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Based on thematic content analysis of textbooks, curricula, and an overview of educational legislation after the 1989 change of political regime in Romania, this paper presents empirical evidence to argue that that post-socialist citizenship education displays surprising similarities with converging post-war changes in the concept of the ‘good citizen’. The findings suggest a complex picture of change combining liberal, communitarian and cosmopolitan renditions of the new citizen, all having a common thread: the shift towards a post-national ethos delinking the citizen from the exclusive purchase of national belonging and decoupling citizen action from the absolute duty to the patria. Such significant changes are often overlooked due to the dominant focus on the failures to comply with an idealized Western liberal model. However, they invite us to reconsider current understandings of both the pitfalls and the opportunities of post-socialist citizenship education by considering them from a different angle: that of wider socio-cultural change that is gradually being institutionalised at the world level.

1 Introduction: The changing faces of citizenship

In the first half of the 20th century the concept of ‘good citizenship’ referred more to obedient subjecthood than to active involvement. The model was not at odds with individual initiative and subversion of social norms as long as it was exercised at “proper times and places” and ultimately led to the betterment of society (Sneden 1919, 4). While liberal nuances in the normative portrait of the ‘good citizen’ were promoted selectively to privileged groups - e.g. in Britain in elite schools for boys (Holt 2008) - the greater good to which citizens’ contribution was to be made referred to an “imagined” national community (Anderson 1991). Citizenship was conceived as an ineffable bond between citizens and their nations, a link founded upon mutual rights and obligations (a legal-status aspect, often described in universal, rational terms) coupled with a sense of belonging (an identity aspect, often described in ethno-cultural terms). With the gradual institutionalisation of the nation-state model in 19th century Europe, the notion of univocal national citizenship linking citizens and states was effectively in place and transmitted to the young through state-organised mass schooling (Weber 1976; Geliner 1983; Ramirez & Boli 1987; Soysal, Strang 1989).

However, the institution of citizenship witnessed dramatic changes in the post-war world and is increasingly understood in post-national terms. Beyond academic debates centred on “denationalised” citizenship (Bosniak 2000), there are also notable changes observed empirically. With the rise of an international human rights regime, citizenship was reshaped by notions of universal personhood as a complement to national belonging (Soysal 1994; Shafir & Brysk 2006). In the context of trans-national labour migration and other global changes, individuals and groups have become beneficiaries of certain rights even in the absence of citizenship status in their countries of residence. Rights are legitimated by, and offered to, previously marginalised groups, as well as to individuals recognized as bearers of personal worth in a variety of contexts across the globe, from Europe to Latin America, from local villages to global cities (Soysal 1997; Yashar 2005; Holston 2008; Sassen 2002). The univocal attachment to the nation, while still important, no longer represents the only requirement of good citizenship in today’s world. Conversely, given the increasing legitimacy of the modern actor as a rational human being endowed with the power to act (Meyer & Jepperson 2000), the aim of individual self-realization no longer poses a threat to the cohesive goals of the national collective. In return for this newfound empowerment, rights-bearers are expected to act responsibly, participate in the improvement of their communities, be environmentally aware, and collaborate creatively in addressing problems such as poverty, famine, war and disease, all of which cut across national boundaries. At a normative level, such concept of citizenship matches the ideal of a cosmopolitan deliberative democracy, which, in the view of some, could find fertile grounds in the trans-national polity that is the European Union (Habermas 2001; Delanty 1998; Delany & Rumford 2005) or, even more generally, in the global sphere where international organizations could gain greater democratic leverage provided that certain conditions are met (Held 2006, chapter 10).

While public schooling continues to be entrusted with the mission of moulding future citizens, citizenship education is not only the target of much reformation efforts at national and international...
levels from both the state and the NGO sector, but has also become an internationally-spread topic of research. Citizenship education in post-socialist countries, especially in the context of European integration, has been receiving increasing attention. The common thread linking studies of post-socialist civic education invariably touches on the difficulties of adapting to democratic citizenship models in the West, casting the region in a constant shadow of laggardness. The aim of this article is to challenge the picture painted by these dominant studies in the field by: (1) proposing a different analytic strategy (focused on change in time rather than current policy evaluation); (2) resting on a fresh theoretical outlook (using insights from a sociological neo-institutionalist perspective); and (3) using empirical data to make an argument that challenges the very assumption inherent in mainstream ‘laggardness’ explanations, namely the dichotomy between an idealized Western-democratic model to be adopted and the un-matching realities of the so-called post-socialist ‘transition’.

Methodologically, my strategy has been to focus on changing emphases in civic education instructional materials across two time periods approximating the 1989 change of political regime; I aimed to take into account the “processual” nature of citizenship education rather than offer a shortsighted view anchored only in the present (Hedtke et al. 2008). To this end, I sampled materials from before and after the 1998 reform which introduced the first post-socialist curriculum and opened the textbook market to competing publishing houses. I consulted all curricular guidelines elaborated after 1989 for civic education (both compulsory and optional), as well as all relevant educational legislation pre- and post-1989 (i.e. the 1978, 1995 and 2010 Education Laws). The textbook selection followed the specificities of the Romanian textbook market, and comprised of a final sample of thirteen civic education books for the secondary and five for the primary level (for both compulsory and optional courses). Before the 1998 curricular reform, teaching was based on unique textbooks produced solely by the Ministry of Education. I thus used all available materials for this time. After 1998, the textbook market was opened to competition between publishing houses. While theoretically there would have been several books available for each grade and discipline, this was not the case due to the peculiar mixture of centralized and free-market logics operating in the field of textbook production, approval and distribution (Singer 2008, 371–2). As the textbook refreshment rate in schools is relatively low and runs independently from curricular revisions, publishers have few incentives to invest in the production of updated books. In consequence, the availability is scant for certain grades and disciplines across time rendering research sampling choices (just as teachers’ choices) rather vacuous. The end-result was that for the post-1998 period, I have selected all the books that have been approved and used in schools for each grade, while also including several well-known books designed for optional courses.

For the data analysis I used an inductive thematic content analysis strategy. In a first step, instructional materials (curricula and textbooks) were reviewed from the point of view of their changing form, structure and organization, as well as their explicit disciplinary aims and justifications along the pre-1998 and post-1998 time division. For the thematic content analysis I purposefully avoided any rigidly defined scheme of categories. Some topics of interest (i.e. citizenship, nation, patriotism etc.) constituted the starting point for in-depth content analysis which resulted in a nuanced landscape of clusters and motifs associated to the notion of ‘good citizenship’.

In the following, I present some of the findings of this analysis related to the theme of ‘good citizenship’. These findings demonstrate how three interrelated aspects - individual self-realization, active participation in community life, and a concern with global issues affecting all human beings - concomitantly made their way into the content of citizenship education, particularly after 1998. While each of these trends could be depicted as a separate dimension of the citizenship ideal inviting the conclusion that there is some inconsistency of definition at hand, an important synergic effect is also observable: the pronounced shift from a strictly nationally-bound to a widened frame of reference for the constructed citizen ideal. This I consider to be a sign of emergent cosmopolitization, for the reasons I shall bring forth below.

I present my analysis in two parts. First, I introduce some of the global changes in the ideal of good citizenship in civic education and propose a theoretical background inspired by the work of the Stanford School of neo-institutionalism, also known as World Polity theory to explain the paradoxes of these changes in the post-socialist context from a fresh angle. Second, I give ample empirical evidence of world convergent trends from the post-1989 Romanian education context along three renditions of citizenship: liberal, communitarian, and cosmopolitan, whilst highlighting what brings them together. I conclude by reflecting on the significance of these shifts for wider societal change, particularly in the post-socialist and Europeanising contexts, and how these can be understood in a World Polity reading.

2 Post-war civic education trends and the World Polity perspective

While at the normative level scholars have promoted the idea of a tolerant cosmopolitan citizenship education to reflect the challenges occasioned by globalization and multiculturalism (Osler & Starkey 2005; Banks 2006; Kymlicka 2003), there is also growing empirical evidence showing that the post-war ideal of the ‘good citizen’ started to permeate the content of education worldwide. These findings suggest that the idea of an active, individually empowered, and globally-concerned citizen becomes reflected in the educational sphere in two key inter-related ways: (i) the content of
schooling (curriculum and instructional materials), and (ii) its means of transmission (pedagogy)6.

In terms of content, the new model finds expression firstly in the rise of social studies and civics disciplines focused on individual autonomy to the detriment of national history subjects centered rather on collective actorhoods (Benavot et al. 1991; Wong 1991; Hyman 2000). Secondly, specific topics within civics focus more and more on individual self-realization, a trend observed both in the neo-liberal West and in the globalizing East were these appear to be in consonance - rather than contradiction - with nation-building features (Schissler & Soysal 2005; Soysal & Wong 2011). Thirdly, there is a clear worldwide growth in coverage of topics of global relevance. The most recent study conducted by the International Educational Association in 2009 in 38 countries revealed that the top three most frequent topics invoked as having a major emphasis in civic education curricula were “human rights”, “understanding different cultures and ethnic groups”, and “the environment” (Schulz et al. 2010, 48); significantly, all of these entail a universalising logic rather than a particularistic one. Moreover, cosmopolitan forms of citizenship rooted in transnational imaginaries increasingly permeate specific instructional materials, as shown in the inclusion of themes with global purchase: e.g. membership in the International Educational Association in 2009 in 38 countries, safeguarding human rights (Ramirez et al. 2006; Meyer et al. 2010), celebration of diversity (Soysal et al. 2005; Soysal & Wong 2010), or intercultural linkages between previously conflicting civilizations (Soysal & Szakács 2010b, 2010a). At the same time, pedagogical transformations reflect a turn towards the value of the individual, as the pupil-teacher relationship moves from authoritative towards egalitarian approaches, the focus on factual knowledge-transmission is complemented by skills, attitudes and competence formation, and educational materials become more attractive and relevant to pupils in terms of imagery and topic selection (Bromley et al. 2011a).

Often considered a response to the challenges of globalization or the changed needs of learners (Karseth & Jameson 2010; Yates & Young 2010), these important shifts are however fraught with tensions and not easily amenable to direct cause-and-effect relationships, notably in situations defined as ‘transitional’ (post-socialism) has often been defined. A sociological neo-institutionalist perspective promoted by the scholarship of John Meyer, Francisco Ramirez and their collaborators, provides a compelling explanatory model for these changes. In this line of thought, the post-war rise of the individually-empowered citizen in education (as elsewhere) is not a direct consequence of new global imperatives but rather a reflection of the worldwide diffusion of the cultural “script” of an “expanded” modern actor, providing a blueprint for legitimate behaviour (Meyer & Jepperson 2000). In the new model, the pupil is no longer expected to become an obedient subject, but an involved active-citizen, “scripted to be an empowered member and participant in a very broad society and nature, not to be subordinated to an exogenously authoritative elite culture” (McEnaney & Meyer 2000, 207)7.

Because such changes are observed in a wide variety of national contexts with differing socio-historical trajectories and divergent constellations of interests, realist explanations based exclusively on the logic of consequentiality (March & Olsen 1989) or the primacy of political and economic interests are called into question. In contrast, neo-institutionalist interpretations recognize the key importance of cultural, non-rational, and socially constructed aspects contouring human activity, and highlight the role of symbolic legitimacy in structuring worldwide change.

To explain the possibility of contradicting logics resulting in similar outcomes in the educational sphere (isomorphism), these approaches often reflect on transnationally legitimated “educational ideologies” made discursively available to, and used by, domestic actors in different ways (Fiala 2006; Soysal & Wong 2011) without necessarily assuming a simple copy-and-paste process, or clear-cut distinctions between “borrowers” and “lenders” of educational models (Steiner-Khamsi 2004, 2009). Thus, while the diffusion of educational ideologies is not considered in the World Polity perspective to be a straight-forward process but instead likened to a “gas” spreading out without a definite centre, without a univocal source, or any purposeful destination (Krücken & Drori 2009, 19), it is no less true that much of this literature has been more interested in the surprising reach of educational scripts across the world (and looked for the features that made them successful) rather than in how this “gas” interacts with other “substances” encountered elsewhere. In this paper I do not take the simplistic view that local interactions (or the meeting point between the global and the local) are not important, nor that there is a single explanatory factor for diffusion. Instead, I challenge both the idea that trans-nationally authorised ideals are either diffused or not in a particular context and that, consequently, we can evaluate them as successes or failures at any given time (the either-or view), as well as the assumption that the diffused ideals have a standard-like quality in the sense of an immutable essence which is to be transferred as is if it is to be considered successful (the essentialist stance).

With the tectonic shifts brought by the year 1989 in the post-war definition of world regions, particularly with the de-legitimation of soviet-style state-socialism which arguably promoted alternative ideologies of education8, Eastern European countries have become especially intriguing for testing the world-convergence thesis given their perceived difference from (Western) world ‘standards’ at the time. Yet, countries from the former Soviet bloc are at worst excluded from international analyses, at best flagged as outliers due to their “post-socialist condition” (Silova 2010) without much further elaboration. Paradoxically then, underdeveloped interpretations of the region’s educational change constitute not only a missed opportunity in international
comparative work - as argued by Buk-Berge (2006) in relation to the publication of results from the 1999 IEA Civic Education study - but also a weak point at the very core of the global convergence thesis.

However, if applied to the case of post-socialist education, an approach inspired by neo-institutionalist scholarship promises to render some of the previously observed paradoxes more manageable: instead of considering internal contradictions to be an anomalous stage that would be overcome once transition was over (understood as a clear path from a well-defined point A to an equally well-defined point B), these could be considered simply an inherent feature of institutionalised (world) culture. As remarked by a well-known Scandinavian institutionalist theorist, inconsistencies between talk, decisions, and action can serve a useful purpose in organizational settings; they may be an impediment to act, but at the same time they constitute an asset in the very survival of an organisation (Brunsson 1986). In the following section I focus on the case of Romania’s changing civic education ideals in order to draw a more complex picture of change and continuity, one which combines several renditions of citizenship which do not neatly fit in an ‘either-or’, ‘old’ or ‘new’ model, evolving in transition or stuck in inertia. With this, I hope to shed some light on the complexity and contradictory nature of change but also argue that even with its well-acknowledged limits, an account inspired from neo-institutionalist scholarship of the World Polity variant may prove its usefulness in our currently one-sided understanding of post-socialist change.

3 The ideal of the good citizen in post-1989 Romanian education: liberal, communitarian and cosmopolitan renditions

One of the classical strands of citizenship debates in the 1990s revolved around distinctions made between liberal, or ‘thin’, vs. republican and communitarian, or ‘thick’, concepts of citizenship10. Analyses of civic education based on this distinction typically pit a focus on individual rights and minimal involvement against an emphasis on collective aspects of citizenship, such as group rights, agency and strong involvement (Zimenkova 2008; Kerr 2002, 214–215; Neubauer 2012). However, with the renewed discursive attention brought to social cohesion and civic forms of patriotism, notably in the post-9/11 West, rigid distinctions of this sort have become uneasy. Civic education programs may promote ‘thick’ citizenship ideals (i.e. obligations of the individual towards the community or a renewed focus on cohesive values) even in contexts that would be habitually considered as ‘thin’ and overly individualistic, such as the USA (Peterson 2011, 143–144), or the UK (Osler 2009, 86–88).

Drawing on dominant citizenship debates, scholars reflecting on civic education in the post-socialist societies of Eastern Europe have also laid emphasis on the individual vs. collective dichotomy, albeit in a different form. In the post-socialist context, tensions between individualist and collectivist understandings of citizenship have been presented in the form of teleological narratives of transition from an authoritative-socialist to a liberal democratic social order (Tibbitts 1994; e.g. Freyberg-Inan & Cristescu 2006). The tension between the two dimensions was seen as a hallmark of transition periods, a sort of “inter-regnum” until the ideal, anti-collectivist, individualistic, (neo-)liberal form of democracy would be achieved at the cultural level (Bizrea 2002). But simplistic polarities of citizenship (e.g. liberal vs. republican, individual vs. collective) are not neatly applicable to West/East, democratic/authoritarian or socialist/post-socialist distinctions. Instead, a mixture of emphases across time periods and local contexts is found empirically, an aspect of consensus particularly amongst researchers concerned with the post-socialist context in education (see Mincu & Horgia 2010; Mincu 2009; Silova 2002, 2009).

Developments in post-1989 Romanian education also depart from polarised discussions of the ideal citizen constructed through formal education. By analyzing the changing content of Romanian post-1989 civic education and of the declared missions of the school I exemplify the threefold nature of ‘good citizenship’ combining: (1) individual self-realization (liberal citizenship), with (2) active involvement in community life (communitarian citizenship), and (3) the extension of citizenship concerns to the global level (cosmopolitan citizenship). All three trends are represented in the post-1989 Romanian context in various degrees and are consonant with wider world trends in civic education both in the West and in the East (Soysal & Wong 2006). The liberal/communitarian citizenship dichotomy and the transitional phase hypothesis reinforcing a simplistic West/East divide have limited explanatory power in the case under scrutiny. In the following sections I bring empirical support for this claim.

3.1 Individual self-realization: The liberal rendition

Declarations of the mission of public schooling enshrined in national education laws often contain codified notions of an ideal citizen. In 1978, the role of Romanian education was to train and develop the “socialist consciousness of the young generation” and to ensure “the growth of a national identity”. But while being grounded in collective values, it “consists of the free, complete and harmonious development of the human
individuality, in the formation of an autonomous and creative personality” (Article 3, points 1 and 2, Legea învățământului 1995, emphases added). Such an ideal targeting the development of human individuality (only based on, but not contributing to, the “aspirations of Romanian society”) seems far removed from the mission of the Romanian school found in previous legislation that stated the primacy of the social (i.e. the formation of a generation) over individual formation.

No longer an end in itself, social progress is now presented as a side consequence of personal development. The 1995 Education Law depicts contribution to society as a result of individuals’ professionalization and successful insertion in the job market by becoming “useful” workers (Article 4, point 1, Legea învățământului 1995). The 2011 Education Law furthers the emphasis on personal development despite maintaining the collective-focused aims of forming “the mental infrastructure of Romanian society” (Article 2, point 2, Legea Educației Naționale 2011). According to the new law, education contributes to individual skill formation through “personal fulfillment and development by realizing one’s own objectives in life, according to each person’s interests and aspirations and their wish to learn all along the course of [their] life” (Article 4, Legea Educației Naționale 2011). Such formulations take for granted the existence of a young person with unique life objectives and reflects the embeddedness of the self-realizing individual model in current educational discourse.

But how is this ideal manifested at the level of citizenship education materials? My analysis reveals that the increasing permeation of the modern script of a self-realizing individual (Meyer & Jepperson 2000; Meyer 2010) is found in curricular contents in three major ways: through a pronounced shift from society- to individual-centred view of social life grounded in the notion of personhood; through a default presentation of the value of individuality as a good in itself; through increasing expectations of self-management placed upon pupils at all levels of schooling. I will give examples of each, in turn.

During state socialism, the primacy of the social over the individual went uncontested. In the tenth grade ‘Social-political knowledge’ textbook, pupils were told that: “society is a whole in which the individual integrates, given that he cannot exist as an autonomous human being outside of collectivity” (Ardeleanu, Clătică 1975, 11). Individuals were present in history books, for example, as national (not individual or universal) heroes because of their contribution to national aims of independence, unity, or state formation. Persons were singled-out only if they reflected the qualities of the entire Romanian people. As the Pioneers’ guide mentioned, “During the millenarian history of our patria, founders and country leaders have risen from amongst the Romanian people, embodying its most precious qualities” (Consiliul Național al Organizației Pionierilor [National Council of The Pioneers’ Organization] 1985, 4).

The situation gradually changed in the decade after the collapse of Ceaușescu’s regime in 1989. The first Civic Culture syllabus included a strong focus on democratic institutions and human rights. But the early contents lacked an equally strong emphasis on the value of individuality. Even though topics on the individual person were covered in separate sections in seventh grade, other topics were still framed through an emphasis on the value of the collective. For example, the existence of a human rights international regime was not justified by recognition of universal personhood but as emerging from the goal of societies to maintain non-violent relationships against dangerous individual domination tendencies.

The interests of people, inequalities, the will to dominate, can all lead to societies governed by violence and fear. All societies wish to limit violence and install social harmony; this has gradually led to the fruition of efforts to elaborate a document, a Charter, containing the fundamental rights of people everywhere (Chirițescu et al. 1997, 96).

With the new 1998 national curriculum, the individual person fully entered the stage of civic education. This shift was apparent in the formulation of specific civic education aims which included “positive valorization of self and others” (Consiliul National Pentru Curriculum [National Council for Curriculum] 1999, 11). Textbooks defined the goal of seventh grade Civic Culture as concerned with “the young person both as a citizen of the state [he/she] belongs to, as member of the different social groups, and as a unique and dignified being” (Nedelcu & Morar 2003, 5). Curricular themes specifically reflecting the concern with the individual person were extended to the primary school and included a full chapter on “The Person” in third grade Civic Education to complement existing sub-topics on “The person: the uniqueness and dignity of the human being” in seventh grade Civic Culture and on personal identity in eighth grade Civic Culture (Consiliul Național Pentru Curriculum [National Council for Curriculum] 1999, 2004)12.

Yet, the preoccupation with the individual transcended prescribed content addressing the person. The idea that the individual is part of different groups with different interests and identities appears in a fourth grade textbook in a lesson about groups and relationships in the absence of a curricular topic on the person (Radu 2006, 5). A multi-level approach to identities completely shifts the perspective from a society-centred to an individual-centred view of social life. In a book for eighth grade national identity is described as an element of personal identity: “National identity […] can be found as part of the individual way of being” (Georgescu & Ștefănescu 2008, 102). Thus, even curricular topics that are traditionally focused on the collective (i.e. the nation) are reinvented to include the value of individuality. National identity is no longer the ultimate differentiator amongst people, but is redefined as part of
personal (individual) identity which is relative, complex, multi-layered and can include other determinants of equal importance.

Another pattern highlighting the value of individuality is the novel presentation of self-enhancement and the pursuit of individual fulfillment as legitimate personal goals, most notably after the 1998 reform. In a textbook for the optional course on civic education for fifth grade we find the example of Ioana, an ambitious and self-confident girl, whose personal aim in life is to become a supersonic airplane pilot. Despite her grandmother’s opposition who considers her ideal “unfit for a woman”, her parents “encourage her to think that through tenacious work [one] can accomplish [one’s] dreams” (Tomoiu et al. 2007, 52). Similarly, in a lesson on “Courage vs. Cowardice” the textbook authors advise pupils to “permanently express [themselves], the person [they] truly are” (Tomoiu et al. 2007, 44).

The opposite of personalisation is deplored in newer books. Uniformity is depicted as a serious threat to the value of individuality, which in turn emerges as a good in itself and is linked with democracy. For example, a book for seventh grade Civic Culture discusses the risks of depersonalization through mass media and belonging to certain social groups (Nedelcu & Morar 2003, 18–19). The authors of an optional textbook express a similar view:

Accepting multiple identities represents one of the strongest arguments of democracy against those who depersonalize the human being based on unifying moulds. Multiple identities allow people to manifest themselves as personalities, and this is one of the objectives of democracy (Chirițescu et al. 2004, 16).

Such a view of the social is dramatically different from earlier periods because it challenges the inherent goodness of the collective, placing individualization aspirations and personal choices as primary. Personal qualities are described as more important than socially authorized or inherited statuses such as aristocratic titles that “produced tragedies in the lives of many people” (Nedelcu & Morar 2003, 9). Having an opinion divergent from that of the majority is celebrated as a sign of autonomy in the distinction made between individual and public opinion, which is in turn prone to manipulation (Georgescu & Ștefănescu 2009, 58).

But it is not only through civic textbooks or the mission of the school that a reconstruction of individuality occurs. Personal realization goals also crop up in cross-, trans-, and extra-curricular educational efforts from an increasingly early age, dramatically extending the expected scope of self-development. For example, the cross-curricular area “Counselling and Orientation” that starts in the first grade and covers all levels of schooling is thematically centred on the child: “Self-knowledge and personal development”, “Communication and social competences”, “Information and learning management”, “Career planning” and “Quality of lifestyle” are its key themes. The overall aim is to form competences for successful insertion in the labour market, but more prominently, it is to transmit a sense of personal acthorhood:

(...), pupils acquire knowledge and skills that help them become responsible actors and contribute to school, community, family and peer group life, to transform the learning activity into a process of lifelong learning and to create their futures (Consiliul Național Pentru Curriculum [National Council for Curriculum] 2005, 16).

In this curricular framework, pupils as young as six years old are expected to engage with their future careers, to learn how to manage their time, and be in control of their personal, social and professional lives. Along with other objectives regarding interpersonal and learning skills, the following objectives of the discipline spanning the full spectrum of schooling levels reflect a strong preoccupation with individual self-realization: “developing a positive attitude towards self as unique and valuable person”; “acquiring skills for career exploration and planning”; “exercising management skills for a quality lifestyle” (Consiliul Național Pentru Curriculum [National Council for Curriculum] 2005, 19).

Finally, there are extra-curricular efforts towards developing an individually responsible perspective on society at large. The National Program of Education for Democratic Citizenship, developed by the Extra-curricular Activities Department of the Ministry of Education together with UNICEF, displays a strong focus on individual self-development and the notion of individual personhood. Its optional textbooks for lower secondary (fifth to eighth grades) are exclusively focused on human rights and the basic principles enshrined in the UNDHR. The notion of ‘person’ is central in the activities suggested and is particularly applied to disadvantaged groups such as refugees, persons with disabilities, or drug addicts. What is noteworthy here is that a variety of social dynamics are presented as driven by personal motivations. The individual person holds the answer to problems related to her own destiny. For example, in the eighth grade book migration is presented as motivated by personal and professional fulfillment and unrelated to any structural factors (Cherciu et al. 2004, 64–65). Portrayals of social phenomena as driven by individual choices are very different from prior deployments of citizenship in which not only was the betterment of national society the main purpose of human activity, but the people as a whole and structural factors (such as class struggle in a Marxist-Leninist depiction) were the real drivers of any individual destinies.

In sum, there are several ways in which a focus on individual self-realization has formally permeated the Romanian content of schooling: an abstract focus on the individual person as a bearer of basic human and citizenship rights safeguarded within a democratic state; the value placed on individuality and the increasingly legitimate pursuit of personal goals; a pronounced shift towards rendering...
individuals responsible for their lives, and increasingly expected to do so from a very young age, even from positions of social disadvantage. All of these themes sur-rounding individual self-realization could be under-stood as a liberal form of the ideal citizen, but they contribute, as I argue further, to the construction of an individually empowered cosmo-politan citizen that matches the script of the expanded modern actor in the post-war world.

3.2 Active involvement: The communitarian rendition

The idea of creating a citizen that is socially res-
pon-sible is not new in Romanian education as
socialist discourses capitalized on active involvement in the collectivity. Each pupil had to show his/her love of the patria by recycling materials, volunteering for patriotic work etc. Even though the word ‘citizenship’ was not used, a sense of duty towards the greater good was strongly promoted, for instance within extra-curricular activities organized by the Pioneers youth organization (see Consiliul Național al Organizației Pionierilor [National Council of The Pioneers’ Organization] 1985). Active involvement in preserving the socialist order was presented as matter of fact in instructional materials. The participation of “working men and women” in the leadership of society through membership in different trade unions, civil organizations, and state institutions was portrayed as an unquestioned aspect of social life. Moreover, the involvement of citizens in society was depicted as part of the nation-centred socialist ethic. For example, helping communities affected by floods in July 1975 was considered in a tenth grade textbook for social political knowledge as a sign of patriotism undertaken in the service of the nation, not for the benefit of the people affected by the calamities (Ardeleanu & Clătici 1975, 126).

However, the aim of active involvement shifted in post-1989 textbook renderings together with the meaning attached to community. The purpose of becoming involved changed from building socialism to safeguarding democracy, construed as fragile in the absence of citizen action. The community of reference was no longer just the patria which in turn simultaneously shrank and expanded to include the local level (relevant to pupils’ everyday lives) and the global scene (relevant to pupils’ being part of the whole of human kind).

How is the purpose of civic involvement redefined as democratic duty in post-1989 schooling? In civics textbooks, we find innumerable examples of active citizenship as a sign of a democratic order. Participatory models of democracy gain precedence in the post-1998 period. In a lesson on “Democratic principles” from an eighth grade Civic Culture book, we read: “Because democracy does not function by itself without mistakes, it is up to everyone of us to render the society we live in democratic” (Georgescu & Ștefănescu 2008, 11). In contrast, a passive stance is ridiculed. In a textbook for seventh graders we find a caricature showing a man pushing a group of citizens in a baby-stroller. Pupils are asked, ironically, whether they think “the President of the republic should be like a parent to all citizens, solving all of their problems and fulfilling all of their wishes” (Georgescu & Ștefănescu 2009, 51). From such examples it becomes apparent that there are strong links between the general turn towards individual empowerment (discussed in the previous section), participatory models of democracy and an anti-authoritarian stance promoted in civics books particularly after 1998.

Even in pre-1998 reform books wherein citizenship duties were less linked to individual self-realization, involvement in public life was depicted as a guarantor democracy in the form of duty towards fellow human beings (thus reflecting more the value of the collective):

The lack of involvement in current problems of the locality, the country, and the world we live in, only results in the subversion of democracy. It is the ‘sin of not committing’ (...), of passing by facts, people, ideas or suffering with indifference. In our ‘citizen’ lives there are a series of obligations that we must respect. Doing otherwise means losing all [the rights] that people have managed to gain through hardship and collaboration. (Chirițescu et al. 1997, 86–87)

In this example, being involved (nota bene: at local, national and global levels) is correlated with explicit obligations deriving from the legally formalized relationship between citizen and state. But interestingly, even if the value of the collectivity remains strong, citizenship obligations are not portrayed as patriotic duties circumscribed exclusively to the national community, as used to be the case in the national socialist paradigm: they simply appear as duties towards others, members of the abstract, universal community of mankind.

This portrayal of active involvement as democratic obligation abstracted from patriotism and national feeling is coupled with a shift in the community of relevance for such involvement. This shift is expressed first in the usage of abstract words to refer to the locus of participation. In a book for an eleventh grade optional civic education course pupils are told that: “democracy presupposes the participation of citizens in the life of society” (Chirițescu et al. 2004, 34), without mentioning which society it refers to. In another fifth grade optional book a sense of citizenship duty is portrayed as comprising moral and legal elements including: to help the less fortunate, to be informed about public issues, to take a stand if things go wrong, and to be ready to get involved in the life of the community (Tomoiu et al. 2007, 16). All of these duties refer to fellow human beings, not only compatriots. The community of reference is nowhere defined nor qualified as national.

A second sign of an updated citizenship model is that even though active involvement is presented as a matter of individual choice, it emerges as a taken-for-granted aspect of the everyday lives of pupils. The resulting image is that of a social reality in
which everyone chooses, unconstrained, to be involved. For example, in a book for seventh graders, an exercise asks pupils to “give examples of activities [they] have undertaken for the good of the community where [they] live” (Georgescu & Ştefănescu 2008, 42-43). In the same chapter, exercises do not ask pupils about their responsibility towards the country, but about their duties and rights within their local environment: “to what extent do you fulfil your duties towards the community in which you live?” (Georgescu & Ştefănescu 2008, 45). The images and examples used to illustrate a lesson on “Citizen participation and responsibility” are extracted either from the international scene i.e. depicting help offered by civilians after the Kobe earthquake of 1995, or the children’s immediate local environments i.e. depicting a pupils’ council meeting in a school (Georgescu & Ştefănescu 2008, 46-48). In a section about responsibility, the authors give the example of a group of residents deciding to create a common relaxation space on top of their building (Georgescu & Ştefănescu 2008, 47). While drawing examples from the familiar life of pupils also reflects the turn towards student-centred pedagogies, it is noteworthy that the national community is not mentioned in relation to active citizenship. Instead, either an abstract transnational community is depicted, or a highly localized context, such as a neighbourhood or school, side-stepping the national level.

To conclude, active involvement in the community, which could be seen as the communitarian aspect of the citizen ideal, takes two specific shapes in post-1989 civic education. First, the duty to participate in public life is linked to democracy and constitutes the expression of individual freedom towards an abstract public good, rather than as a collective duty towards the socialist order, as used to be the case before 1989. Second, the target of involvement has shifted towards non-nationally bound understandings of ‘community’ to include both local and global levels of action, a point that equally supports the cosmopolitan dimension that I turn to next.

3.3 Global concerns: The cosmopolitan rendition

The shift towards non-nationally bound dimensions of civic involvement is matched by a redefinition of citizenship as increasingly cosmopolitan, decoupled from the national imaginary and concerned with world problems (Soysal & Wong 2006). This development merits particular attention in the Romanian context because it departs strongly from renderings of citizenship from the recent past. Despite projections of international solidarity amongst socialist states (suggestedly called “proletarian internationalism”), the ultimate “imagined community” (Anderson 1991) of the socialist period stopped sharply at the national level: “Within the different social formations, humans live in certain forms of community, for example grouped into families, clans, tribes, peoples and nations” (Ardeleanu & Ciocici 1975, 13). Tellingly, all sources cited in pre-1989 textbooks referred to the Program of the Romanian Communist Party, the speeches of Nicolae Ceauşescu, or the code of conduct for Romanian Communist Party members. The existence of monoidological sources surely reflects the lack of political pluralism during Ceaușescu’s regime; but it also points to two key peculiarities of the “national socialism” promoted during his rule: the equation made between the flourishing of the nation and the efforts of the Romanian Communist Party, and Romanian protochronism, the belief in the superiority of Romanian cultural productions (Verdery 1991, 116-121).

In sharp contrast to the casting of the nation as the ultimate community of belonging for a socialist citizen, the new textbooks are increasingly consonant with post-1945 worldwide developments in educational definitions of the nation, which tend towards a de-glorification of the latter (Schissler, Soysal 2005; Soysal 2002; Soysal & Szakács 2010a). In post-1989 Romanian education, as in the post-war world, the nation has been redefined not only as less heroic or belligerent (Szakács 2011) but also as increasingly inserted within a global frame of reference.

This is already apparent in the pre-reform Civic Culture textbooks. Even though the seventh grade book presents a traditional nation-building narrative in its historical account of the “Formation of the Romanian Nation” (Stefan et al. 1996, 120–123), the only section specifically addressing Romanianness in the 8th grade is, interestingly, located within a chapter on “The Global problems of human kind”, and is titled “Romania’s identity amongst the states of the world” (Chiriţescu et al. 1997, 106). Here, identity is deployed as an abstract concept, applying equally amongst world states. Only economic aspects create inequalities. Claims to identity refer to state features abstracted from history and culture, such as geographical and geopolitical position, beauty of landscape, economic or political specificities: “The Romanian lands mean harmony, variety, beauty and considerable resources” (Chiriţescu et al. 1997, 107)16. Such an approach reduces the aura of the nation: its uniqueness is reduced to a specific location and specific political/economic circumstances that hardly resemble the bombastic patriotic language of former times. Romanianness emerges less as a community of feeling based on unified exceptional values and more as an identity referring to a territorial unit with a particular political organization, with its assets and problems, simply a state amongst others17.
By contrast, the world emerges as a community endowed with its own will, based on shared values such as human rights, diversity and equality: “Ensuring respect for human rights, the world we live in today wants to be a community; a community of peoples and states that are different in terms of development, customs and ways of life, size and organization” (Chirițescu et al. 1997, 106). In a post-1998 reform seventh grade textbook, the same goal is presented as an accomplished reality: “Despite so many differences, we can talk about a single world, about the existence of an international community, with its own interests and problems” (Nedelcu & Morar 2003, 27). In a fourth grade Civic Education book the international community not only appears as a group of (nation)-states, but also as a community of persons: “The totality of people on the continents of the Earth form the international community” (Radu 2006, 51). Defining the international community in this way reinstates the principle of personhood and reflects the increasing fragmentation, individualization and uncoupling of the bonds of citizenship from the national principle.

A reframing of the imagined community also emerges implicitly from the means chosen by textbook authors to convey prescribed curricular notions. The personalities used either as bad examples or as role models to illustrate citizenship principles are increasingly non-Romanian. Historical and cultural characters that populate civic textbooks are drawn from the global legacy of mankind rather than from Romanian history or culture alone. Mahatma Ghandi serves as example of the legitimate disobedience of laws, Mother Theresa as an example of solidarity, Richard Nixon as an example of the power of the media, Rosa Parks of courage against all odds, Anne Frank of human tragedy etc. In contrast, Romanian historical heroes are presented less gloriously than ever before. In a seventh grade book, Vlad Tepes and Alexandru Ioan Cuza, two of the traditional heroes of the Romanian imaginary given their purported role in national independence and unification, are offered as examples of non-democratic rule and censorship of the press. Reference is sporadically made to historical or fictional figures associated to other nations, such as King Arthur, Napoleon, Harry Potter, or Charlie Chaplin suggesting a trend towards populating the world of citizenship with a multi-national set of heroes and villains in addition to the national ones (Lăcătus 2007, 49;89, Tomoiu et al. 2007, 11; Georgescu & Ștefănescu 2008, 28).

Quotes also started to draw from non-Romanian authors. A fifth grade optional Civic Education textbook opens with a quote from Rudyard Kipling (Tomoiu et al. 2007, 3). Further in the book we find quotes from cultural and scientific personalities from the Anglo-Saxon, French and ancient Greek worlds: Beethoven, Plato, la Rochefoucault, Aristotle, Demosthenes, etc. along with only two Romanians, Nicolae Iorga and Tudor Mușatescu (a historian and a playwright). Similarly, a seventh grade textbook extensively quotes from non-Romanian, internationally recognized texts such as the American Constitution, the French Constitution, the UDHR, or a UNESCO report (all seen as hallmarks of democracy), alongside excerpts from the Romanian Constitution (Nedelcu & Morar 2003). In this way, it becomes apparent that the social world presented to pupils is no longer a purely Romanian one, populated exclusively with Romanian heroes. Romanian youth is presented with global personalities to look up to, reflecting universal principles, such as struggles for peace, justice and equality. Such changes are relevant to the creation of a globalized world of cultural and scientific authority beyond an exclusive sense of belonging.

In such re-imagined world, citizenship is also redefined as post-national. In a seventh grade book the new meaning of citizenship is presented as a contemporary reality: “The content of citizenship has gradually surpassed the aspect of legal belonging to a state, incorporating the rights and liberties based on universal principles, expressed in human rights documents” (Georgescu & Ștefănescu 2009, 10). In the post-national view (Soysal 1994), the citizen ceases to be understood only as a national and is instead defined as a resident of a country; an aspect confirmed by textbook definitions whereby a citizen is “the inhabitant of a state who enjoys political and civil rights”. Citizenship, in turn, is not simply defined as a bond based on cultural or national identity (i.e. an ethno-cultural understanding of nationality), but as a legal relationship: “the political and legal bond between a person and a state” (Chirițescu et al. 1997, 20). This post-national citizen emerging from civics textbooks is concerned with global issues as much as with local ones. The degradation of the environment, natural catastrophes, poverty, the violation of human rights, or war are all portrayed as global problems that each citizen should be concerned with, already in the pre-1998 reform period. For example, under the title “The Global problems of mankind: The world at the end of the twentieth century” the 1997 eighth grade Civic Culture book addresses global inequalities and underdevelopment, third world poverty, famine and violation of basic rights, global migration, war and violence, intolerance and racism, diseases of our century (cancer, and especially AIDS(15)). In the same book, environmental concerns and defending the universal right to education of children are described amongst those citizenship duties that all of us should fulfil as part of humanity, interestingly in the same paragraph with national citizenship duties such as military service and the payment of taxes (Chirițescu et al. 1997, 87).

Post-1998 books move from simply presenting global issues as “concerning all of us” (Lăcătus 2007, 38; Nedelcu & Morar 2003, 27) to encouraging pupils to actively engage with them through debate and critical thinking. In a seventh grade book pupils are asked to “find out what destroys [the ozone layer] and how they could contribute to its protection” (Lăcătus 2007, 39). In an optional eleventh grade course, pupils are asked to debate whether or not Greenpeace actions to protect the whales are justified in the context of millions of people dying of
hunger in the world (Chiritescu et al. 2004, 111). Even though these examples do not represent a predominant concern in the analyzed textbooks (as most topics are still related to the state and the local community, especially for the core formal curriculum), their growing presence is noteworthy. Pupils are increasingly encouraged to think about, debate and engage with topics that are not of relevance to their own country, alone, but to the larger world. All of these topics gradually contribute to imagining a community larger than that of the nation.

But this reframing does not only emerge from prescribed content and its illustrations chosen by authors, but also from its packaging. A cosmopolitan redefinition of citizenship transpires from the structural organization of topics within the curricula which construct a multi-level view of society that includes the global level21. The syllabus for fourth grade Civic Education from 2005 contains a chapter entitled “The Community” including: the local community, the people, the nation and international community. The syllabus for seventh grade Civic Culture from 1999 onwards similarly organizes the chapter on “Life in society” along sub-chapters on the person, the social being, local community, national community, international community. Finally, the eighth grade syllabus for Civic Culture from 1999 approaches the chapter on “Patriotism” by discussing personal identity as comprising: family, regional, local, national, European layers, and then moving on to patriotism and European integration. The significant point to note is that the nation is not portrayed in isolation, as a single determinant, but in relation with the local and the international communities in a progressive approach, both in topics that are not traditionally linked to the nation (e.g. the individual person) and in more traditional ones (i.e. patriotism as collective value). The cosmopolitan packaging given to portrayals of the nation highlights, as much as the content, the emergent post-national trend in Romanian in civic education.

To conclude, there is solid evidence to suggest that both periods of post-1989 change considered (i.e. before and after the 1998 curricular reform) display certain degrees of convergence with world trends in schooled constructions of citizenship. These scripts involve an increasingly cosmopolitan view of the social and the citizen, as a complement to (not replacement of) the national imaginary. The new citizen reflected by these changes is an expanded actor, empowered at the individual level, expected to act to the benefit of the community and to be concerned about global developments as ways to uphold a universalizing ideal of democracy.

4 Conclusion: Reinterpreting post-socialist change in a world polity key

The most commonly invoked factor to explain challenges to citizenship education in post-socialist states is the weakness of their democracies, socio-economic difficulties or cultural gaps (Georgescu 2000; Tibbitts 1994; Radiukiewicz & Grabowska-Lusinska 2008; Bunescu et al. 1999). These explanations often conflate the failures of citizenship education (as those of democratization) with the post-socialist condition understood in terms of transitiology, a model that posits a more or less linear, yet clearly deterministic, transition from point A to point B, or two states of affairs that are known in advance (Wagner 2004). In this paper, I took issue with this dominant view of citizenship education in post-socialist contexts and brought evidence of the changing contents of citizenship teaching since the shift of political regime in Romania to show that the laggardness assumption may be flawed if the global context is to be taken seriously. To this end, I used insights from sociological neo-institutionalism and showed several ways in which an increasingly post-nationalised ideal of citizenship has made its way into Romanian education, despite its refraction into different, arguably contradictory, renditions (liberal, communitarian and cosmopolitan), and despite the complementary persistence of national frames of interpretation (which provide the expected local flavouring to the meanings associated to ‘good citizenship’).

However, it is impossible to conclude this argument without reflecting on the wider significance of these changes and on the context in which they are taking place. As it has been suggested in calls for institutionalist approaches to citizenship education in transformation countries (Zimenkova & Hedtke 2008), educational policy-making is an organisational field undercut by political interests of different kinds; this field is embedded in both internal and external contexts in which a multitude of actors are to be found, each leaving an imprint on the decisions and actions that are being taken, and finally on the end ‘product’ of citizenship education: what is taught and practiced in schools. Amongst the external pressures most often invoked in research on post-socialist countries we find the EU or sometimes Europe more broadly, taken to include the Council of Europe and its manifold initiatives in the field of education for democratic citizenship. It would be thus highly seductive to claim that the Romanian changes in the content of citizenship education presented here are mere window-dressing aimed to emulate a (Western) European model, in a national bid to meet the criteria for acceptance in the select club of Europe - a rather low price to pay, all other things considered21. In contrast to this possible interpretation that assumes clear-cut boundaries between actors, interests, and demands, as well as a strong conditionality power of the EU in the area of nationally-controlled educational contents, I wish to put forward a radically different reading of change in connection to Romania’s European aspirations.

The key insight that I propose is not, as most contend, simply that the educational sphere is subject to multiple external pressures from donors or international organizations, such as the World Bank, the EU or the OECD: these indeed often influence the adoption and sometimes to even greater extent the discursive justification of educational policies, the wording of certain curriculum guidelines etc.,
through a myriad of instruments, from data collection to standardization of tests, the diffusion of best practices through international expert meetings and so on (Steiner-Khamsi 2004; Grek & Lawn 2009; Robertson 2005; Beech 2009). The key insight I suggest in addition to recognizing the external embeddedness of any national system is that the role of such actors (often mistakenly considered as clearly-bounded and interested entities), is much more indirect and diffuse than usually thought. Europe, in this sense, which, as I argue elsewhere (Szávács 2013, 128), constitutes Romania’s ‘significant other’ in terms of its own nation-building project, is not shaping Romanian education directly by purposefully using carrot-and-stick techniques to shape domestic policy-making as it may happen in other policy fields that are Europeanising in a classical “conditionality” reading (Schimmelfennig 2007)2. Instead, Europe’s powerful influence rests on the legitimacy it holds in the Romanian imaginary and it effectively translates into the transmission of globally attractive discourses. These discourses are not the exclusive monopoly of Europe, nor of ‘the global’ (centrefield as it may be); they are promoted by Europe because in its turn, Europe is also externally embedded in broader frameworks of meaning (one example would be the human rights regime which Europe claims as its own, but has gained global currency in the post-war world with the rise of the UN and has become increasingly abstracted from its Western European origins). Given the lack of clearly specified European-wide policies in the area of citizenship education - with the exception of some programs promoting active and tolerant citizenship that however do not have hard binding power, and do not originate from the European Commission alone, but also from other international bodies such as the Council of Europe, UNICEF or the UNESCO (Hedtke et al. 2008; Pingel 1999; Grek & Lawn 2009; Novoa 2007), it may be difficult, if not impossible, to discern between European and global influences in the promotion of ‘good citizenship’ concepts, not least because such models implying a post-national and cosmopolitanised outlook are so similar across the world.

How does all of this explain the unlikely emergence of cosmopolitanised citizenship ideals in the Romanian context, a context that has been characterised as a particularly “reluctant democratiser” (Kubicek 2003) and late-comer to the EU? In the World Polity understanding that I am putting forward here, Romania emerged after 1989 from a period of relative isolation from agents of diffusion of world culture - i.e. international organizations, transnational networks, INGO’s, international experts etc., in other words, from the key agents of diffusion of world culture (Boli & Thomas 1999) - and it now slowly aims to reorient with them. The eagerness of post-socialist countries to become legitimate players on the world stage (and also the European stage in the case of Romania, as shown above) is reflected in the openness of their governments and other domestic stakeholders to promote post-war democratic citizenship education ideals and to embrace world-authorised principles of education, such as life-long learning (Jakobi 2011), student-centred pedagogies, individual self-enhancement, universal human rights, active global citizenship, and so on. The puzzling aspect for students of post-socialism should not be why there are difficulties in realizing such ideals in practice, because, as institutionalist scholarship has shown, these ideals often fail to materialize in consolidated democracies as well. The more interesting question is rather why is it that nation-states promote, through their public education, citizenship models that may seem contradictory to their own raison d'être (e.g. citizens involved in their own self-development and concerned with global issues as much as, or sometimes even more than, they are concerned with promoting national goals). In a World Polity interpretation, these developments are explained by the wide cultural change reflected in the citizenship discourses promoted through education and trans-mitted via transnational networks of expertise, European ones included: the post-1945 script of the nation-state which makes it difficult for well-connected states to portray themselves in isolation from others, or to promote exclusive constructions of their identities.

However, it is important not to idealize this state of affairs. What I have highlighted in this paper are the usually overlooked significant changes, but there are also inherent tensions that must be accounted for, recognized and thoroughly researched - even though they fall outside the remit of this paper. Despite the admitted polyphony of voices, interests and stakeholders pushing for citizenship agendas for different reasons and resulting in contradictory outcomes (Rus 2008), one undoubted point emerges: the path taken by Romanian education is gradually more consonant with global scripts of citizenship and nationhood which are shifting towards cosmopolitanised versions. The new citizen reflected in the new student-centric education is an empowered, locally involved, socially responsible and globally concerned individual, endowed with personal dignity and human rights who is no longer expected to bow to the exclusive demands of the patria. The pantheon of ‘gods’ to be worshipped has been shrunk and extended at the same time. The new citizen is encouraged to speak out, claim rights and debate freely, in the name of values that have a global reach. Unlike that usually held, post-socialist Romanian education is not lagging behind world developments, nor is it caught in-between two paradigms, but contributes to these very shifts, whilst exhibiting an (un)surprising mixture of citizenship dimensions that resonate with current world constellations of educational ‘best practice’. The novelty illuminated by these findings consists in the combined presence of three dimensions of the citizenship ideal, rather than in their separated consideration as reflective of different times or divergent external influences. These observations invite further questions regarding the case of the Romanian education as an instance reflecting wider societal change in relation to individualization and liberalization, empowerment and global awareness, themes that have hardly been seen as correlated before and yet might provide good impetus for a renewal of our concepts.
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Endnotes

* The research this study is based on could not have been possible without the financial support of the University of Essex Sociology Department, and the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research who hosted and funded the author’s two research visits and helped with the selection of materials. I would also like to thank Yasemin Soysal, Ireneusz Pawel Karolewski and Timofey Agarin, as well as two reviewers whose comments have greatly helped improve this paper.
Post-war transnational rights include some social and economic rights for non-nationals, but scarcely any political rights if we are to follow T.H. Marshall’s (1950) classical definition.

See Hahn (2010) for an overview of citizenship education research grouped according to world region: Fernández and Sundström (2011) for a state of the art report on citizenship education research from a liberal perspective; Neubauer (2012) for a critical review of eight key international civic education comparative studies; and Heeter (2004) for a broad historical account of preoccupations with citizenship education since antiquity to present-day.

For instance, sometimes only one textbook was available for a classroom, through their interaction within the schooled setting, and their own enactment of globally diffused scripts, which may be restrictive (Schweisfurth 2006). While I concur with the neo-institutionalist stance seeing students and teachers as thoroughly embedded in their cultural environment, I also consider this environment to be constructed not only through changes in the content of citizenship education (as highlighted in this paper) but also through the everyday encounter between participants in the classroom, through their interaction within the schooled setting, and their own enactment of globally diffused scripts, which may show conspicuous ambivalences and contradictions. I exploit the role of teachers and students in their everyday negotiation of ‘good citizenship’ as well as the discrepancies and ambiguities that may arise in their interactions elsewhere (Szakács 2013).

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss mechanisms of diffusion, as literature on the topic is both vast and multidimensional: from DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983) seminal account of the different types of isomorphism (coercive, mimetic and normative), to the analytic framework provided by Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) or Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) exploring various reasons for policy transfer (i.e. a mixture of elements on a continuum between perfectly rationallession-drawing to directly imposed coercive transfer), to the critical European institutionalist tradition seeking to historicise the local contexts of educational policy translation by focusing more on various semantic appropriations (Schriewer 2003, 2012). Hence, this study is based on my own translations from Romanian, as there is nothing glorious about them.

AIDS is by far the most relevant topic being allocated three pages as compared to less than half a page for the other disease discussed (cancer). This is explained by the fact that in the 1990s the international community had been sensitized to the large number of AIDS cases among children. This is similar to what Syszyl and Szakács (2010b) refer to as the ‘multiscalar approach’ with regard to the French 2008 history geography curriculum.

I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for making this point and hence occasioning the ensuing discussion.

Examples of policy fields that are deemed to respond to a larger or broader policy also show the influence of the geopolitical perspective on the global/local nexus in education see Anderson-Levitt (2003).

According to some World Polity authors, the very existence of an alternative model of education should be the considered with care. The socialist ‘alternative’ ultimately ‘invented’ its own distinctiveness and was taken seriously precisely because it did not contradict the world-authorized modern script of education, hailing the same principles of progress and equality lying at the heart of institutionalized education models (Ramirez, Meyer 2002).

For a normative discussion of the connections between citizenship theories and civic education ideals in a liberal democratic context, see Held (2006). For a comprehensive presentation of classical and contemporary models of democracy cutting across the over-simplified distinction between ‘liberal’ and ‘republican’ notions of citizenship highlighting their philosophical bases leading to developmental vs. protective variants, see Held (2006).

All translations from Romanian are my own. Unless otherwise stated, all italicised words within quotations are added emphases.

The research this study is based on could not have been possible without the financial support of the University of Essex Sociology Textbook Research who hosted and funded the author’s two visits to Romania.
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