CICE Current Issues in Comparative Education

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

Cosmopolitanism, Education and Comparative Education

GUEST EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

ARTICLES

ESSAY

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

COPYRIGHT

DISCLAIMER

Current Issues in Comparative Education

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

Cosmopolitanism, Education and Comparative Education

GUEST EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

ARTICLES

ESSAY

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

COPYRIGHT

DISCLAIMER

Cosmopolitanism in Civic Education: Exploring Cross-National Trends, 1970-2008

Patricia Bromley
Stanford University

This study examines how far education systems worldwide have progressed from depicting society as rooted in a homogenous, bounded nation-state towards cosmopolitan emphases on a common humanity and social diversity. The research uses a unique longitudinal and cross-national primary source of data – high school civics, history, and social studies textbooks published since 1970. Textbooks are central to socializing particular identities because they define legitimate knowledge and desirable social attributes, and also communicate privileged concepts of national or global citizenship. In this way, they can exacerbate national and sub-national ethnic and cultural conflicts, or help to support the development of cosmopolitan identities. I find a broad increase in cosmopolitan emphases of universalism and diversity in civic education curricula in much of the world. However, even within cosmopolitan theories there are divergent views on the potential implications of a more universal and diverse notion of citizenship for society.

In the wake of World War II, international attention turned to the detrimental role of education systems, and especially textbooks, in promoting hyper-nationalism. Social science curricula at the time emphasized culturally homogenous citizens of unitary national states, often demonizing and stereotyping the 'other'. Early work by the United Nations and many bilateral commissions aimed to reform school curricula with the goal of eradicating bias from society. Such reforms reflected a broader and fundamental change in notions of citizenship – from focusing on the construction of a unitary national identity to embracing cosmopolitan ideals of protecting universal human rights and the diversity of special groups such as women or minorities.

Textbooks are central to efforts to socialize particular views of citizenship because they define legitimate knowledge and desirable social attributes, and also communicate preferred concepts of identity. In this way, they can exacerbate national and sub-national ethnic and cultural conflicts, or help to support the development of cosmopolitan identities. This study examines how far education systems worldwide have progressed from depicting society as rooted in a homogenous, bounded nation-state towards cosmopolitan emphases on diversity and human equality using a unique longitudinal and cross-national primary source of data – high school civics, history, and social studies textbooks published since 1970. I find a broad increase in cosmopolitan emphases in civic education curricula in much of the world. In the following sections I outline the existing research that frames this study, describe my data and methods, present findings, and discuss differing cosmopolitan interpretations of the results that lead to divergent implications for society. One view argues cosmopolitanism is fundamentally beneficial, and the ultimate fulfillment of cosmopolitan benefits will be best realized through the creation of a world state. A contrasting cosmopolitan perspective argues it is the absence of a world state that enables global social and cultural integration to flourish, and regards cosmopolitan trends as creating opportunities for evil as well as good.

Background

In recent years many have noted a resurgence of attention to cosmopolitanism, often attributing this rise to the confluence of globalization, decolonization, migration and multiculturalism (See, for example, the thorough discussion in Chapter 1 of Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). These global

Current Issues in Comparative Education, Vol. 12(1): 33-44.

trends may be particularly amplified in the wake of World War II, following the de-legitimization of nationalism (Kaplan, 2006) and an increased emphasis on international cooperation through, for example, the creation of the United Nations system. The construction of an increasingly integrated world has weakened an older notion of nation-states as insular polities with a culturally homogenous citizenry by shifting the locus of authority above and below the state, a process sometimes called "glocalization" (Robertson, 1992). Supra-nationally, these pressures cultivate a common, cosmopolitan frame of reference among individuals as agentic equals possessing inherent human rights. Sub-nationally, they foster the identities and equality of diverse groups in society. Despite widespread recognition of these trends, much social science research exhibits a methodological nationalism that precludes researchers from examining the effects of these global phenomena (Beck & Sznaider, 2006). In contrast, a cosmopolitan lens enables the exploration of changes in citizenship education worldwide.

On one level all cosmopolitan approaches are similar in that they encourage the vision of an interconnected society and culture that is unbounded by the political territory of the nation-state, leading to analyses that consider influences and changes that go beyond national borders. A central component of cosmopolitanism is universalism, traditionally represented by the notion of world citizenship. Indeed, the word 'cosmopolitan' itself comes from the classical Greek 'kosmou politês' meaning a 'citizen of the world'. The ideals of world citizenship remained a central tenet of cosmopolitanism through the Enlightenment, most notably in the work of Immanuel Kant. Contemporary cosmopolitan thinking has expanded notions of universalism from world citizenship to include the modern conception of human rights, an inherently universal notion. Pogge (2008), for example, outlines a contemporary view of cosmopolitan morality "formulated in terms of *human rights*" (p. 176, emphasis in original), meaning that it "centers on the fundamental needs and interests of individual human beings, and of *all* human beings" (p. 184, emphasis in original). Similarly, Levy & Sznaider (2004) describe "the recent proliferation of human rights ideas as a new form of cosmopolitanism" (p. 143). In the same vein, Beetham (1999) outlines a proposal of human rights as a model for cosmopolitan democracy.

In addition to incorporating the ideas of human rights, many contemporary interpretations of cosmopolitanism explicitly emphasize the potentially homogenizing force of universalism as emerging hand-in-hand with the celebration of diversity. In other words, cosmopolitanism "means not a replication of uniformity but an organization of diversity, an increasing interconnectedness of varied local cultures" (Hannerz, 1996, p. 102). Thus, being a cosmopolitan involves willingness to tolerate, celebrate, engage openly with, and even seek out diverse social and cultural experiences (Levy & Sznaider, 2004; Hollinger, 1995; Delanty, 2006a, 2006b; Pollock et al, 2000). Appiah (1997) extends this incorporation of diversity to include attachment to the nation-state through a 'cosmopolitan patriotism' or 'rooted cosmopolitanism'. Others accept diversity from social or cultural sources like gender or ethnicity, but conceptualize cosmopolitanism largely as an alternative to the political identities associated with national patriotism (Nussbaum, 1994).

Although emerging together, the dual trends of universalism and diversity can come into conflict. Cosmopolitan theories share the challenge of addressing whether universalism is benign, beneficial, or a form of hegemony, and how to balance universal principles with the empowerment of diverse groups in society (See Breckenridge et al., 2002 for an in-depth discussion). A common clash occurs when the interests of corporate social groups, such as indigenous groups but also including nation-states, place obligations on members that possibly contradict the universal principles of human rights or limit individual freedoms. Many scholars address this tension by celebrating a specific form of diversity, one rooted in individual choice, tolerance, and voluntary

participation in social groups. Cosmopolitans promote diversity in the sense of accepting group membership as an individual choice and source of identity, but insist individual rights should not be subordinate to the interests of any particular social group (Appiah, 1997; Kymlicka, 1995). In the words of Hartman & Gerteis (2005) cosmopolitanism "defends diversity only insofar as it allows and expands individual rights and freedoms" (p. 228).

In sum, contemporary cosmopolitanism includes two main emphases, universalism, in the form of global citizenship and human rights, and diversity, in the form of celebrating heterogeneous social groups and promoting equal rights for divergent groups. A mounting body of evidence suggests that conceptually and practically, notions of the nation-state as a territorially bounded polity governing a homogenous citizenry with a common culture are giving way to this cosmopolitan model. For example, Sassen (2006) argues that notions of authority and rights, once constructed as territorially bounded to the nation-state, are increasingly denationalized. Similarly, Fligstein (2008) focuses on the emergence of a transnational identity in the European sphere. Looking beyond Europe, much recent scholarship shows that universal human rights are on the rise as a core component of contemporary world culture (Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Ramirez et al., 2006; Elliott, 2007). Other world cultural studies show the empowerment of diverse groups such as indigenous peoples (Cole, 2005), women (Wotipka & Ramirez, 2008), and children (Boyle et al., 2007) over time.

These de-nationalized, cosmopolitan trends are also reflected in civic education. Meyer et al (forthcoming) find a dramatic increase in human rights emphases in civic education across many countries over time. Using cross-sectional data from 28 mainly European countries, Mintrop (2003) shows that there is a new face to civic education that emphasizes social movements, rights discourse, and critical thinking. Similarly, Levinson (2004) traces the rise of a new form of civic education in Mexico designed to democratically empower students through student-centered pedagogy. In Costa Rica and Argentina, Suárez (2008) describes the rise of global human rights as a central feature of national civic education.

While important in their own right, the majority of these studies are limited either by their focus on particular countries or regions, or they consider only a single time point. Those that have global scope examine areas outside education or only partially consider the range of topics associated with cosmopolitanism. For instance, Meyer et al. (forthcoming) looks only at human rights, rather than examining world citizenship, human rights, and diversity. Thus, the question remains as to how far the shift towards a cosmopolitan world view plays out in citizenship education around the world, particularly given that mass schooling is still mostly under the control of national governments.

Data, Measures & Method

I tracked the rise of emphases on universalism and diversity in 465 history, civics and social studies textbooks from 69 countries around the world published since 1970. The majority of books come from the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig, Germany. The Institute collects social science textbooks from countries around the world and has a library with over 60,000 social science school books published since World War II. It was founded after the Second World War with the explicit aim of reforming social science curricula and textbooks to move them away from the nationalism thought to have generated the crises and tragedies of the first half of the twentieth century. Textbooks were originally gathered and used as part of a project to examine human rights education led by John Meyer and Francisco Ramirez (Meyer et al., forthcoming).

Each book was coded on parameters designed to measure the cosmopolitan emphases of universalism and diversity (coding protocol available from author). To reduce error, each concept is constructed using two measures, and the measures themselves are constructed as indices of multiple items from the coding scheme, with the exception of a single question on whether global citizenship is mentioned. Universal emphases are measured by a dichotomous indicator for whether the book mentions international citizenship and a factor index assessing the amount of discussion of human rights in the book. The four items in the human rights index are substantially inter-correlated and load heavily onto one underlying factor. The items are: (a) The amount of explicit discussion of human rights (zero to five scale, zero being no discussion and five being over half the book) (b) The number of international human rights documents mentioned (e.g., United Nations Charter, Convention on the Rights of the Child) (c) Reference to any national human rights documents or national governmental bodies (e.g., the Declaration of the Rights of Man or an Ombudsman's Office for Human Rights) (d) Discussion of any major human rights disaster (e.g., the Holocaust), conceived in human rights terms rather than simply as a great historical tragedy.

Diversity emphases are measured, first, using an index of the amount of the book dedicated to heterogeneous social groups and interests. The specific groups and interests included are: women, the elderly, racial and ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples, immigrants or refugees, disabled or special needs, homosexuals, the poor (or poverty), health, education, language or culture. Each group or interest is measured on a scale from zero-to-five (zero being no discussion and five being over half the book) and summed to create an index that ranges from zero to thirty-seven. Second, diversity is measured using an index ranging from zero to eleven of whether these same groups and interests are mentioned as bearing rights, which indicates an emphasis on the equality of divergent groups and interests within society.

In the course of developing the coding scheme and analyzing the textbooks, every effort was made to reduce error, including the challenges of translation, by checking inter-rater reliability, searching out fully bilingual translators (most often native speakers of the textbook language pursuing a higher education degree in English), sitting with translators as they coded textbooks to answer questions, and reviewing each coding sheet to check for inconsistencies. Most importantly, the questions are factual in nature, not relying on the judgment or content knowledge of coders and translators.

There are several limitations to this data. It is not feasible to obtain a representative sample of textbooks from each country over time, and it is impossible to know the extent to which each book is used in the classroom or assess how students are being influenced. These drawbacks limit the transferability of my results and hinder my ability to consider the extent to which curricula is a specific mechanism through which national identity is constructed. However, the difficulty of obtaining relevant longitudinal, cross-national data contributes to the dearth of research that extends beyond nation-state boundaries.

The method used to analyze data is descriptive. I analyze whether the mean scores on the measures of universalism and diversity described above change significantly over time around the world. To track change over time the books are divided into two periods, 1970-1994 and 1995-2008. This split reflects both substantive reasons (to capture changes in Eastern Europe from the 1990s) and has a methodological rationale (the sample is divided roughly evenly at this time point). Looking at trends in five or ten year increments results in similar findings to those reported

here. Means are presented for the whole sample and sub-samples representing six world regions, Western Europe and North America (plus Australia and New Zealand), Eastern Europe, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and North Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The sample size within each region and time period influences the significance of the means test, and further methodological checks indicated that creating more detailed regional breakdowns (such as splitting Asia into East Asia and South Asia) weakened the analyses. However, checking more nuanced country groupings was valuable to ensure that generally countries within a region follow similar trends. A notable outlier is the case of Israel, where books exhibited higher levels of universalism and diversity than other countries of the Middle East. Given the unique position of Israel in the Middle East, it is included in the worldwide trends but excluded from regional analyses.

Findings & Discussion

The results of a descriptive analysis are clear. There is a longitudinal trend towards greater emphasis on universalism and diversity across a broad range of countries. Table 1 reports the findings for measures of universal emphases in textbooks. Panel A shows a significant worldwide increase in discussions of human rights in civic education. Looking at regional trends, all parts of the world except the Middle East and North Africa show an increase in human rights, and the rise is significant in all regions except Asia. It is possible textbooks in the Middle East and North Africa are following a different path than the rest of the world, however it is also important to note that results from this region are the least reliable due to the difficulty of obtaining books. There are far fewer books from the Middle East and North Africa in this analysis than from other world regions.

Panel B of Table 1 shows the proportion of books that mention global citizenship or membership in a world community. Again, there is a general trend towards discussing global citizenship in curricula around the world, including countries of the Middle East and North Africa. Here, the only exception is in Eastern Europe. Discussions with coders suggest that the earlier mentions of 'global citizenship' in Eastern Europe referred specifically to an international communist or socialist community, which was imagined as becoming the dominant global framework. Further, some scholars observe the persistence of traditional civic education in newly independent states, especially in Eastern Europe, and attribute an emphasis on creating national values to the instrumental needs of nation-building and a desire for economic growth (Rokkan, 1975; Green, 1990; Kolstoe, 2000). In the post-1995 period, the newly formed Eastern European countries may be de-emphasizing notions of global community relative to other world regions in order to focus on nation-building.

Table 2 presents evidence of increasing curricular emphases on diversity. Panel A indicates the amount of discussion of particular groups and Panel B notes the proportion of books mentioning the rights of these groups. The amount a text dedicated to discussing diverse groups has generally increased since 1970, most notably in Latin America and also significantly in Eastern Europe and in the Middle East and North Africa. In Sub-Saharan Africa and in Western Europe and North America the amount of diversity discussion was already markedly higher than the rest of the world when this study began in 1970. The early attention to diversity in these two very different world regions could be attributed to a number of influences. In the West, perhaps the democratic process in liberal societies or perhaps a culture of individualism leads to greater representation of diverse social groups and interests in education systems. In sub-Saharan Africa, it is plausible that the legacies of colonialism shaped the curricula of former colonies to look like their Western colonizers. Further, the actual level of ethno-linguistic diversity in society,

	1970-1994 (n=252)	1995-2008[a] (n=213)	
A. Mean Score on Human Rights Index (0 - 4.74)			
Worldwide	0.77	1.36	***
Western Europe & North America	0.99	1.42	*
Eastern Europe	0.48	1.42	***
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.70	1.43	*
Middle East & North Africa	0.66	0.49	
Latin America & Caribbean	0.47	2.58	***
Asia	0.63	0.88	
B. Proportion of Books Mentioning Intl. Citizenship (0-1)			
Worldwide	0.15	0.27	***
Western Europe & North America	0.09	0.27	**
Eastern Europe	0.19	0.18	
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.42	†
Middle East & North Africa	0.00	0.29	†
Latin America & Caribbean	0.32	0.61	*
Asia	0.12	0.20	

*** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, † p<.1, one-tailed tests

[a] Significance indicates t-test comparing difference between periods 1 and 2.

[b] The numbers of books for each region and time period are: Western Europe and North America (103 and 56), Eastern Europe (62 and 59), Sub-Saharan Africa (27 and 12), Middle East and North Africa (7 and 7), Latin America and the Caribbean (23 and 22) and Asia (25 and 57).

Table 1. Indicators of Universalism in Textbooks Worldwide Over Time

high in many sub-Saharan African countries, may contribute to a greater emphasis on social diversity in texts. In Africa and the West, diversity discussions increased only slightly between 1970 and 2008, suggesting a possible ceiling effect. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this paper to empirically test such speculations, but additional analyses along these lines are currently underway by the author.

Panel B similarly shows most regions (the West, sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Middle East and North Africa) increasingly emphasize equality among diverse social groups and interests by depicting them as rights-bearing, and the increase is statistically significant in all regions except the Middle East and North Africa. Unexpectedly, Eastern Europe and Asia show a decline in rights language since 1970. As before, Eastern European countries may be lower because they are particularly concerned with building a unitary national identity in the post-1995 period due to their newness. Asian countries tend in general to depict society as more homogenous, although recent studies suggest a trend to group empowerment, for example the increasing recognition of women and children's rights in Japan (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004). In general, the findings that illustrate an increase in diversity are not as strong as for universalism: Fewer regions show a statistical increase in diversity and significance levels are weaker. Skrentny (2002) argues that all sorts of minority rights claims increasingly become re-conceptualized as human rights claims. This re-framing of the rights of diverse groups as human rights may

	1970-1994 (n=252)	1995-2008[a] (n=213)	
A. Mean Score on Amount of Diversity (0 - 37)			
Worldwide	8.91	9.62	
Western Europe & North America	12.53	13.80	
Eastern Europe	5.66	6.83	†
Sub-Saharan Africa	10.93	11.08	
Middle East & North Africa	1.57	5.57	†
Latin America & Caribbean	3.91	15.73	***
Asia	5.97	6.21	
B. Mean Score on Number of Rights (0 - 11)			
Worldwide	1.39	1.88	*
Western Europe & North America	1.89	3.09	*
Eastern Europe	1.35	1.32	
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.67	1.17	†
Middle East & North Africa	0.57	0.71	
Latin America & Caribbean	0.17	3.95	***
Asia	1.58	0.77	

*** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, † p<.1, one-tailed tests

[a] Significance indicates t-test comparing difference between periods 1 and 2.

[b] The numbers of books for each region and time period are: Western Europe and North America (103 and 56), Eastern Europe (62 and 59), Sub-Saharan Africa (27 and 12), Middle East and North Africa (7 and 7), Latin America and the Caribbean (23 and 22) and Asia (25 and 57).

Table 2. Indicators of Diversity in Textbooks Worldwide Over Time

contribute to the observed relatively greater increase in human rights emphases than diversity rights in curricula.

Overall the findings suggest a worldwide trend towards cosmopolitan emphases in civic education textbooks, with slightly greater emphases on universalism than diversity. The form of cosmopolitanism may vary, for example emphasizing human rights in Eastern Europe and international citizenship in the Middle East, but every region of the world increased significantly on at least one measure of cosmopolitanism, except Asia. But even Asia shows a raw increase on three of the four measures. Further, case studies of individual countries within Asia suggest that a qualitative change towards a model of cosmopolitan citizenship is underway in ways that are not captured in this study (See, for example, Law (2004) for Taiwan and Hong Kong, Moon (2009) for South Korea, and Chan-Tiberghien (2004) for Japan). Although the indicators used here enable cross-national and longitudinal comparison of textbooks to a far greater extent than previous studies, these macro-level measures certainly fail to capture many more nuanced changes and meanings that can be gleaned from looking at individual cases. In contrast to case studies, the aim here was to show a shift towards cosmopolitan emphases in civic education curricula worldwide. The next challenge is to consider what theories of cosmopolitanism propose as the implications of such changes.

Although cosmopolitan theories tend to share a focus on increasing universalism and diversity worldwide, scholars diverge dramatically in their analysis of the mechanisms that create global interconnectedness, and the implications of the emergence of a global society. Most cosmopolitanisms operates under a strong normative framework, arguing that the construction of a world community, and even a world state, is the most moral and just governance outcome. Beck and Sznaider argue "What cosmopolitanism *is* cannot ultimately be separated from what cosmopolitanism *should be*." (2006, p. 4). Historically, the cosmopolitanism of ancient philosophers and more modern political philosophers like Immanuel Kant was focused on a utopian future, concerned with creating world citizenship and a world republic. Recently, normative political philosophers, notably David Held, have revived the notion of cosmopolitanism to champion the values of human rights and democracy as general principles of transnational governance to cope with negative effects of economic globalization (Held, 1995; 2004). This line of work argues that the emergence of a world society, world culture and even a world government is a positive development for all. Thus, the emergence of cosmopolitanism in citizenship education is interpreted as leading towards a more just and equitable world, and potentially a step towards creating a formal system of global governance.

A contrasting line of cosmopolitan research, often called world polity theory (referring specifically to the neo-institutional studies of John Meyer, Francisco Ramirez and colleagues), tends to be agnostic about the morality of a global culture, citing pros and cons of the trends they observe. In the classic paper outlining a world cultural approach, Meyer et al (1997) state that due to the emergence of a world society "greater good becomes possible and likely but so too does greater evil, as good and evil become more derivative of world culture and therefore of greater scale than in earlier times" (p. 173). Further, world polity theory asserts that a global society exists because of the lack of a world government and argues that the nation-state is defined and legitimated as the primary actor on the world stage. From this perspective, the rise of universalism and diversity indicates a decline in charisma of the nation-state and increasing interconnectedness worldwide, but do not portend the demise of the state. The first line of work interprets an increase in transnationalism as a step towards more formal global governance. To the extent that world society theory takes a normative stance, it is critical of notions of a world government. Meyer et al (1997) argue that "a powerfully organized and authoritative worldwide actor would obviously lower the dynamism of world society" (p. 169). Thus, world polity scholars do not interpret increasing emphases on universalism and diversity in textbooks as a natural step on the road to a single world government or homogenous world society, nor do they view the creation of a formal system of global governance as the ultimate goal of cosmopolitanism.

Lines of cosmopolitanism also differ in their understanding of the mechanisms driving an increase in universalism and diversity. For some, the trends of cosmopolitanism arise unintentionally, in some cases due to the pressures of globalization (Held et al, 1999) or as a byproduct of the activities of experts, professionals, and nation-states enacting globally-accepted scripts for rational behavior (Meyer et al., 1997). The world polity perspective argues countries adopt a range of practices, such as signing international human rights treaties, because it is the expected, rational and legitimate thing for countries to do, not necessarily because they believe in the treaty or intend to enforce it. This often leads to extensive decoupling between formal policies and on-the-ground realities. In some cases a symbolic policy adoption can influence practice in a way that conforms to the cosmopolitan ideals of global governance, but this is unrelated to the initial reason for ratifying a treaty (See the example of improvements in human rights practices in Hafner-Burton and Tsutsui 2005). The emphasis on rational actorhood and decouping among world polity scholars also explains why they do not assume the empirical observation of increasing emphases

on universalism and diversity will have inherent benefits for individuals worldwide. Nation-states may not intend to enact the ideals put forth in curricula, and global interconnectedness may deepen asymmetries in forms of economic, political, social and cultural power.

Alternatively, others argue the globalization and world polity mechanisms laid out above are a deformed version of cosmopolitanism (Beck & Sznaider, 2006). In this view, cosmopolitan trends must emerge from a struggle by individuals to promote and implement the ideals of cosmopolitanism itself, not as a byproduct of economic globalization or of countries and individuals enacting scripts of rational actorhood. Papastephanou (2002) differentiates between globalization and the intentional creation of cosmopolitan trends by claiming "the first signifies an empirical phenomenon whereas the second denotes an ideal" (p. 75). In the case of schooling, Gunesh (2004) argues that "'cosmopolitan education' – or perhaps it should be 'education for cosmopolitanism' – would be based on a clear conceptualization of the outcomes, in terms of 'cosmopolitanism' or 'the cosmopolitan individual', rather than on an educational context, such as a particular type of school, or on a purpose arising from particular views of the 'needs' of contemporary global society" (p. 268-269). In other words, for this group of cosmopolitans, the observed trends towards universalism and diversity are meaningless unless they stem from intentional individual action in pursuit of cosmopolitan ideals. Thus, from this perspective observing the empirical trends has no bearing on cosmopolitanism and only an assessment of the mechanisms of change can provide insight. In time this particular divide between the variants of cosmopolitan thinking may lessen. Beck & Sznaider (2006) argue for a 'neo-cosmopolitanism' or 'cosmopolitan realism' that embraces world changes that support their goals even if they occur as side-effects of globalization. They suggest adopting "the farther cosmopolitan rituals and symbols spread, the more chance there will be of someday achieving a cosmopolitan political order" (p. 8).

Conclusion

This research has shown an increase in universalism and diversity emphases in high school citizenship education curricula worldwide in the period since 1970. Empirically, this extends studies of cosmopolitanism in education to a greater range of countries and over a longer time period than previous research. Theoretically, it illustrates that cosmopolitan perspectives vary in their interpretation of the processes driving such trends and the implications for society. Some interpret the rise of universalism and diversity as a step towards an ideal world governed by a single global polity. Others argue that these trends indicate a shift in the conception of citizenship worldwide, but that nation-states will and should remain the most legitimate global actors. Further, while some depict the construction of a cosmopolitan world as utopian, others avoid taking a normative stance on the emergence of a global polity. Despite these differences, cosmopolitan studies of all persuasions greatly add to our understanding of social and educational issues by emphasizing that countries are not independent units of analysis and by recognizing forms of identity and attachment beyond the nation-state.

Acknowledgments

Work on this paper was funded by a grant from the Spencer Foundation (200600003) to John Meyer and Francisco Ramirez, and benefited from their generous feedback on initial drafts. It received additional support from a Stanford School of Education Dissertation Improvement Grant. Finally, the study was possible only because of the impressive textbook collection of the George Eckert Institute, in Braunschweig, and the extraordinarily helpful assistance of Brigitte Depner and her staff, and the many individual colleagues who helped collect textbooks, including Garnett Russell, Suk Ying Wong, Rennie Moon, David Suárez, Marine Chitashvili, Pepka Boyadjieva,

Shushanik Makaryan, Marika Korotkova, Gili Drori, Sandra Staklis, Marina Andina, Luke Terra, Nii Addy, Carrie Oelberger, Jaime Quevedo, Dijana Tiplic, Martin Benvenidas, Kaisa Snellman, Elina Makinen, Magdalena Gross, and Elizabeth Buckner.

References

Appiah, K. A. (1997). The multicultural misunderstanding. *New York Review of Books*, *44*(15), 30–36.

Beck, U., & Sznaider, N. (2006). Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57*(1), 1-23.

Beetham, D. (1999). *Democracy and human rights.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Boyle, E. H., Smith, T., & Guenther, K. (2007). The rise of the child as an individual in global society. In Venkatesh, S. A., & Ronald K. R. (Eds.), *Youth, globalization and the law* (pp. 255-283). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Breckenridge, C., Pollock, S., Bhabha, H. K. & Chakrabarty, D. (2002). *Cosmopolitanism.* NC: Duke University Press.

Chan-Tiberghien, J. (2004). *Gender and human rights politics in Japan: Global norms and domestic networks.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cole, W. (2005). Sovereignty relinquished? Explaining commitment to the international human rights covenants, 1966-1999, *American Sociological Review, 70*, 472-495.

Delanty, G. (2006a). The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology, 57*(1), 25-47.

Delanty, G. (2006b). Cosmopolitan Citizenship. In Blau, J. & Smity, I.K (Eds.), *Public sociologies reader* (pp. 37-50). Maryland: Rowmand and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Elliott, M. (2007). Human rights and the triumph of the individual in world culture. *Cultural Sociology, 1*(3), 343-363.

Fligstein, N. (2008). *Euroclash: The EU, European identity, and the future of Europe.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, A. (1990). *Education and state formation: The rise of education systems in England, France and the USA.* London: Macmillan.

Gunesch, K. (2004). Education for cosmopolitanism: Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education. *Journal of Research in International Education, 3*, 251-275

Hafner-Burton, E. & Tsutsui, K. (2005). "Human rights in a globalizing world: The paradox of empty promises. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*(5), 1373-1411.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global*

culture: Nationalism, globalisation and modernity (pp. 237–51). London: Sage.

Hannerz, U. (1996). *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places.* London and NewYork: Routledge.

Hartmann, D. & Gerteis, J. (2005). Dealing with diversity: Mapping multiculturalism in sociological terms. *Sociological Theory*, *23*(2), 218-240.

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Held, D. (2004). *Global covenant: The social democratic alternative to the Washington consensus.* USA: Polity Press.

Held, D., McGrew, A. G, Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture,* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kaplan, S. (2006). *The pedagogical state: Education and the politics of national culture in post-1980 Turkey.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Keck, M. & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kolstoe, P. (2000). *Political construction sites: Nation-building in Russia and the Post-Soviet states.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, W. W. (2004). Globalization and citizenship education in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review,* 48(3), 253-273

Levinson, B. (2004). Hopes and challenges for the new civic education in Mexico: Toward a democratic citizen without adjectives. *International Journal of Educational Development, 24*: 269–282.

Levy, D. & Sznaider, N. (2004). The institutionalization of cosmopolitan morality: The Holocaust and human rights. *Journal of Human Rights, 3*(2): 143-157.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G., & Ramirez, F. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology, 103*: 144-81.

Meyer, J. W., Bromley, P., & Ramirez, F. Forthcoming. Human Rights in Social Science Textbooks: Cross-National Analyses, 1975-2006. *Sociology of Education.*

Moon, R. (2009). Teaching world citizenship: The cross-national adoption of human rights in formal schooling. School of Education, Stanford University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Mintrop, H. (2003). The old and new face of civic education: Expert, teacher and student views. *European Educational Research Journal, 2*(3), 446-454.

Nussbaum, M. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review, XIX*, 5.

Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 36*(1), 69–86.

Pogge, T. (2008). *World poverty and human rights: Cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Pollock, S., Bhabha, H. K, Breckenridge, C. A., & Chakrabarty, D. (2000). Cosmopolitanisms. *Public Culture, 12*(3), 577–589.

Ramirez, F., Suárez, D., & Meyer, J. W. (2006). The worldwide rise of human rights education, 1950-2005. In Benavot, A. and Braslavsky, C. (Eds.), *The changing contents of primary and secondary education: Comparative studies of the school curriculum* (pp. 25-52). Hong Kong: CERC.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture.* London: Sage.

Rokkan, S. (1975). Dimensions of state formation and nation-building: A possible paradigm for research variations within Europe. In Tilly, C. (Ed), *The formation of national states* (pp. 570-598). NJ: Princeton University Press.

Skrentny, J.D. (2002). *The minority rights revolution.* Boston: Belknap Press.

Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages.* NJ: Princeton University Press.

Suárez, D. (2008). Rewriting citizenship? Civic education in Costa Rica and Argentina. *Comparative Education*, *44*(4), 485-503.

Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. eds. (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wotipka, C., & Ramirez, F. (2008). World society and human rights: An event history analysis of the convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women. In Garrett, G, Simmons, B., and Dobbin, F. (Eds.), *The global diffusion of markets and democracy* (pp. 303-343). Cambridge: Cambridge University.