EXTENSIONS OF CITIZENSHIP? EXPLORING DIGITAL, GLOBAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Anna Björk
Demos Helsinki
Claire Shaw
Aalto University

Abstract Citizenship education has throughout history been used as a tool for articulating and embedding politically set visions of societies. As such, it has functioned as a response to contemporary political challenges and the changing societal landscape. Simultaneously, new forms of citizenship have emerged to equip students - and citizens - with new capacities and values. These citizenships include digital, global, and environmental citizenship, each figuring within education policy discourse to differing extents. The extensions continue to transfer 'citizenship' from its state-centric origins towards contemporary global governance structures and other points of reference. At the same time, these citizenships also create new demarcations and challenge the legal dimension of citizenship. This paper examines how these forms of citizenship are presented on a national and transnational scale. The curriculum and policy approaches of three European nations, three transnational organisations and one academic institution are analysed to assess how citizenship is recontextualized in the face of globalisation, climate change and digitalisation. When applied to the presentations of these citizenships in education, the traditional dimensions of citizenship reveal an emphasis on the values and duties of digital, global and climate citizens, with the onus placed on citizens' responsibility to others. Generally, the rights associated with these citizenships and, particularly who guarantees such rights, are less clear. By discussing these citizenships within contemporary contexts at multiple geographic

levels, the paper provides concrete examples of the debates on and uses of the concept of citizenship and the roles of citizenship education. In so doing, we shed light on some of the more recent extensions of citizenship.

Keywords: Global citizenship, climate citizenship, digital citizenship, citizenship education, global trends

Abstrakti Kansalaiskasvatus elää ajassa ja sopeutuu yhteiskunnallisiin ja poliittisiin haasteisiin. Sen kautta voidaan artikuloida sitä, miten kansalaisuuden tulisi vastata näihin haasteisiin, ja millaisia kyvykkyyksiä ja arvostuksia niihin katsotaan kuuluvan. Digitaalinen, globaali- ja ympäristökansalaisuus ovat esimerkkejä uusista kansalaisuuden käsitteen käyttöyhteyksistä, jotka ovat löytäneet paikkansa koulutuspolitiikan diskursseissa. Ne siirtävät edelleen kansalaisuuden käsitettä pois kansallisvaltiokeskeisestä tulkinnasta ja sitä vastoin vahvistavat kansalaisuutta osana globaaleja kehityskulkuja. Samaan aikaan ne kuitenkin tuottavat myös uudenlaisia jakolinjoja sekä haastavat kansalaisuutta oikeudellisen aseman kautta tulkittavana käsitteenä. Tämä artikkeli tarkastelee digitaalista, globaalia ja ympäristökansalaisuutta eri esimerkkien avulla ja kysyy, miten kansalaisuutta tulkitaan uudelleen digitalisaation, globalisaation ja ympäristökriisin haasteiden kautta. Linssinä toimivat kansalaisuuden käsitteen vakiintuneet ulottuvuudet. Lähestymistapa osoittaa, että erityisesti velvollisuudet ja arvoihin perustuva tulkinta painottuvat digitaalisen, globaalin ja ympäristökansalaisuuden käsitteellistämisessä, erityisesti siten että yksilön vastuu muita kohtaan korostuu. Oikeudet, ja erityisesti se, kuka voi taata oikeudet yksilölle näiden kansalaisuuden kategorioiden yhteydessä, on aineistossa toissijaista velvollisuuksien ja vastuiden suhteen. Artikkeli tuokin esiin konkreettisten esimerkkien kautta, miten kansalaisuuden käsitteellä kurotetaan kohti uusia merkityksiä eri viitekehysten avulla.

Avainsanat: Kansalaiskasvatus, digitaalinen kansalaisuus, globaali kansalaisuus, ympäristökansalaisuus, globaalit kehityskulut

Introduction: Applying citizenship in contemporary contexts

Citizenship education has throughout history been used as a tool for developing future members of society to match a politically established vision of society embedded within curriculum and policy. It is therefore politically positioned to aim towards normative interpretations of citizenship (e.g. Schugurensky & Myers, 2003/2008). The target groups for citizenship education may become part of the educational system at different points in time, be it at the beginning of their basic education path, integration courses, or adult education. In this article, we examine citizenship education as a tool for articulating interpretations of citizenship. Our examples are all conceptualisations where "citizenship" is paired together with a prefix, naming its specific field of reference: digital citizenship, global citizenship and environmental citizenship. Considering citizenship as a contested concept, our main research questions concern how citizenship education curricula treat these prefixes, and how some of these commonly recognised dimensions of citizenship are applied in these contexts. We explore these questions by examining how these extensions are discussed in curricular documents, policy documents and reports in various European contexts.

Conducting citizenship education via the military for those considered full members of the polity in classical Sparta, Athens, and other *poleis,* is an early example of how duties and virtues were the first keys to full membership of the polity after the formal status was recognised (Heater, 2002, p 457). As an academic exercise, citizenship education can be scrutinised from multiple angles - from critical pedagogy to postcolonial studies and democratic theory (for a recent overview, see e.g. Veugelers, 2019). Because citizenship education is part of our societal structures, it is also influenced by societal,

political and international undercurrents (Keating et al., 2009; Sardoč, 2021), and our cases reflect the significance of emerging technologies, globalisation and environmental change to our societies. Our interest in citizenship education is instrumental to exploring how citizenship as a contested concept features as part of our contemporary global challenges and democracy as part of our ongoing and past research projects.

The pursuit of technological leadership in digitalisation is currently one of the key EU strategies,[1] and the United Nations has also launched initiatives to address technologies as prominent parts of realising Sustainable Development Goals and discussing digital human rights.[2] National governments are adopting digital governance strategies, albeit at varying paces. The hype is accompanied by a growing understanding of the problems in the use of data, resulting in biased algorithms, intense competition over resources and the lack of transparency of expert power embedded in the development and application of these technologies, all of which also have impacts on the lives of individual citizens (e.g. Hintz et al., 2018, Introduction). The concept of global citizenship has formed from several strands, including an openness towards other cultures, advocacy and the development of human rights, and global capitalisation. Reflecting contemporary interconnectedness, global citizenship now generally refers to developing competences and attitudes pertaining to the relationship between individuals and the global community, often through a lens of justice solidarity in spite of criticism that national and local implementations are centred around improving

[1] See e.g. European Commission 2021: Shaping Europe's digital future https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en
[2] United Nations: UN Secretary-General's Strategy on New Technologies. https://www.un.org/en/newtechnologies/
United Nations: Digital human rights. Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Technology https://www.un.org/techenvoy/content/digital-human-rights

international competitiveness (Pais & Costa, 2020; Shultz, 2007; UN, n.d.). Finally, environmental citizenship (also referred to as climate citizenship, ecological citizenship and green citizenship) and environmental citizenship education, has been a distinct field for around 20 years. The intensifying climate crisis and its prominence on political agendas is likewise a growing context for citizenship. Environmental citizenship refers to a commitment to the "common good" (Dobson, 2007). The need for environmental citizens - those actively working to preserve and protect the environment - is especially dire as the impact of human behaviour on the environment is creating more and more irreparable damage (Hadjichambis & Reis, 2020).

All examples reach out to contexts outside the nation state framework. In this sense, they reflect the complexity of the global interdependence of political and economic systems. This also links them to the recognised political challenges to international co-operation and global governance, such as introspective radical right populism and a re-emphasis of national sovereignty (Sardoč, 2021). Notably, citizenship education has throughout its history been a top-down endeavour. Be it provided by the military, the family or the church, it has been formed around the idea of normativity and socio-cultural cohesion. After the French Revolution and the formation of the modern citizenship concept, the need for public citizenship education increased. As democratic institutions continued to develop and representative democracy in the form of parliamentarism gained strength, citizens were also in need of new skills in order to exercise their political rights. The same was true of decolonisation (for an overview, see e.g. Heater, 2002, p 464). Another perspective on polity formation, i.e., the strengthening of nationalism throughout Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries, highlighted *demos* through exclusion and distinction, and citizenship as a political tool. Since the late 1990s, a

distinctive feature of citizenship education has been integration courses, which are tied to the issuance of residence permits and naturalisation policies, among others. The main aim of these activities has been to emphasise the core values, skills and knowledge expected of future citizens (e.g. van Oers et al., 2010). Through citizenship education, our three extensions display the tension and interplay between global, regional, and national level interpretations of citizenship.

Commonalities in Western citizenship concepts

As an analytical point of departure, we perceive the concept of citizenship as a key concept in politics from a constructive and reflexive perspective rather than something with a fixed definition, as stressed in Wiesner et al. (2018, pp 1-16), in comparison with a more positivist concepts, often employed in comparative politics. This perspective, based on the now internationally recognised fields of conceptual history and the history of ideas,[3] emphasises citizenship as something changing in range and meanings over temporal, political and cultural contexts. Part of this understanding is to consider citizenship as something constituted through practice, rather than established through a shared identity and sense of belonging. Its application is therefore well suited to a reading seeking to address practises of citizenship education curricula and how they shape the use and range of citizenship.

Because emerging technologies, globalisation and environmental change have proven to be contexts where agency is articulated as citizenship, we wonder if these

_____

[3] The emergence of this field is generally attributed to the work of Reinhart Koselleck and Quentin Skinner. A recurring overview of contemporary topics can currently be found in the dedicated publication *Contributions to the History of Concepts*:
https://www.berghahnjournals.com/view/journals/contributions/contributions-overview.xml

also affect our understanding of citizenship as a key political concept, especially when some of the basic dimensions of citizenship are considered. The basic dimensions here are also a feature of the abovementioned analysis of Wiesner et al. (2018; for an earlier introduction, see Wiesner & Björk, 2014), which we here reapply. The dimensions are divided into four major ones: 1) access to citizenship; 2) rights; 3) duties; and 4) the possibility of participation, or the active content of citizenship. The idea is to recognise commonalities among the most prevalent concepts of citizenship across the contextual differences. The original analysis is based on Western European and democratic concepts of citizenship, and in our analysis we therefore limit our perspective to these. We are also limited to using sources either published in or translated into English, therefore accepting that we may in some cases have some blind spots regarding national-level interpretations. Since our examples all emanate from the state-bound concepts, however, we are willing to accept these limitations and treat the original analysis as a framework for discussing our three examples, all transcending the national, state-centred contexts.

One of the significant undercurrents is the premise that citizenship is linked to democracy and democratisation: If we perceive the formulation of the four dimensions as sites of controversy (Wiesner et al., 2018, p 7), they are not to be treated as mere heuristic tools for sensemaking, but rather as examples of how the (national) concepts of citizenship have been inherent in and instrumental to making claims for the democratisation, recognition and reinterpretations of the polity. The perspectives covered by academics in their analyses of citizenship show the vast range of its use and meanings: Historically, *citizenship* has been attached to e.g. the formation of states or corresponding political entities (e.g. Magnette, 2005; Fahrmeir, 2007; Joppke, 2010). The

political development of nation-states created new practices for state borders and emphasised the significance of having recognised membership of the state. Recently, the tightening of the naturalisation systems across Europe (for an example, see van Oers, 2021) and the difficulty of accommodating citizenship as an inclusive concept (e.g. Graeve et al., 2017), as well as the increasing revival of deprivation of citizenship as a viable part of citizenship politics (e.g. Mantu, 2015) continue to display the inherently conditional nature of citizenship as something based on demarcations. Citizenship is therefore contested in many ways, depending on the historical development and politics (see e.g. Brubaker, 1992, 2001), sense of belonging and discussion on identity (Yuval-Davis, 2006, 2007; Brubaker & Cooper, 2000), and importantly to our sources, beyond the boundaries of individual states (on cosmopolitan citizenship, see e.g. Linklater, 1999; Horst & Olsen, 2021; on European union citizenship, see e.g. Kostakopoulou, 2007; Wiesner, 2018). One perspective on our three examples is therefore to raise the question of possible controversy in these contexts, even if articulating extensive conclusions about this fall beyond the scope of the paper. Whether the issue is who is part of the *demos*, what rights and duties are subsumed by the status of citizenship, or what expectations and modes of participation are included, it all points in the direction of expansion or intensification of citizenship and the ability to actually exercise it. The main examples of the paper approach citizenship as conceptual extensions seeking to articulate contemporary expressions of agency. As such, they also imply new possibilities and limitations, i.e., conditionalities, on agency, but also perhaps possibilities for democratisation.

Contemporary examples of citizenship education for digital, global and environmental citizenships

To emphasise concepts as context-bound, we are here interested in sources where citizenship education is explicitly articulated as a target, tool, or forum for realising citizenship. Hence, whereas it could be argued that citizenship education is somehow the aim of (national) curricula in general, we are interested in the explicitly argued cases. The contexts for citizenship education here include examples from both the national and transnational level for each extension of citizenship. Curricula were chosen by literature reviews and database searches, resulting in an initial selection of 35 national programmes and five transnational programmes. This paper analyses policy documents and reports rather than the in-classroom implementation of these programmes, as the focus is on how extensions of citizenship are articulated and what those articulations reveal about the concept and controversies of citizenship.

The initial scanning of documents included programmes on a global scale, but the selection was narrowed down to the European context, for reasons explained in the preceding section. Final selections were made according to the relevance of the content and the availability of the documents (curricula, resources and policy documents) in English, including three national approaches to the extensions, namely Digital Malta, the National Digital Strategy 2014-2020; the Czech Republic's national curriculum; National Strategy for Global Development Education and Estonia's national curriculum, three approaches developed by non-governmental bodies (Council of Europe Digital Citizenship Education project, the Oxfam Global Citizenship guides, and the ENEC Framework of the Education for Environmental Citizenship), and one report

by an academic institution (the College of Europe report, The Future of Environmental Citizenship in the EU).

As mentioned, the basic dimensions are features which are widely recognised in interpretations of citizenship. Access to citizenship defines who is a member of the *demos*, i.e., who is included in the polity by reason of full citizenship status as opposed to the more limited status of permanent residence etc. The issue of access has in recent decades been debated and contested by mobility and transnational forms of governance, for example. The various forms of access highlight the conditionality of citizenship, and one of the most debated issues in 2000s Europe has been naturalisation, i.e., granting citizenship via an application process.

While access to the extension of citizenships discussed below may be linked to national identities and clearly delineated legal citizenships, it is largely granted through active engagement with rights, duties, and participation. Rights, duties, and active content participation have, in turn, been legal consequences of accessing citizenship.[4] Duties have been a less studied field, with education, military service and taxes as the most famous examples (but also the duty to vote, for example). Active participation refers to the question of "what the *demos* does", such as taking part in elections (Wiesner et al., 2018, p 9). Participation has notably prevailed as a key topic in academic debates and political agendas since the famous "participatory turn" (for an

---

[4] Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (see https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/udhr.pdf) recognises everyone's right to nationality. The relationship between citizenship and human rights as an analytical discussion falls beyond the scope of the present paper (see e.g. Owen, 2017). It is important to note, however, that the interest in Hannah Arendt's analysis of the "right to have rights" (see *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1968), pp 290-302; esp. revived by Seyla Benhabib, see e.g. 2004) is particularly relevant to the political and societal realities of many, especially in the context of migration flows, debates on immigration and statelessness (in relation to Benhabib's argument, see e.g. Bauböck, 2007), highlighting the relationship between access to citizenship and its consequences.

overview, see e.g. the collection of articles by Bherer et al., 2016), and is one of the ways of realising the complexity of citizenship as a status, democratic processes for exercising power, or building collective identities on multiple scales (Mäkinen, 2021, pp 3-4). Here, we use these dimensions to bring our cases together to see how they relate to these commonalities.

In each case, the examples are used to discuss the extensions from differing perspectives, with the aim of showing that, as with the history of the concept of citizenship in general, its contemporary forms are also far from having singular definitions or subjected to essentialism. They also show the variety of actors involved in the citizenship education discourse, where international organisations and national governments, for example, represent the various dimensions of governance through citizenship.

Table 1 below synthesises the analysis of the approaches, highlighting the similarities and differences in approaches to the four elements of citizenship within the extensions.

	Access	Rights	Duties	Active participation
Digital citizenship	● Active engagement in online community life (Council of Europe) ● Having digital literacy skills (Malta)	● Legal rights (Council of Europe) ● To access and inclusion (Council of Europe) ● To benefit from technology (Malta) ● Access to digital infrastructure (Malta)	● Act responsibly, ethically, and with empathy (Council of Europe, Malta)	● Influencing environment, e.g. through civic technology or social networking (Council of Europe, Malta)

Global citizenship	• Active engagement in local community and "wider world" (Oxfam) • Being part of a European and global community (Czech Republic)	• UN approach to human rights (Oxfam, Czech Republic) • Legal rights as citizens of Europe and the nation (Czech Republic)	• Act as agents of positive change in local and global community (Oxfam, Czech Republic) • Respect diversity (Oxfam, Czech Republic)	• Community participation (Oxfam, Czech Republic)
Environmental citizenship	• Responsible environmental behaviour (ENEC, Estonia) • Relationship/connection to nature (ENEC, Estonia, College of Europe) • European citizenship (College of Europe)	• Right to clean environment (ENEC, College of Europe) • Legal rights (ex. Aarhus convention) (ENEC, College of Europe) • No specific reference to rights (Estonia)	• Obligation to not harm environment (ENEC) • Actively work to solve and prevent environment problems (ENEC, Estonia) • Act in an environmentally friendly way, including personal choices (Estonia) • Protect environmental rights of future generations (College of Europe)	• Civic participation (ENEC, Estonia, College of Europe) • Acting as agents of change (ENEC)

Table 1. Four elements of citizenship within the extensions.

Digital citizenship education

To tackle the intensifying impact of new technologies on key societal processes, institutions and individuals, citizenship education curricula have started to address digitalisation as a prominent part of citizenship articulations. Examples of digital citizenship education are 1) the Council of Europe Digital Citizenship Education Programme; and 2) Digital Malta. While the duties and active content of citizens are similar, these programmes illustrate two different priorities within digital citizenship; the first being concerned with the human rights based perspective on digitalisation, and the latter on the potential of digital citizens to benefit from online engagement.

Digital citizenship, while previously often approached solely from a competence-based definition, has shifted toward a focus on *how* the internet is used (Jones & Mitchell, 2016). It is not just the ability to use the internet and digital technology, but also requires responsible, active and ethical engagement (Buchholz et al., 2020; Jones & Mitchell, 2016; Pedersen et al., 2018). Lozano-Díaz, Figueredo-Canosa and Fernández-Prados (2020) suggest that digital citizenship is a more active exercise of democracy, using the digital world as a political space. As an extension of citizenship, digital citizenship means the definition of norms, duties and participation in a context which is not strictly local and is dependent on accessing a specific infrastructure.

The Council of Europe developed a Digital Citizenship Education programme, identifying digital citizenship as a "a range of competences, attributes and behaviours" that allow online users to engage with and benefit from online communities while promoting respectful, responsible and safe online behaviour (Council of Europe, n.d.-b). The Council of Europe is an international human rights organisation of 47 member states, aiming to promote

human rights, democratic ideals, and a European identity, and is funded by member state contributions (Council of Europe, n.d.-d). The Digital Citizenship programme was developed in 2016 under the Council of Europe Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (EDC/HRE) programme, following the Council of Europe principles of human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

The Digital Citizenship Education programme provides resources for educators and policy recommendations in the European context but is not formally required to be included in European national curricula (Council of Europe, n.d.-c). The Council of Europe defines digital citizens as more than just internet users; they actively and responsibly use the internet to engage in community life (Richardson & Milovidov, 2019). To realise this goal of engagement, The Council of Europe proposes using citizenship education, as education is "both the spark and as effect of a process of citizenship" (Council of Europe, n.d.-b).

A digital citizen is obligated to be ethical and empathetic in online interactions, and has the right to "privacy, security, access and inclusion, freedom of expression and more" (Richardson & Milovidov, 2019, p 14). Understanding and valuing human rights is also reiterated throughout the Digital Citizenship Handbook. Specifically, the handbook refers to rights guaranteed under the GDPR, including the right to request access to or deletion of personal data. Brief reference is also made to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Code of EU Online Rights.[5] While some of the rights mentioned are guaranteed under the GDPR registration, others - such as the right to access and

---

[5] The Code of EU Online Rights is a compilation of basic rights guaranteed in EU law, such as access to services and networks, non-discrimination in online services, and protection of personal data. The document itself has no legislative power. https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/sites/digital-agenda/files/Code%20EU%20online%20rights%20EN%20final%202.pdf

inclusion - are less clearly defined and depend on the behaviour of others, the national legislation and the actions of technology companies. When digital citizenship education is provided, the expectation is that children will be empowered to actively participate in digital society, and those who may be marginalised by limited technology skills or access are able to participate (Council of Europe, n.d.-b). One of the domains of DCE, "active participation", emphasises that digital citizens work to influence their environment through tools such as civic technology or online communities like Wikipedia (Council of Europe, n.d.-a). Engagement is encouraged on the local, regional and global levels.

A national-level perspective on digital citizenship is introduced by Digital Malta, the government of Malta's ICT strategy for 2014-2020. Digital citizenship is approached as a collection of competences that enable and empower citizens to benefit from the internet, including the creation of content (Digital Malta, 2019). It is "about action", reflecting the shift of digital citizenship as a step beyond digital skills (Department of eLearning, 2015, p 12). All Maltese citizens should have the opportunity to "grow as a digital citizen" and benefit from the opportunities provided by technology, regardless of skills, age, disability or economic means. Free wireless internet in public spaces around Malta is listed as a way to promote the development of digital citizenship (Digital Malta, 2019), addressing the role of the national government to ensure sufficient infrastructure in support of the programme's aims.

It is argued that being a digital citizen requires treating people with respect online and actively communicating with the wider community, including local government and NGOs (Department of eLearning, 2015; Digital Malta, 2019). Specifically mentioned are the use of mobile apps and social networking websites. According to the plan, one of the benefits of increased digital citizenship

is the promotion of Maltese language, culture, and identity. The implementation of the programme has not, however, been followed to the letter: The Digital Malta strategy included a plan to add digital citizenship to the national curriculum, but no mention is made there of digital citizenship. Despite this, Digital Literacy has been a cross-curricular theme in the National Curriculum Framework since at least 2012 and digital ethics is included as a topic in the 2019 ICT syllabuses for secondary schools. The only mention of digital citizenship in the curriculum is in the optional Media Literacy programme, a part of the Maltese Matriculation Certificate (MATSEC),[6] which includes "Act as a responsible digital citizen" as an aim of the optional Media Literacy Education programme (MATSEC, n.d.). Furthermore, the Ministry for Education's Directorate for Digital Literacy and Transversal Skills has hosted digital citizenship workshops for teachers and students, including one using the Council of Europe's dimensions of digital citizenship (Digital Literacy Malta, 2021). Overall, digital citizenship in Malta is defined mainly in how Maltese citizens connect to each other or to government bodies, with less focus on the wider global digital community.

The two examples show how digital citizenship is referred to in the curricula in terms of spatiality (from Council of Europe transnational level towards Maltese local applications), participation and engagement (Council of Europe and the Maltese example of infrastructure and social connection) as well as safeguarding human rights by emphasising the responsibilities and ethics of online behaviour and use of digital space. However, they do not specify exactly who is a digital citizen; whether it is a question of access to the technology and skills provided by the national governments, or guaranteed in some other

---

[6] MATSEC is a series of exams required for admission to the University of Malta.

way. Digital citizenship therefore seems to remain at least partly dependent on the national forms of citizenship, given that there is no other way to ensure access to the necessary tools.

Global citizenship education

Global citizenship education, like other forms of 'citizenship education', does not have a clear and agreed definition across academia and policy. As the Cold War came to a close and the world began to open up, the concept of a global community and mediating peace rose to prominence; by the 1990s, global citizenship had become significant in education discourse, developing from the cosmopolitan tradition (Schattle, 2009). Alongside the articulation of global citizenship, European Union citizenship as established in the Maastricht Treaty (1992) represents a legally prescribed form of non-national citizenship. The EU therefore provides a further transnational reference point for citizenship education curricula aiming at identification with other than national contexts.

Several educational frameworks overlap with global citizenship, including peace education, development education and environmental education (e.g. Mannion et al., 2014; Sant et al., 2018). Global citizenship education, as well as these overlapping educational frameworks, all include a sense of global connection and responsibility. Examples of global citizenship education include 1) Oxfam (international organisation) and 2) the national curriculum of the Czech Republic. They supplement each other by explaining how the pursuit of something understood as the "International community" can be articulated by an international actor and a national government. Both understandings of global citizenship utilise scales of participation (Mäkinen, 2021), framing participation on a local, regional and global scale to define

global citizenship. The aim common to both is to use the UN human rights-based approach as the key reference point, but the latter example represents an attempt to identify a national articulation of citizenship as part of the global community.

Taking the interconnectedness of humanity as its main framework, Oxfam, an international charitable organisation working to end poverty and inequality, first developed a global citizenship curriculum in 1997. In line with several other citizenship educations,[7] Oxfam approaches global citizenship education as an overarching framework for learning, rather than as an independent additional subject (Oxfam, n.d.). The central ideas of global citizenship education include: 'globalisation and interdependence', 'social justice and equity', 'equity and diversity', 'sustainable development' and 'peace and conflict' (Oxfam, 2015b, p 6-7). Oxfam defines a global citizen as a person who understands the "wider world" and takes an active part in their community "to make our planet more peaceful, sustainable and fairer" (Oxfam, n.d.).

In the Oxfam reading, human rights are central to global citizenship, with specific reference made to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as rights children have in classrooms and schools (Oxfam, 2015a). As global citizens, students are expected to take responsibility for their actions, act as agents of change for a better future, respect diversity and make informed choices based on critical thinking (Oxfam, 2015a; Oxfam, 2015b). Additionally, global citizens participate "in the community at a range of levels, from the local to the global" (Oxfam,

---

[7] See e.g. cross-curricular subjects in the Czech Republic (including Democratic Citizenship, Education Towards Thinking in European and Global Contexts, and Multicultural Education), transversal competences in Finland (including Global and Cultural Competence and Societal Competence), and as an interdisciplinary and cross-curricular theme in Croatia (citizenship education)

2015a, p 5). Participation begins as young as ages 7-11 by contributing to decision-making in school and expands to wider spheres, including participation in political processes. The curriculum is grounded on the idea that all people are capable of contributing to positive change in the world. The references to the UN framework, as produced by an established international organisation, including sustainable development, which is a major international tool for cooperation, emphasises the feasibility and importance of realising such citizenship.

In the Czech Republic, the connection to Europe and the wider global community is a key part of Czech education policy, and several tenets of global citizenship are reflected in the curriculum. While global citizenship is not mentioned specifically in the education curriculum, understanding global and European values is one of the seven goals of education listed in the National Education Act (Parliament of the Czech Republic, 2004). The most recent education policy strategy includes improved citizenship competences as one of the main strategies but focuses these on the more traditional understanding of citizenship at the local and national level (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, 2020).

In the curriculum, the connection between students, the Czech Republic, Europe and the global community is mentioned in several subjects, including civic education and social sciences (Balada et al., 2007a, 2007b). Both basic and secondary education curricula include cross-curricular subjects, namely "Education Toward Thinking in European and Global Contexts" and "Multicultural Education", reflecting the same principle presented by Oxfam that these topics should permeate all subject matter. These two subject areas promote respectively critical thinking towards globalisation and development, and respect for diversity.

Although mention is made of the relationship between the Czech Republic and the global community, more

emphasis is placed on the relationship between Europe and the Czech Republic and on learning European culture and values (Balada et al., 2007a, 2007b). Students are expected to understand their obligations and rights as citizens of the Czech Republic and of the European Union and to participate in efforts to solve problems on the local, national, and international levels (Balada et al., 2007a, 2007b). Human rights and the rights of children are also taught under "Education Toward Thinking in European and Global Contexts", a cross-curricular subject, and are mentioned in subjects like civic education, history and "Humans and their World" (a primary education subject) (Balada et al., 2007a, 2007b). Additionally, the responsibility to create "a world where all people may live with dignity" is listed in the 2011-2015 National Strategy for Global Development Education (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, 2011). Compared to the curriculum documents, this national strategy is less Eurocentric and encourages a commitment to wider, global development.

Global citizenship and both global and European values as reference points to national citizenships are attempts to accommodate the realities of multilateral governance. They are also tools for arguing for an interpretation of citizenship which clearly acknowledges a democratic premise of citizenship. Intuitively, a global citizenship education would be a reading of citizenship as a counter to nationalism and a nation-state understanding of citizenship. As the Czech examples show, however, in the national context even global and European emphases on the concept of citizenship remain to be interpreted through a national lens of access, rights and political processes as the country joined the European Union in 2004 and the reinterpretation of national citizenship was applied to the new multilateral governance system.

Environmental citizenship

Responsibility for the environment appears often as an aspect of global citizenship as an extension of rights beyond the human sphere (Mannion et al., 2014). Usually, this perspective is taken as the duty of global citizens to promote sustainable development (Gough, 2018). The relationship between humans and nature is a central part of environmental citizenship, with some approaches viewing humans as stewards of the environment, and others presenting nature and humankind as living in harmony. While all the approaches emphasise a commitment to sustainability, they diverge in some definitions of the rights and duties of environmental citizens, as well as in their scale of participation.

The European Network for Environmental Citizenship (ENEC) is an EU funded project with the aim of strengthening the field of environmental citizenship in Europe and participating countries. While it has not created a specific curriculum, ENEC has published a Framework of the Education for Environmental Citizenship, emphasising the urgent need for this form of education and defining the goals and objectives of such education (ENEC, 2020). Environmental citizenship is defined as the "responsible environmental behaviour of citizens" actively contributing to sustainability and developing "a healthy relationship with nature" (ENEC, 2019, p 7). This active effort to resolve problems is key in defining an 'environmental citizen'. The framework specifically identifies examples of environmental rights and duties including: "Right to life and to a pure environment for every human being", "Public access to environmental data and information", "Obligation not to cause environmental impacts", and "Inter- and Intra-generational equity." (ENEC, 2020, p 11). Environmental citizens are expected to solve and prevent environmental problems and to promote the common good (ENEC, 2020).

The importance of long-term impact is emphasised throughout, as intergenerational justice is mentioned as a main output of environmental education and students are expected to learn to serve as agents of change, with encouraging civic participation and action on a local, national, and global scale as part of the educational content.

As an environmental right, ENEC highlights the right to access environmental data as promised under the Aarhus Convention. The Aarhus Convention, or the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, was adopted in 1998 by the UNECE (European Commission, n.d.). The Aarhus Convention makes a direct connection between human rights and the environment, indicating the value of protecting the environment (European Commission, n.d.). The Convention guarantees the rights of the public under three pillars: the right to "access to environmental information", including information on the state of the environment, public policies and human health; the right to participate in environmental decision-making; and "access to justice", which allows citizens to challenge governments when the first two pillars are infringed (European Commission, n.d.).

In Estonia, responsibility for the environment is reflected throughout the curriculum. Although environmental citizenship is not specifically mentioned, as with the example of global citizenship education in the Czech Republic, the values and competences of environmental citizenship are present throughout basic and secondary education. Environmental sustainability is listed as a core social value in basic and upper secondary education (Government of the Republic of Estonia, 2014a, 2014b). Estonia's commitment to environmental education has been reinforced by the implementation of the Environmental Education and Awareness action plan

2019-2022, signed in 2017 (Ministry of the Environment of Estonia, 2018). In basic education, students are expected to understand the value of a sustainable lifestyle and the relationship between humanity and nature (Government of the Republic of Estonia, 2014a). In the upper secondary curriculum, students are expected to develop social and citizenship competences, including learning to "value and follow the principles of sustainable development" (Government of the Republic of Estonia, 2014b, p 3). Further, 'environment and sustainable development' serves as a cross-curricular subject intended to be taught throughout multiple courses. Humanity's valuing of and responsibility for the environment is reiterated throughout multiple curricular documents, highlighting the interconnectedness between humans and the need to behave in an environmentally friendly way (Government of the Republic of Estonia, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c). This responsibility includes not only individual actions, but also participation in environmental initiatives on a social and global level (Government of the Republic of Estonia, 2014d). The Estonian curriculum does not specifically define rights in relation to the environment or environmental sustainability.

In 2021, students in the College of Europe[8] published a report on the concept of environmental citizenship. The report was published as part of the "TellUs - EU Environmental Policy Lab" programme, a joint initiative between the College of Europe and the Directorate-General for Environment of the European Commission, intended to enable students to contribute to the European policy agenda (Amand & Jareño Cuesta, 2021). While it offers no specific curriculum, it does present education as a key tool for furthering environmental citizenship and

---

[8] The College of Europe is an academic institution offering postgraduate studies in the field of European studies. It was founded to promote European cooperation as a direct response to World War II.

environmental sustainability, framing environmental citizenship as an added dimension of European citizenship. Citing Hellen Pallett (2017), environmental citizenship is defined as a "means of promoting goals of sustainability and environmental protection and integrating environmental concerns into political theory and modes of political engagement" (as cited in Amand & Jareño Cuesta, 2021, p 27). According to this report, the key principles of environmental citizenship include: inclusivity and intersectionality; the rights and duties of environmental citizens at multiple levels; a "societal model that moves beyond anthropocentrism and that offers a holistic approach to human interactions with the environment"; and a redefinition of "value" (Amand & Jareño Cuesta, 2021, p 10). Environmental citizenship requires educational initiatives to prepare youth for the challenges of building a sustainable future. Environmental citizens are expected to educate others on sustainability and to participate in civic and local action. Protecting the environmental rights of future generations is approached as a moral obligation (p 17). Some of the rights introduced in the report rely on collective efforts for sustainability, such as the right to clean air and clean water. Specific mention is also made of the legal framework within the EU that guarantees certain rights, such as the Aarhus Convention[9] and two EU directives to improve access to environmental information and the right to public participation in environmental governance (Amand & Jareño Cuesta, 2021).

While all three approaches to environmental citizenship stress the importance of active participation on multiple geographic levels, the College of Europe and ENEC provide an understanding of environmental citizenship on a Euro-local scale. Although ENEC does not specifically mention European citizenship as the College

[9] Although not strictly a European Union treaty, it has only been ratified by the EU and countries in Europe and Central Asia.

of Europe document does, the reference to the Aarhus Convention and the fact it is an EU funded project implies a tacit boundary of who is included. These multi-scale approaches highlight the ability of the citizenship extensions to transcend geographic borders and reflect the need for action on multiple levels to address a global challenge.

Conclusions: Extensions of citizenship in newly established contexts

We have named our examples extensions *of citizenship.* This reflects our starting point, *the basic dimensions* of citizenship, and an attempt to emphasise that citizenship still functions as a crucial key concept in politics even if it entails different prefixes and annexes. In choosing our examples, however, uncertainty emerged over which conceptual choice would best illustrate our reading of the three citizenships: new *layers* of citizenship, *alternative* citizenships or possibly something entirely different. By settling with *extensions,* we have hoped to do justice to the flexibility and persistence of citizenship as a reflexive concept fit to many contexts.

Interpreting the four dimensions of citizenship in the contexts of digitalisation, globalisation and the environmental crisis would perhaps not be an adequate framework for an analysis if citizenship still were not a key political tool for defining who exactly is a member of the polity. Accessing citizenship in the classical sense would refer to ways of acquiring citizenship as a legal status. To some extent this remains the case in our extensions as well, at least in the contexts of the national interpretations of digital, global and environmental citizenship: the rights, duties and participatory expectations are interpreted through membership of a particular state-polity. The debates on the relationship between citizenship and human rights also touch upon this dimension, and even if

this paper omits it, the link between our extensions and the right to have rights is one way to analyse controversies regarding access. In accessing e.g. digital citizenship at a global level, the basis for citizenship is defined more in the context of human rights framework and global citizenship, leaving open the question of who exactly would guarantee the realisation of this type of citizenship. The lack of basic digital infrastructure is not a minor limitation for making this type of citizenship accessible in a truly global sense.

Overall, being a digital, global, or environmental citizen seems to be defined by assuming an active role in these fields. In this scenario, education is a way to gain that citizenship by building the skills, knowledge, values, and drive needed to participate in these arenas. Alternatively, access to these is granted by mere existence and these education programmes merely seek to create 'better' citizens. In any case, each case emphasises participation (albeit not in very definite form) as key to realising the particular extension of citizenship. It would therefore not be too bold to argue that active participation is also one of the keys to accessing these citizenships if the link to the legal status is outside a national context. Further, by viewing participation as scalar (constituted across multiple levels), we can highlight the significance of both bordered citizenship practises and extra-national citizenship practises (Mäkinen, 2021).

Political rights have been a key claim in citizenship battles since the French Revolution, most notably whether in the sense of class, gender, ethnicity, or other potentially discriminatory intersections, but responsibilities and duties seem to have recently gained ground. In the context of environmental citizenship, for example, the argument about realising one's own rights through mutual respect for the same rights of others is among the key elements. Rather than having the duty to protect a country, political regime or territory, the individual has responsibilities towards the environment or, as the first examples show,

other human beings in the digital forums. Arguably, skills and duties (and values) are the main focus of educational content, possibly because it is the easiest to 'teach'. Rights in these contexts seem less clearly defined, and when defined, it is unclear who guarantees them to whom. For example, in the case of digital citizenship, depending on how rights are defined, some are provided by the government (e.g. Internet access), while others are dependent on the behaviour of others.

Finally, it is conceivable that the three extensions of citizenship here are actually better for describing and making visible the many positionings and intersections that citizenship inherently fosters. Our approach has sought to address the four basic commonalities discernible in most interpretations of citizenship and is based on approaches familiar from citizenship studies and conceptual history as an interdisciplinary field. By making this choice, we have focused on aspects of citizenship enabled by having a legal citizenship status as part of the state-polity. Therefore, having explored extensions apparently gravitating towards non-state contexts and interpretations, the lens is limited as regards some other possible framings of the topic. For example, emphasising the extensions as sites of struggle in terms of classifications and claiming recognition to specific agendas or groups as part of the social order (in the sense of Bourdieu, 1987, pp 479-484), would pave the way for analyses engaging more with social and cultural identification. Linking this with the question of power (e.g. Swartz, 2013, pp 137-142), would further explain the extensions as a nexus of state power and classification. Together with the abovementioned link between citizenship and human rights, these approaches to the questions of contemporary extensions and the flexibility and political use of the concept of citizenship could be further developed in future research. In the chosen context, the extensions seem to both readjust, and reach

beyond the classical commonalities: While they do provide new tools for participation, a sense of belonging to a wider (global) community and emphases on particular rights, they also are not equally accessible and realisable to all individuals irrespective of their background or place of residence. Rather, they introduce further sites of struggles for equal opportunity and equity in the politics of citizenship, where identification and recognition play important roles. Which concepts and meanings are established, and which are omitted in the process remains debatable.

References

Arendt, H. (1968). *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.

Amand, A., and Jareño Cuesta, E. (Eds.). (2021). *The future of environmental citizenship in the EU.* Bruges: College of Europe.

Balada, et al. (2007a). *Framework education programme for secondary general education (Grammar schools).* Prague: Výzkumný ústav pedagogický v Praze [Research Institute of Education in Prague].

Balada, et al. (2007b). *Framework educational programme for basic education.* Prague: Výzkumný ústav pedagogický v Praze [Research Institute of Education in Prague].

Bauböck R. (2007). The Rights of Others and the boundaries of democracy. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 6(4), 398-405.

Benhabib, S. (2004). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bherer, L., Dufour P. and Montambeault, F. (2016). The participatory democracy turn: an introduction. *Journal of Civil Society*, 12(3), 225-230.

Bourdieu, P. (1987*). Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 531-548.

Brubaker, R., and Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "Identity". *Theory and Society*, 29(1), 1–47.

Buchholz, B. A., DeHart, J., and Moorman, G. (2020). Digital citizenship during a global pandemic: moving beyond digital literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 64(1), 11-17.

Council of Europe (n.d.-a). *Active participation.* Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/en/web/digital-citizenship-education/active-participation

Council of Europe. (n.d.-b). *Digital citizenship and digital citizenship education.* Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/en/web/digital-citizenship-education/digital-citizenship-and-digital-citizenship-education

Council of Europe. (n.d.-c). *Digital citizenship education project.* Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/en/web/digital-citizenship-education/digital-citizenship-education-project

Council of Europe. (n.d.-d). *Objectives and mission.* Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/en/web/sarajevo/objectives-mission

Department of eLearning. (2015). *Digital literacy: 21st century competences for our age.* Ministry for Education and Employment (MEDE), Malta. Retrieved from https://dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/ERTE/Estudos_Tecnologias/elc_digital_literacy.pdf

Digital Literacy Malta. (2021). *Digital Citizenship.* Retrieved from https://digitalliteracy.skola.edu.mt/digital-citizenship/

Digital Malta. (2019). *Digital Citizen.* Retrieved from https://digitalmalta.org.mt/en/Pages/Landing-Pages/DigitalCitizen.aspx

Dobson, A. (2007). Environmental citizenship: Towards sustainable development. *Sustainable Development, 15*(5), 267-285.

ENEC (2019). *Education for environmental citizenship in focus.* Lemesos, Cyprus: European Network for Environmental Citizenship – ENEC Cost Action.

ENEC (2020). *Framework of the education for environmental citizenship – ENEC Cost Action.* Retrieved from https://enec-cost.eu/framework-of-the-education-for-environmental-citizenship-del-21/

European Commission. (n.d.). *Aarhus Convention.* Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/environment/aarhus/

Fahrmeir, A. (2007). *Citizenship. The rise and fall of a modern concept.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gough, A. (2018). Sustainable development and global citizenship education: Challenging imperatives. In I. Davies, L. Ho, D. Kiwan, C.L. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant and Y. Waghi (Eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Government of the Republic of Estonia. (2014a). *National curriculum for basic schools.* Retrieved from https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/est_basic_school_nat_cur_2014_general_part_1.pdf

Government of the Republic of Estonia. (2014b). *National curriculum for upper secondary schools.* Retrieved from https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/est_upper_secondary_nat_cur_2014_general_part_final.pdf

Government of the Republic of Estonia. (2014c). *Appendix 13 of national curriculum for basic schools: Descriptions of cross-curricular topics*. Retrieved from https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/est_basic_school_nat_cur_2014_appendix_13_final.pdf

Government of the Republic of Estonia. (2014d). *Appendix 14 of national curriculum for upper secondary schools: Descriptions of cross-curricular topics. Retrieved from* https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/est_upper_secondary_nat_cur_2014_appendix_14_final.pdf

Graeve, K.D., Rossi, R.J. and Mäkinen, K. (eds.) (2017). Citizenships under Construction: Affects, Politics and Practices. In K. De Graeve, R. Rossi, and K. Mäkinen (Eds.). *COLLeGIUM Volume 23 Citizenships under Construction: Affects, Politics and Practices* (pp. 1-11). Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies.

Hadjichambis, A.C. and Reis, P. (2020). Introduction to the conceptualisation of environmental citizenship for twenty-first-century education. In A. C. Hadjichambis, P. Reis, D. Paraskeva-Hadjichambi, J. Činčera, J. Boeve-de Pauw, N. Gericke and M.-C. Knippels (Eds.). *Conceptualizing Environmental Citizenship for 21st Century Education*. Cham: Springer.

Heater, D. (2002). The History of Citizenship Education: A Comparative Outline. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55, 457–474.

Hintz, A., Dencik, L., and Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2018). *Digital citizenship in a datafied society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Horst, C. and Olsen, T.V. (2021). Transnational citizens, cosmopolitan outlooks? Migration as a Route to Cosmopolitanism. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 11(1), 4–19.

Jones, L. M., and Mitchell, K. J. (2016). Defining and measuring youth digital citizenship. *New Media & Society*, 18(9), 2063-2079.

Joppke, C. (2010). *Citizenship and immigration.* Cambridge: Polity.

Keating, A., Ortloff, D. H., & Philippou, S. (2009). Citizenship education curricula: the changes and challenges presented by global and European integration. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 41(2), 145-158.

Kostakopoulou, D. (2007). European Union citizenship: Writing the future. *European law journal,* 13(5), 623-646.

Linklater A. (1999) Cosmopolitan citizenship. In K. Hutchings and R. Dannreuther (Eds.). *Cosmopolitan Citizenship.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lozano-Díaz, A., Figueredo-Canosa, V. and Fernández-Prados, J. S. (2020). Sustainable development goals and digital citizenship. *Proceedings of the 2020 8th International Conference on Information and Education Technology.* Okayama, Japan: Association for Computing Machinery.

Magnette, P. (2005). *Citizenship. The history of an idea.* ECPR Monographs. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Mäkinen, K. (2021). Scales of participation and multi-scalar citizenship in EU participatory governance. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space,* 39(5), 1011-1029.

Mannion, G., Biesta, G.J.J., Priestley, M. and Ross, H. (2014). The global dimension in education and education for global citizenship: genealogy and critique. In V. de Oliveira Andreotti (Ed.). *The political economy of global citizenship education.* London: Routledge.

Mantu, S.A. (2015). *Contingent citizenship: The law and practice of citizenship deprivation in international, European and national perspectives* (Immigration and asylum law and policy in Europe, 37). Leiden: Brill Nijhoff.

MATSEC. (n.d.). *Media literacy education: Syllabus/learning and assessment programme 2021.* Retrieved from https://www.um.edu.mt/__data/assets/pdf_file/00 06/355461/SEC41MediaLiteracyEducationSyllabus 2021covid.pdf

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (2020). *Strategy for the Education Policy of the Czech Republic up to 2030+.* Retrieved from https://www.msmt.cz/uploads/brozura_S2030_en_f in_online.pdf

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. (2011).
*2011-2015 National Strategy for Global Development
Education.* Retrieved from
https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign_relations/devel
opment_cooperation_and_humanitarian/general_inf
ormation/national_strategy_for_global_development.
html

Ministry of the Environment of Estonia. (2021).
*Keskkonnahariduse ja -teadlikkuse tegevuskava
2019–2022 [Environmental education and awareness
action plan 2019–2022].* Retrieved from
https://envir.ee/kaasamine-
keskkonnateadlikkus/keskkonnateadlikkus/keskko
nnahariduse-ja-teadlikkuse-tegevuskava-2019

Owen, D. (2017). Citizenship and human rights. In A.
Shachar, R. Bauböck, I. Bloemraad and M. Vink
(Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship.* Oxford:
Oxford University Press.

Oxfam. (2015a). *Education for global citizenship: A guide
for schools.* Oxford: Oxfam House.

Oxfam. (2015b*). Global citizenship in the classroom: A
guide for teachers.* Oxford: Oxfam House.

Oxfam. (n.d.) *What is global citizenship?* Retrieved from
https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/who-we-
are/what-is-global-citizenship/

Pais, A., and Costa, M. (2020). An ideology critique of
global citizenship education. *Critical Studies in
Education,* 61(1), 1-16.

Parliament of the Czech Republic. (2004). *Act No. 561/2004 on preschool, primary, secondary, higher and other education (Education Act).* Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/natlex4.detail?p_isn=71366&p_lang=en

Pedersen, A. Y., Nørgaard, R. T. and Köppe, C. (2018). Patterns of inclusion: Fostering digital citizenship through hybrid education. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 21(1), 225-236.

Richardson, J. and Milovidov, E. (2019). *Digital citizenship education handbook.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., and Shultz, L. (2018). *Global citizenship education: A critical introduction to key concepts and debates.* London: Bloomsbury.

Sardoč, M. (2021). Citizenship, social change, and education. *Centre for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 11(2), 97-109.

Schattle, H. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In R. Lewin (Ed.). *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship.* New York: Routledge.

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

Schugurensky, D. and Myers, J.P. (2003/2008). Citizenship education: Theory, research and practice. *Encounters on Education*, 4, 1-10. Published online 2008. https://doi.org/10.24908/eoe-ese-rse.v4i0.655

Swartz, D. L. (2013). *Symbolic power, politics, and intellectuals: The political sociology of Pierre Bourdieu.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

UN. (n.d.). *Global citizenship.* Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/global-citizenship

Van Oers, R. (2021). Deserving citizenship in Germany and The Netherlands. Citizenship tests in liberal democracies. *Ethnicities*, 21(2), 271-288.

Van Oers, R., Ersbøll, E. and Kostakopoulou, D. (2010). *A re-definition of belonging? Language and integration tests in Europe.* Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Veugelers, W. (ed.) (2019). *Education for Democratic Intercultural Citizenship.* Leiden: Brill.

Wiesner, C. (2018). Shaping Citizenship Practice through Laws: Rights and Conceptual Innovations in the EU. In C. Wiesner, A. Björk, H.-M. Kivistö and K. Mäkinen (Eds.). *Shaping citizenship. A political concept in theory, debate and practice.* New York: Routledge.

Wiesner, C. and Björk, A. (2014). Introduction. Citizenship in Europe after World War II—the challenges of migration and European integration. *Contributions to the history of concepts*, 9(1), 50-59.

Wiesner, C., Björk, A., Kivistö, H.-M. and Mäkinen, K. (Eds.) (2018). *Shaping citizenship. A political concept in theory, debate and practice.* New York: Routledge.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006) Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40(3), 197-214.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2007). Intersectionality, Citizenship and Contemporary Politics of Belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 561-574.