *Curriculum Inquiry* 48 (1): 95-114. doi:10.1080/03626784.2017.1409592
- Stein, Sharon, Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, and Rene Suša. 2016. "'Beyond 2015', Within the Modern/Colonial Global Imaginary? Global Development and Higher Education." *Critical Studies in Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/17508487.2016.1247737.
- Suh, Yonghee., Sohyun An, and Danielle Forest. 2015. "Immigration, Imagined Communities, and Collective Memories of Asian American Experiences: A Content Analysis of Asian American Experiences in Virginia US History Textbooks." *The Journal of Social Studies Research* 39 (1): 39-51. doi:10.1016/j.jssr.2014.05.002.

- Tarozzi Massimiliano, and Carlos A. Torres, eds. 2016. *Global Citizenship Education and the Crises of Multiculturalism: Comparative Perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Thornberg, Robert, and Kathy Charmaz. 2014. "Grounded Theory and Theoretical Coding." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Analysis* edited by Uwe Flick, 153-169. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Torres, Carlos A. 2015. "Solidarity and Competitiveness in a Global Context: Comparable Concepts in Global Citizenship Education?" *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 14 (2): 22-29.
- Warburg, Margit. 1999. "Baha'i: a Religious Approach to Globalization" *Social Compass* 46 (1): 47-56. doi:10.1177/003776899046001005.
- Wood, Bronwyn E. 2014. "Participatory Capital: Bourdieu and Citizenship Education in Diverse School Communities." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 35 (4): 578-597. doi:10.1080/01425692.2013.777209.
- Worden, Elizabeth A., and Alan Smith. 2017. "Teaching for Democracy in the Absence of Transitional Justice: The Case of Northern Ireland." *Comparative Education* 53 (3): 379-395. doi:10.1080/03050068.2017.1334426.
- Yadgar, Yaacov. 2011. "Jewish Secularism and Ethno-National Identity in Israel: The Traditionist Critique." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 26 (3): 467-481. doi:10.1080/13537903.2011.616041.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40 (3): 197-214. doi:10.1080/00313220600769331.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira, Floya Anthias, and Eleonore Kofman. 2005. "Secure Borders and Safe Haven and the Gendered Politics of Belonging: Beyond Social Cohesion." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (3): 513-535. doi:10.1080/0141987042000337867.