

# THE RELATIONSHIP OF ACTIVE AND GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP WITH RESPECT TO INDIVIDUAL, BELONGING AND PARTICIPATION

**Gülmiş Emiroğlu\***

## **Abstract**

The tasks and responsibilities of an individual are considered with respect to the conditions of today's changing world and they are being tried to be formed in the direction of political, economic, social, and technical developments that have been experienced during the last quarter of 20th century. The concepts of active and global citizenship can be ranked between those elements. It must be taken into account that since each of those concepts has an historic background and they belong to the western civilization then they have some common characteristics as well as they differ with some points. It is aimed with this study to reveal the common points and differences of those two concepts with respect to the individualism, membership/belonging/identity, and participation. As a result of literature survey, it is observed that active and global citizenship concepts have a common intellectual idea with respect to the individualism and participation. On the other hand, it is also concluded that when the development period of those concepts are taken into account, they differ with each other with respect to the belonging/identity.

*Copyright © 201x International Journals of Multidisciplinary Research Academy. All rights reserved.*

## **Keywords:**

Citizenship;  
Active citizenship;  
Global citizenship;  
Participation;  
Belonging.

## **Author correspondence:**

Necmettin Erbakan University, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Konya-Türkiye  
Email: [gemioglu@konya.edu.tr](mailto:gemioglu@konya.edu.tr)

## **1. Introduction**

The human being who is in the effort to understand and lead the life either produce new terms through occurring new conditions and purposes or change the current terms regarding to their meanings, and enlarge them. Hence active citizenship term is seen pointing out meaning enlarging of citizenship term as a result of those efforts. Global citizenship is a new citizenship model considering "classic\*\* citizenship criterions". But due to direct and indirect determined relation between active and global citizenship, it can be thought that active citizenship points another direction than classical citizenship. This study that researches mentioned relation has purpose to determine

1. Historical development of active and global citizenship

2. Similarities and differences of active and global citizenship terms regarding to their intellectual basics  
Regarding to human/individual, membership/belonging/identity and participation that are accepted as basic elements of citizenship.

Following assumptions lead to the study:

1. Every concept bears a historical background and evolution.

\*Necmettin Erbakan University, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Konya-Türkiye

\*\* Herewith 'classic' term expresses modern citizenship that is composed with national state structure.

2. The concepts which have similar historical background are designed by similar humans, societies or institutions and the basic reason for this similarity is they do have roots within the same civilization circle. This study is mainly based on literature review.

## 2. Evolving Meaning for Citizenship: Active Citizenship

The etymological source of the word citizenship dates back to the words “citizen” or “citoyen” which are derived from Latin word “cite” which has the meaning of being up to a political society, or being a member of a city-state in ancient Greek [1].

The concepts like participation, representation, autonomy and self-regulation have loaded new meanings and functions to the citizenship [2]. Ünsal expresses this situation of modern citizenship as taking responsibility that are effective for every member of this certain state other than having rights due to belonging of this state [3]. Barber who has an understanding on “powerful democracy” loads continuous and active tasks to the voluntary citizen in a democratic state structure. The citizens in this process, never comes together with blood or political agreements but they are rather neighbors due to their “common interests, common solutions to their problems, and their voluntary participation” [4].

One of the evolving meanings of citizenship that are used to express the developments in concept is the active citizenship. Likewise, the characteristics of modern citizenship like “individually participant and being effective” comes with the concept of active citizenship [5].

Passive citizen comprehension that was adopted after the end of World War II and the social state applications that pinned this approach lead to reconsider the individual-state and individual-society relations while especially trying to find resolutions to the social problems. The active citizenship approach that was dwelled on in the United Kingdom during 1980’s and started to rise between 1988-1990 took place first in EU’s Lisbon 2010 Strategy on Competitive Knowledge Society and Better Social Association [6]-[5].

This course that starts from putting an individual in an idle position to the rights based citizenship puts forward the social responsibility and drives that individual to play a role in political or social life and this is the situation that activates him. The active citizenship in its simplest definition develops the quality of life of an individual and gives him the chance of defining the problems of his society and actively take part in the struggle of healing problems within his society [7]. Saripek explains the citizenship as the manner of noticing the problems of society in which one lives and taking an active role to find solutions to these problems and raising the level of Standard of living [8]. According to Arendt, the active citizenship shall have the meanings of action for every citizen, development of judicial capacity, and having a certain degree of political activity [9].

In other words, active citizenship is “declaring his expectations, using his rights, and conducting his responsibilities” [10]. The purpose of active citizenship is reconnect the citizens to their society and organizations, and to give them the chance of participating to the decision making bodies within their public and hence the citizens in this course of process take interest in social values and wider political targets and purposes based on the view point of their own concerns [7].

Hoskins and Mascherini model the variables that define the active citizenship within the direction of expanding frame in four dimensions [11]:

1. Protest and social change: Making protests, participating in unions, participating in environmental and human rights organizations.
2. Community life: Participating in social, cultural organizations, participating in professional, sportive associations, and participating in religious institutions or school councils and providing to those institutions and organizations unorganized support.
3. Representative democracy: Engagement in political parties, voter turnout and participation of women in political life.
4. Democratic values: Democracy, intercultural understanding and human rights.

Modern citizenship defines the frames of active citizenship in the form of a citizen who “uses his rights and undertakes his responsibilities” and amends some other elements and dimensions to this definition like adopting personal or social values and accepting them, having general and personal ethics, behaving in a mature and being reasonable. The ethic dimension of citizenship requires being dependent to the active citizenship and being an instrument of ethic regeneration and social integration [12].

In fact, active citizenship can also be defined as “the characteristics that a citizen shall have” rather than defining as a type of citizenship and this new definition comprises information, skill, behavioral and value dimensions [5]. Especially the values dimension of that definition can also be accepted as a distinctive dimension although it is built on information, skill, and behavior characteristics [13]. In a way, active citizenship can also be evaluated as a comprehension practice of a human who is integrated with his information, behavior, and values dimensions and this definition leads it to cover the rights and

responsibilities fields of a citizen based on his information, comprehension, and his values hence it covers almost all aspects of his life.

### 3. Global Citizenship

In the latest half of 20th century, the globalism is a phenomenon although nobody reached a consensus for its essence, running, and results. It is also defined as “time and space jam” and due to globalism, the societies have become multi-cultured and the distance between the cultures and states disappeared and organizations that have international power emerged [14]. At this stage, Held thinks that a cultural connection emerged between humans and this is the result of mutual interaction created by global economic system, international communication and transportation networks, international organizations that have authority like auditing and limiting and trans governmental diplomacy [15].

In particular, increasing multi dimensional international relations that are the indicators of globalism created controversial points with respect to the state structure and the citizenship concept within last quarter of the last century and this lead people to be aware of the concept of global citizenship. Global citizenship is not a new concept as is active citizenship although it was put forward as a result of globalism. The history of global citizenship may date back to Stoics who assume a world state where every human is equal and brother to each other based on natural law [16]. The Stoic idea of world citizenship that bears moral quality survived during Rome and at the beginning period of Enlightenment[17]. Later on, Locke described world citizenship in a sense and Kant enunciated world citizenship within the framework of “cosmopolitan law” [18].

The global citizenship is defined today as “the citizen who evaluates the events with the upper identity of single world and single humanity” and the meaning and reasons of it is expressed on the basis of concepts that arise during globalization and with its assets [19]. These explanations also indicate to the transformation of modern citizenship especially on the matters of rights/responsibilities, membership/belonging/identity and participation. Hence Osler and Starkey state that rapid development in technology and evolvement of relations between humans in respect of purpose and location make citizenship within borders of a single state impossible [19]. It is such that, universal identity replaces national identity and universal equity replaces national loyalty and universal value like human rights gets prominence [19].

As it is seen, while the prominence of globalization in the field of politics increases, global citizenship is attributed a political identity. As a matter of fact Falk defines the global citizenship as a political identity that comprises political actions and active citizenship [15]. Stokes also emphasizes the global citizenship phenomenon that comes into prominence with its actions in global institutions and political affairs [20].

Ilkeda evaluates global citizenship rather with moral values with its creative empathy against further sufferers, the efforts exerted against understanding different people and respecting them, and wisdom on understanding life together with its political dimension [21]. Miranda indicates to the following four characteristics of a global citizen [22]:1. Recognizing all humans,2. Protecting environment,3.Helping to the lacker,4.Struggling for peace.

The global citizen shall be aware of global problems and have the skills to find solutions for them and he shall be in the quality of having responsibility, tolerance, appreciation, collaboration, critical thinking, dispute settlement, participation in the politic life, conservationist and being sensitive on human rights [23]. Following characteristics for a global citizen are indicated in the guide prepared by Oxfam [24]:

Table 1.Characteristics of a global citizenship

<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Values and attitudes</b>
Social justice and equit	Critical and creative thinking	Sense of identify and self-esteem
Identity and diversity	Empathy	Commitment to social justice and equity
Globalisation and interdependence	Self-awareness and reflection	Respect for people and human rights
Sustainable development	Communication	Value diversity
Peace and conflict	Cooperation and conflict resolution	Concern for the environment and commitment to sustainable development
Human rights	Ability to manage complexity and uncertainty	Commitment to participation and inclusion
Power and governance	Informed and reflective action	Belief that people can bring about change

The global citizenship with respect to its indicated characteristics carried responsibility field of citizenship to the widest limits as to compromise all world by building citizenship attitude and behaviours over new global information, skills, and values.

### 3. Premises for an Active and Global Citizenship

The relation between active citizenship and global citizenship may be dealt with under these three headings both for their commonality and for their basis: Human/individual approach, membership/belonging/identity and participation.

#### 3.1. Human/Individual Approach

Active citizenship and global citizenship requires being aware of “individuality”. Being aware of “individuality” provides having rights due to this individuality and again being aware of preserving these rights. The evolution of individual within general human approach is started in Ancient Greek but had its grounds with the renaissance humanism and Enlightenment.

The Sophists reviewed “human who is deemed to be the most precious” in BCE.5 and BCE.4 and stated that the basic purpose of this study is the benefit of human [25]. They thought human as the scale of everything and they had an “individualist and libertarian” approach to human and due to their this approach they are resembled to Enlighteners [25]-[26]. Stoics define liberty as “undetermined” and adopted the principle of “stay still against the impacts of external world” [26]. Hence, Epictetos who is a Stoic has been defined human that is an integral part of nature as a creature that assigns own values himself [27]-[28]. As a result, the idea of “an individual who has specific values in his inner world” started to evolve in Rome with the contribution of Stoics [29].

D’holbach states that human is “an individual who lost his liberty and became a slave” in Middle Ages [27]. But in Italian city states, human is accepted to be an entity looking for his character and looking for the ways to present his characteristics, who evolves with his actions and who has economic functions and who is different from society as an individual during Renaissance [9]-[30].

The human mind was in the basic determinant position at the 17. and 18. Centuries and the Sophists accepted the human as the scale of everything [31]. The human is no more a natural member of a cultural society, but he is the one who has basic wants and powers at the beginning of history without a date and he is the one who has the capacity of creating society, law, state, good and bad [12]. So the individual – the citizen is no more an absolute law, or a moral entity but he is rather a psychological and physiological entity [12].

The individualism continuously evolved during centuries after Renaissance and has been supported with the following developments in 19. Century: Revolution in time and space concepts, increasing inventions in technical era, obtaining intense and surplus production in agriculture, international commerce; increasing wealth with the precious metals, acceleration of investments, establishing of infrastructure for transportation and marketing, composing a kind of total network for the markets and economy [32]. Especially the success of individual at science and technology increased the liberty that is evolving on ego. As a result of this approach, individual created himself and this lead to liberty, liberty lead to knowledge and arrived to a point of possessing.

As it is seen, we face to face an individual understanding that develops and enforces in the base of mind and freedom. According to White, Western thought that “has individual focused thought structure” puts the individual, his liberty, and his benefits forward and takes him responsible due to his mind and activates him [33]. Both active citizenship and global citizenship deems the individual who is responsible, having liberty due to his mind as a subject. One point to consider at this point is the acceptance of force of will of the citizen in both of citizenship concepts as the basis of the concept of citizenship and the running of the life although the field of actions and responsibility is a social based element.

#### 3.2. Membership/Belonging/Identity

Citizenship means being a member of a social institution in general and due to this belonging it is the total of all rights and responsibilities arising from this belonging. As a matter of fact, the citizenship has been a category of rights demanded by the individuals throughout the history but also indicated the rights and identity provided by the state [34]. So the citizen is the individual who feels sense of belonging.

In Ancient Greek, it is the belonging established with city states and the individuals who are entitled to be a citizen are the members of this city state. Zenon who established the Stoa Academy, expressed that all humans in the world are equal [25]. The world citizen concept of Stoics lead to double citizenship law in Roma although it is not applied practically. This law requires that a human who inhabits in Roma but not a Roman is also a citizen of Roma due to the multinational structure of Roma.

Since feudal structure was effective in Middle Ages, one can say that a sense of fidelity to an individual was present then. But the sense of belonging to city or belonging to a state was effective after the Italian city states.

Belonging generally has been affected from changes occurring in individual understanding. As a matter of fact, the individual defined by Descartes and Hobbes has a kind of belonging based on common characteristics rather than being a member of a whole body [27]. This structure is a kind of social particular and it is expressed with the concept of social contract within the framework of national sovereignty developed during French Revolution [27]. Hence, modern citizenship concept developed based on the center of nation and national will concepts. Today, the citizen of national state that is dominant of political structuring in the world is being defined and decomposed with their national identity and belonging [35]. Mentioned national identity and belonging composes main base of identity and belonging area gradually included an enlarging specification in active citizen regarding to politic. But, further than political bound, the active citizenship includes all humanity in the frame of ethical responsibility [36].

Today, there are many opinions that express the feeling of belonging to a modern national state till two hundred years are now in vulnerability and gained another dimension during globalization process. From the point of this view, there are multi identities today instead of national identity. "The membership of an international society" that is the world identification is driven forward between the multi identities of today [37]. World Identity that gathers all people under a sole identity composes the base of global citizenship that "is desired to be placed in a determined humanity envisagement" [38].

On the other hand, it is also considered that the globalism cannot suppress the national identity yet it supports the development of national belonging during this process so no global identity can be created [39]. The basis of those ideas are construction of the identity definition to those two requirements of "continuity during time (common history)" and "being different from others" as Şimşek and Ilgaz states [40]. In case of "being lack of those requirements" and being aware of this fact is true then can it always be expected to create belonging feeling as to motivate an individual? Although there are some exceptions, this question seems to be not answerable positively due to the nature of human tending to categorize the life.

Active and global citizenship models carry commonality at the point of belonging to humanity due to enlarging content of active citizenship and especially regarding to social and ethical area. However, basing active citizenship to national identity "politically"; basing global citizenship to global/world identity point out to difference between both citizenship regarding to identity/belonging. As Polat states, when the definition and the development of citizenship indicating belonging to a definite political organization and the legal order between the individual and the state are considered, the global citizenship being tried to be defined out of such an organization is controversial by taking into account the nature and the running of citizenship concept [34].

### 3.3. Participation

One of the other basic concepts of citizenship is the participation. Because the citizenship begins with the participation that is both a responsibility and a right.

As a matter of fact, citizenship has comprised of political participation since Ancient Greek [2]. But it is only possible to talk about a limited participation in this period. The Sophists argued that everybody shall participate in political actions on the basis of natural law and brotherhood [25]. Although there is a citizenship understanding projecting both having status and participation, there was no efforts encouraging citizens to administrative processes in Rome [41]-[42].

Participation of public efficiently to management periods has been realized only in Renaissance in some Italian cities and by the United States and France revolutions [42]. The modern citizenship principles established during this period and this way of citizenship and degree of democracy is different from the activity, autonomy and liberal situation of individuals in city states of Ancient Greek [41].

Today this kind of participation extended to a degree of including economic and social fields and even reached to a multi dimensional and multinational degree within the framework of non-governmental organization. That is to say, the citizen is moving away the point of waiting the service of a state while he is becoming more demanding and participating to the decision making procedures and demanding more rights. [10]. Increasing rate of participation that shows dispersion practical to participation area and society base can be subject to change at policy and state understanding, technological developments and acceptance of "shared responsibilities" beyond rights and authorities of citizenship [43]. But, one of the most important elements supporting to participation is individualist understanding. Because, the individual that is considered privileged than society at the democracies should have affection power the society and equal attendance to the society [44]. As a result of those ideas, citizenship concept developed by relocating the mind to the center and participation of the individuals directly or indirectly to all fields of the life [45].

In fact, when the historical development of the citizenship is taken into account, it can be observed that there is a direct relation between the concepts of citizenship, being active, and participation beginning from the start point. But, particularly within the latest century, the increasing sphere of influence and the power to the mission loaded to the social or individual initiatives created an environment that requires both active citizenship and participation that complement each other. This is the result of powerful approaches that

redefine active citizenship within political and social participations with respect to the concept of active citizenship [11]. Participative behaviors within the framework of active citizenship compromise all domains beginning from “defining governments as accountable” to the behaviors of voting under representative democracy and to the daily life activities within society[11].

On the other hand, the global citizenship requires actual participation since global citizenship develops in the course of environmental protection, climate change, poverty, immigration, and hunger. This is due to the fact that, an active participation and responsibility is loaded upon global citizens through other citizens/international organizations to solve above mentioned problems. The participation and global knowledge level of the individuals constitute both starting point and the aim of global citizenship.

Active and global citizenship is separated from each others practically at the case of basing participation with political identity and belonging, due to executing of participation periods, needing a concrete political structure/state. But, at the same time, active and global citizenship need a participation that puts forward intervention and affection of individual to life, and participation ability and show strong similarity to each others[46]. Furthermore, exactly at this point, it can be stated that participation that bases to human rights and responsibilities carries passing qualification from active citizenship to global citizenship. Hence, according to Andrews and Lewis, global citizenship is “a new feature” of active citizenship including international rights and responsibilities [43]. As a matter of fact, it can be said at this point that participation based on human rights and responsibilities leads to consider active citizenship as the global citizenship.

#### 4. Conclusion

All evolutions that took place in late half century lead to arguments on the meaning and functions of citizenship. As a matter of fact active citizenship and global citizenship are developed as a result of these arguments in similar periods, on similar needs and purposes.

First of all, when historical period is considered, active and global citizenship terms have historical past including serious meanings together with previous meanings and some kind points.

Also, it has been determined that active and global citizenship terms have some historical and intellectual commonality regarding to basic principals of citizenship, like individual and participation. Increasing and indicative affect and importance of individual in the life and requiring of participation at resolution and preventing of problems is valid for both citizenship kinds. Because increasing ability of individual in every field, strengthen of his/her participation composes base of active citizenship and global citizenship at the base of active citizenship. It can be said that the development at individual and participation terms in the historical period is always supporting to each others and both of citizenship models can be built easily on a powerful individualism.

But, while realizing targets of local or global social aims, since both citizenship concepts are based on powerful individualism, this reminds the harmony problem that can evaluated under means-effect-result relationship. On the other hand, in an environment that puts the individual and his freedom in the center, the society is weakened with respect to the individual, and when the individual-society balance is in favor of individual then it can be observed that the prominence of theory and practice in the life will not coincide and the benefits of the society could not be effectively and continuously provided.

Although commonly emphasizing of ‘Humanity’ term, active and global citizenship is different from each other regarding to belonging. Likewise, active citizenship adopts national identity/ state, global citizenship adopts world identity. Active citizenship is placed in current political structure, but belonging at global citizenship has not been established a suggestion yet and it is about membership rather than identity.

Also it can be thought that belonging based to identity with globalism is not executed parallel so much. That is, belonging connection that was composed by identity conscious has been forwarded from Old Greece and Italy City-states to national states; at the next periods, despite of lived developments in the frame of terms such as individual, equality, human rights has been stopped like it reached to its natural borders. It can also be said that national identity and belonging feeling strengthens while the globalism widens by taking into account the behavior of European Union States against latest refugee crisis [47].

It can be thought in this points that the belonging that was established by identity conscious is different from belonging that only was composed by membership. Aforementioned differences raise doubts on the realizability of the global citizenship since human is an entity of having priorities starting from inner cycle to the far cycles. This can also be stated as a transition from personal to general. But, the inner cycles of an individual defining his belongings in global citizenship left ambiguous. If a result is reached like understanding the priority must be given to global rather than individual then this order will not coincide with the natural structure of a human and may lead to unnatural behaviours. Besides that, the status and the identity honored by the states to its citizens throughout history will lead the citizenship to a controversial position with respect to the global citizenship and its realizability. There is also another hard point to realize the global citizenship and to put it into a meaningful position like putting all world societies into a de facto structure with respect to belonging.

Despite of this visual difference about belonging, active citizenship as a product of conditions and matters created by globalism in a determined rate composes base of global citizenship and opens its way. So then, active and global citizenship terms that are defended in virtue of some concrete needs can be assessed as a new expression of Western Political Thought and applications that is dominant and continued since 17<sup>th</sup> century when historical period is considered. In this point, when binary application type in the history is considered (leading countries - led countries) those two matters can be emphasized through result of research:

On the frame of global citizenship and global problems, can active citizenship be affected on thinking, application and accessing to result for all societies and people in the same degree? In other mean, have all societies in the world a power and possibility that will compose global affection?

If there are societies more efficient and stronger than the others, whether the global citizenship is an element or a tool of a suitable structure including the ones who have this power in this point (who makes global) also ones who don't have the same force (who are being globalized)?

## References

- [1] Bouineau, J. "Fransa'daDevrimDönemindeYurttaşlarveYurttaşlık." InBalibar, E., Borne, D., Bouineau, J., Copeaux, E., Leca, J.,Schnapper, D.*Dersimiz: Yurttaşlık* (Ilgaz, T. Pri.) (Küey, Y. Trans.). İstanbul: Kesit; 1998. p. 109-143.
- [2] Güven, S. *İlköğretimBirinciKademedeVatandaşlıkEğitimiÜzerineBir Durum Çalışması*. [unpublished PhD thesis].Ankara: Gazi University; 2010. 335 p.
- [3] Ünsal, A. "YurttaşlıkAnlayışınınGelişimi". In Ünsal, A.editor. *75 YıldaTebaa'danYurttaş'aDoğru*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı; 1998. Chapter 1, YurttaşOlmaYolunda; p. 4-36.
- [4] Barber, B. *GüçlüDemokrasi*. (Beşikçi, M. Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı; 1995. 375 p.
- [5] Tutkun,T. *Öğretmen Adaylarının Medya Okuryazarlık Düzeyi ile Aktif Vatandaşlık Bileşenlerinden Temsili Demokrasiye,Protesto ve Sosyal Değişime Katılım Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişki*[unpublished PhD thesis]. Çanakkale:Çanakkale Onsekiz MartUniversity; 2013. 227 p.
- [6] Kara,C.,Topkaya,Y. and Şimşek,U. "Aktif Vatandaşlık Eğitiminin Sosyal Bilgiler Programındaki Yeri."*Zeitschriftfür die Welt der Türken -Journal of World of Turks*, .4, (3), pp.147-159, 2012. [cited 2017 February 2]. Available from: [http://www.dieweltderuerken.org/index.php/ZfWT/article/view/400/kara\\_topkaya\\_simsek](http://www.dieweltderuerken.org/index.php/ZfWT/article/view/400/kara_topkaya_simsek)
- [7] Kabukcu,G. *Active Citizenship and Community Policing in Turkey* [unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara: OrtadoğuTeknik University; 2006. 127 p.
- [8] Sariipek, D. B. "SosyalVatandaşlıkveGünümüzdeYaşadığıDönüşüm: AktifVatandaşlık."*ÇalışmaVeToplum*, 2 (9), pp. 67-95, 2006.[cited 2012 June 20].Available from:<http://www.calismatoplum.org/sayi9/sariipek.pdf>
- [9] Güngör, M. *Ulus-DevletYurttaşlığındanKüreselYurttaşlığaTürkiye'deYurttaşlıkOlgusu*[unpublished PhD thesis]. Malatya: İnönü University; 2008. 296 p.
- [10] Oktik,N., Yılmaz,G.G., Özbek, Ç. and Değer,F. "Demokratik Katılım ve Yerel Hizmetler: UNDP "Yerel Yönetim Reformu'na Destek Projesi" ve Yönetim Katılımın Yeni Biçimleri."*Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (İLKE)*, Güz, (21), pp.141-161, 2008. [cited 2017 February 2]. Available from:<http://www.sobbiad.mu.edu.tr/index.php/asd/article/viewFile/211/215>
- [11] Kartal, O.Y. *ÖğretmenAdaylarınınMedyaOkuryazarlıkDüzeyleriyleAktifVatandaşlıkBağlamındaToplumYaşamınaKatılmaDüzeyleriArasındakiİlişki* [unpublished PhD thesis]. Çanakkale: ÇanakkaleOnsekiz Mart University; 2013. 269 p.
- [12] Özkazanç, A. "ToplumsalVatandaşlıkve Neo-LiberalizmSorunu."*AnkaraÜniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 64, (1), pp. 247-274, 2009. [cited 2012 February 05].Available from:<http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/42/937/11674.pdf>
- [13] Keating-Chetwynd, S. editor. *How All Teachers Can Support Citizenship and Human Rights Education: AFramework for the Development of Competences*. Council of Europe. 2009. 84 p. [cited 2016 November 15]. Available from:<http://books.google.com.tr>
- [14] Harvey, D.*PostmodernliğinDurumu*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Savran, S. Trans.). İstanbul: Metis; 1999. 407 p.
- [15] Alpaslan, G.*KüreselleşmeSürecindeUlus-DevletveVatandaşlıkİlişkisi: VatandaşlığınDönüşümü* [unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara: Gazi University; 2008. 181 p.
- [16] Sabine, G. *SiyasalDüşüncelerTarihi*1. (Rızatepe, H. Trans.). Ankara: TürkSiyasiBilimlerDerneği; 1969. 338 p.
- [17] Dower, N."The Idea of Global Citizenship-A Sympathetic Assessment."*Global Society*, 14 (4),pp. 553-567, 2000.[cited 2012 June 21].Available from:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713669060>
- [18] Heater, D.*YurttaşlığınKısaTarihi*. (DelikaraÜst, M. Trans.). Ankara: İmge; 2007. 231 p.
- [19] Kan, Ç. "Sosyal Bilgiler EğitimindeKüreselVatandaşlık."*PamukkaleÜniversitesiEğitimFakültesiDergisi*, (26), pp. 25-30, 2009. [cited 2012February 06].Available from: [http://pauegit.indergi.pau.edu.tr/Makaleler/1577961273\\_%c3%87i%c4%9fdem%20Kan1.pdf](http://pauegit.indergi.pau.edu.tr/Makaleler/1577961273_%c3%87i%c4%9fdem%20Kan1.pdf)
- [20] Stokes, G. "Global Citizenship."*Ethos*, March, 12, (1), pp. 19-23, 2004. [cited2012 July 05].Available from:<http://web.ebscohost.com.library>.
- [21] İkeda, D.*Thoughts on Education for Global Citizenship*. 1996. [cited 2012 June 15].Available from:[http://www.daisakuikeda.org/sub/re\\_sources/works/lect/lect-08.html](http://www.daisakuikeda.org/sub/re_sources/works/lect/lect-08.html)
- [22] Göl, E.*Sosyal ÖğretmenAdaylarınınKüreselVatandaşlıkTutumDüzeylerininFarklıDeğişkenlerAçısındanİncelenmesi*[unpublished master's thesis].Kırşehir: AhiEvrans University; 2013. 134 p.

- [23] Cifuentes, L., Merchant, Z. and Vural, Ö.F. "Web 2.0 Technologies Forge The Way For Global Citizenship." *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8, (15), pp. 295–312, 2011. [cited 2012 February 13]. Available from: <http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/122276-20110628151815-15cifuentesmerchantvural.pdf>
- [24] Oxfam. *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools*. 2015. [cited 2017 January 17]. Available from: [C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/Belgelerim/Downloads/Global\\_Citizenship\\_Schools\\_WE B.pdf](C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/Belgelerim/Downloads/Global_Citizenship_Schools_WE B.pdf)
- [25] Ağaogulları, M.A. *Kent Devletinden İmparatorluğa*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ankara: İmge; 2000. 425 p.
- [26] Arslan, A. *Felsefeye Giriş*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Ankara: Vadi; 2002. 280 p.
- [27] Doğrucan, A. "Ortaçağ Batı Düşüncesinin İnsanın Özgürlüğünü Kısıtlamasına Tepki Olarak Ortaya Çıkan Modern Düşüncede İnsanın Özgürlüğü". (n.d.) [cited 2012 June 09]. Available from: [http://usak.academia.edu/Ay %20Feg%20BCIDo%20C4%20Frucaan/Papers](http://usak.academia.edu/Ay%20Feg%20BCIDo%20C4%20Frucaan/Papers)
- [28] Yakıt, İ. "Türk-İslam ve Batı Düşünürlerine Göre İnsan Nedir Ne Değildir?" 2010. [cited 2012 June 10]. Available from: <http://www.tasavvufidusunce.com/2010/12/turk-islam-ve-bati-dusunurleri-ne-gore-insan-nedir-ne-degildir/>
- [29] Mummyakmaz, H. *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Vatandaşlık* [unpublished PhD thesis]. Ankara: Gazi University; 2008. 333 p.
- [30] Hocaoglu, D. *Laisizm'den Milli Sekülerizme*. Ankara: Selçuk; 1995. 512 p.
- [31] Gökberk, M. *Felsefe Tarihi*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed. İstanbul: Remzi; 1999. 431 p.
- [32] Çetin, H. "Liberalizmin Tarihsel Kökenleri." *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 3,(1), pp. 79-96, 2002. [cited 2012 June 11]. Available from: <http://iibfdergi.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/archive/liberalizmin%20tarihsel%20k%C3%B6kenleri.pdf>
- [33] Özerkmen, N. "İnsan Merkezli Çevre Anlayışından Doğa Merkezli Çevre Anlayışına." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42, (1-2), pp. 167-185, 2002. [cited 2012 July 04]. Available from: <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/26/1012/12293.pdf>
- [34] Polat, E. G. "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Vatandaşlık Anlayışı." *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, (3), pp. 127-157; 2011. [cited 2017 January 01]. Available from: <http://www.ankarabarusu.org.tr/siteiler/ankarabarusu/tekmakale/2011-3/2011-3-4.pdf>
- [35] Erözden, O. *Ulus Devlet*. Ankara: Dost; 1997. 141 p.
- [36] National Council for the Social Studies. *Creating Effective Citizens*. [cited 2016 December 6]. Available from: <http://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/publications/se/6505/650511.html>
- [37] Kan, Ç. "Değişen Değerler ve Küresel Vatandaşlık Eğitimi." *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, Eylül, 17, (3), pp. 895-904, 2009b. [cited 2017 February 02]. Available from: [http://www.kefdergi.com/pdf/17\\_3/17\\_3-12.pdf](http://www.kefdergi.com/pdf/17_3/17_3-12.pdf)
- [38] Şanlı, Y. *Küreselleşme Sürecinde İnsan Hakları: Sığınma Hakkı* [unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara: Ankara University; 2004. 167 p.
- [39] Akdemir, A.M. "Küreselleşme Kültürel Kimlik Sorunu." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3, (1), pp. 43-50, 2004. [cited 2017 January 17]. Available from: <http://e-dergi.atauni.edu.tr/ataunisobil/article/viewFile/1020000075/1020000069>
- [40] Şimşek, U. ve Ilgaz, S. "Küreselleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9, (1), pp. 189-199, 2007. [cited 2017 January 17]. Available from: <http://e-dergi.atauni.edu.tr/ataunisobil/article/viewFile/1020000401/1020000394>
- [41] Altun, B. *Avrupa Birliği Yurttaşlığı ve Avrupa Kimliği Tartışmaları* [unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara: Ankara University; 2006. 138 p.
- [42] Karaduman, H. 6. Sınıf Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Dijital Vatandaşlığa Dayalı Etkinliklerin Öğrencilerin Dijital Ortamdaki Tutumlarına Etkisi ve Öğrenme Öğretme Sürecine Yansımaları [unpublished PhD thesis]. İstanbul: Marmara University; 2011. 366 p.
- [43] Andrews, R. ve Lewis, G. "Citizenship Education in Wales: Community, Culture and the Curriculum Cymreig." 2000. [cited 2012 June 20]. Available from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001571.htm>
- [44] Kınal, R.Y. *Vatandaşlık Bilgisi*. İstanbul: Nobel; 2004. 203 p.
- [45] Sabancı, O. *İlköğretim 7. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Yer Alan Vatandaşlık Konularıyla İlgili Kavramsal Anlamaları* [unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara: Gazi University; 2008. 285 p.
- [46] Branson, M.S. and Quigley, C.N. *The Role of Civic Education*. 1998. [cited 2012 July 4]. Available from: [http://www2.gwu.edu/~ccps/pop\\_civ.html](http://www2.gwu.edu/~ccps/pop_civ.html)
- [47] Karaduman, S. "Modernizmden Postmodernizme Kimliğin Yapısal Dönüşümü." *Journal of Yaşar University*, 5, (17), pp. 2886-2899, 2010. [cited 2017 January 16]. Available from: <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/jyasar/article/view/5000066086/5000061592>