Chapter 15
Towards a Common Framework for Global Citizenship Education: A Critical Review of UNESCO's Conceptual Framework of Global Citizenship Education

Xiaodan Sun

Abstract UNESCO's Education 2030 Agenda called on a number of countries to integrate global citizenship education (GCE) into their national curriculum and deliver it in the classroom. UNESCO's first guidance on the topic of global citizenship education is titled *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives*. The term global citizenship was defined by UNESCO as "a sense of belonging to a global community and a common humanity, which emphasises political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global" (UNESCO 2015). This paper aims to provide a critical review of UNESCO's conceptual framework of Global Citizenship Education and to situate into the broader academic discourse and practices of GCE. It starts with a critical review of the relevant literatures to explore the philosophical basis for GCE and its intellectual origins. Then it aims to clarify what that actually means as a feature of educational practice. It then critically assesses the conceptual framework UNESCO provides, especially its cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural dimensions.

15.1 Introduction

UNESCO calls on countries to integrate and deliver GCE in curricula and classrooms through the 2030 Agenda and its guidance on this, seen in *Global Citizenship Education*, which uses the outcomes of three related UNESCO events to formulate guidance—the Technical Consultation on Global Citizenship Education (September 2013) and the First and Second UNESCO Forum on Global Citizenship Education (December 2013 and January 2015, respectively).

The term global citizenship was defined by UNESCO as "a sense of belonging to a global community and a common humanity, which emphasises political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the

X. Sun (✉)

Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment, UCL Institute of Education, London, UK
e-mail: xiaodan.sun.16@ucl.ac.uk

national and the global" (UNESCO 2015). This paper will critically review and assess the UNESCO conceptual framework for GCE and place it into a broader context and discourse.

Starting with a critical review of the relevant literature to explore the philosophical basis for global citizenship, this paper aims to critically analyse UNESCO's conceptual framework of GCE and its cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural conceptual dimensions. It finally comes to the conclusion that UNESCO's conceptual framework of GCE has clarified the conceptual basis of GCE, and it has provided pedagogical guidance for developing the GCE curriculum framework.

15.2   Citizenship in a Globalising World

Citizenship is a concept that has historically evolved, rather than being something static at a point in time. In Western thought, citizenship refers to the "legal rights and responsibilities bestowed on an individual by the state in which they are citizens, denoted by their nationality" (Marshall 1950). Recent studies have redefined citizenship as less state-centred, giving it a more actor-orientated approach in which "citizenship is obtained through citizens themselves, based on their diverse sets of identities" (Gaventa 2002). This pluralistic approach "expands the meaning of rights, no longer confining them to just civil and political ones, but now including economic, social and cultural ones, including the right to participate, at the local, national, and global level" (Gaventa 2002).

This expansion of global citizenship (GC) is critical in today's society: it is a path for "overcoming global governance deficits", for "maintaining ecological sustainability" and for "promoting universal human values" (Gaventa 2010). Global citizenship is no longer an abstract philosophical idea, but a realistic one, especially now in the twenty-first century, where various complex problems need a new form of citizenship as a response (Gaventa 2002).

15.3   The Origins of Global Citizenship

The idea of global citizenship has been widely discussed in Western and Asian political philosophy. In Hinduism, there is the concept of Advaita, which has been translated as "the essential unity of God and man and for that matter of all lives" by Mahatma Gandhi (Heater 2002). The idea of "Datong" exists in classical Chinese philosophy, and it has been translated as "Great Unity". This concept, first introduced in the *Book of Rites*—an ancient Confucian classic—was further developed in the modern era by reformist Kang Youwei in his *Datong shu* (The Book of the Great Unity), in which he outlined how human society will achieve peaceful development by promoting a central world government, universal love and common good (Chen 2011). Furthermore, Fei Xiaotong (1990), a pioneering Chinese sociologist

and anthropologists, his ideas of "appreciating the cultural values of others to make the world become a harmonious whole" also emphasises the idea of Datong. Currently, China's President Xi Jinping has advocated Belt and Road Initiative, which aims to the creation of "a big world family of harmonious coexistence". Even if Datong is a utopian vision of the peaceful world, it has "the sense of belonging to a global community and common humanity", which shares some common ground with UNESCO'S definition of global citizenship.

In Western countries, the idea that "man belongs to a global community and shares a common humanity" has been discussed constantly from Graeco-Roman cosmopolitan thinkers to contemporary environmentalists (Heater 2002). Socrates said, "I am not a Greek, but a citizen of the world" (Heater 2002). The Stoics believed in "the oneness of the universe and man's dual identity as a member of his state and of common humanity", which was also strongly emphasised by the Roman Empire (Heater 2002). Kant, one of the major philosophers in the eighteenth-century, believed in "The Law of World Citizenship" (Heater 2002). In the nineteenth century, the pioneers of communism fought for the replacement of "the bourgeois state by a classless global society" (Heater 2002). In the twentieth century, the idea of Cosmopolitanism has been reinforced by the trend of globalisation, while Cosmopolitans identify themselves as "global citizens who belong to global community and common humanity" (Heater 2002). In the twenty-first century, the world is facing challenges that are even more complex: challenges related to climate change, poverty, terrorism and migration, all calling for human beings to learn to live together.

15.4 Global Citizenship as a Feature of Educational Practice

In the 1930s, terms such as "being world citizens" were recognised in educational traditions to fight against the rise of fascism and militarism (Bourn 2016). The term "Global Citizenship Education" has featured as an educational practice in Europe since the 1990s. The interwar period saw antecedent movements such as the emergence of Council for Education for the World Citizenship in the UK (Harrison 2008); while in the 1950s and 1960s, the education programme started to emphasise "empowering the young generation with a global outlook" (Tye 1999). This term, Global Citizen Education, gained currency in Europe and America after 1996 (Bourn 2016).

Global Citizenship Education is related to the policies and practice of a number of "adjectival education", namely citizenship education, global education and development education. These different educations are transformative and can contribute to fundamental changes among learners, education systems and global society (DEEEP 2015). All of them emphasise the learner's active and participative involvement in the learning process, involving critical thinking and critical literacy (DEEEP 2015). There are also a number of overlapping and closely related content issues, but with different learning objectives.

Since the 1970s, there has been recognition of the international dimension to citizenship education. Starkey and Osler (2008) reframed education for international citizenship, which addressed the issues of peace, human rights and democracy from a local to a global scale. UNESCO's statement in 2015 made reference to "educating caring and responsible citizens committed to peace, human rights, democracy and sustainable development" (UNESCO 2015). GCE's primary vehicle is citizenship education because local populations are more diverse and more willing to live cooperatively with those from different backgrounds.

Global Citizenship Education is related to the policies and practices of global education. The Maastricht Declaration on Global Education in 2002 is the European strategy framework for achieving the millennium goals by advancing Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education. The Maastricht Declaration in 2002 defined global education as "opening people's eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakening them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all". The Maastricht Declaration on Global Education influenced the emergence and growth of Global Citizenship Education and informed policies and practices in various European countries (Bourn 2016).

Development education can also serve as an useful entry point to address the topic of global citizenship education. Development education aims to help learners to understand global poverty, develop a critical understanding of aid and charitable giving, and encourage people to act as the agent of change towards a more just world (Bourn 2016). Oxfam developed an educational programme specifically for GCE in 1996 that united these concepts from development and global education; the first curriculum was published in 1997 and has since served as the practical guide for schools in the UK (Bourn 2016).

Global citizenship education is aligned with Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). GCE and ESD are mutually reinforcing approaches connected with Target 4.7 and both advocate a "transformative and holistic pedagogy". Both also "empower learners with knowledge, skills, values, and behaviour to build a peaceful and sustainable world". These two differ in their thematic topics: ESD focuses on common agenda for sustainable development and lifestyles, while GCE promotes a culture founded on peace, non-violence, and intercultural dialogue. These two approaches, connected with Target 4.7, are mutually reinforcing approaches to achieve the 2030 sustainable goals.

Since the 1990s, GCE has been seen as the way which the disparate kinds of "adjectival education" (DEEEP 2015): it uses these different disciplines and provides an educational response to the changes resulting from increased cultural and economic globalisation. It "overcomes the various divides present in development education" (e.g. North–South/developing–developed/First World–Third World), and it "goes beyond a minimalist form of global education dealing with global awareness" (Bourn 2016). It highlights the common agenda for sustainability and the commitment to Sustainable Development Goals. In addition, it goes beyond the legal rights and responsibilities of national citizenship and implies an active role to "forge a more just, peaceful and sustainable world" (UNESCO 2015).

15.5 UNESCO's Interpretation of Global Citizenship and Global Citizenship Education

Global Citizenship Education is becoming more popular internationally within bodies such as UNESCO. The normative foundation for UNESCO's approach to global citizenship education was first developed in UNESCO's 1974 Recommendation, which treated education as a foundation for promoting peace, international understanding and cooperation (UNESCO 1974). Since the launch of the UN Secretary General's Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) in 2012, GCE has become one of the three UNESCO education priorities (UN 2012). In 2015, since the launch of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, GCE became one of Target 4.7's topic areas for sustainable development goals in education (UNESCO 2015).

UNESCO's three Global Citizenship Education Forums have set the global policy directions for global citizenship education in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. The First Global Citizenship Education Forum took place in Bangkok in 2014 with the theme "Global Citizenship Education", aiming to prepare learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century. This first forum was concerned with conceptual issues and promoted a discussion of "Why Global Citizenship Education" and "What is Global Citizenship Education". The Second Global Citizenship Education Forum took place at the Paris UNESCO headquarters in 2015 with a theme of building peaceful and sustainable societies—preparing for post-2015. This second forum identified policy priorities and strategies for the implementation of GCE under the UNESCO's Education 2030 Agenda. The Third UNESCO Forum on Global Citizenship Education took place from 6th to 10th March, 2017, in Ottawa during the UNESCO Week for Peace and Sustainable Development. The objective of the Third GCE Forum was to highlight the central role of teachers and teacher educators in the effective promotion of GCE and implementation of Target 4.7 of the SGD on Education. The third forum on GCE provided a platform for the discussion of innovations in pedagogical approaches, teacher education and practices in GCE.

The aforementioned *Global Citizenship Education*, the first official teaching guidance from UNESCO on GCE, defines global citizenship as a "sense of belonging to the global community and sharing in a common humanity, with emphasis on political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global" (UNESCO 2015). Global citizenship does not, however, entail any legal status but can be understood as an ethos or value, rather than any formal citizenship (UNESCO 2015). GCE transforms learners, giving them the opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to contribute to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world (UNESCO 2015). There are four pillars of learning: "learning to know, learning to do, learning be and learning to live together" (UNESCO 2015) that uphold conceptual dimensions, namely cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural (Table 15.1).

The three domains of learning, namely cognitive (intellectual capability, i.e. knowledge or think), affective (feelings, values and attitudes) and psychomotor (skills and behaviours), provide the theoretical foundation for UNESCO's core concep-

Table 15.1 Core conceptual dimensions of global citizenship education (UNESCO 2015)

Cognitive
To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations
Socio-emotional
To have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity
Behavioural
To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world

tual dimensions. Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) first described the cognitive domains of learning, and his colleague David Krathwohl (1964) was the first author of the development of affective domain. Bloom's Taxonomy of learning has been revised by Anderson and Krathwohl in 2001 by reversing the two highest forms of cognition. The former version ordered functions from simple to complex thus: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. In the newer version, these nominal functions are changed into verbs: knowing, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluation and creating. Krathwohl et al. (1964) further developed the affective domain, which focuses on feelings, values and emotions. The process of internalising of values is ordered as receiving, responding, valuing, internalising and characterising (Krathwohl et al. 1964). The idea of the "psychomotor domain" was developed in the 1970s and I have adopted the work of Dave (1970), although there are two other psychomotor taxonomies from which to choose, namely Anita Harrow's (1972) and Simpson's (1972). Dave (1970)'s taxonomy is considered as appropriate as it is ordered as imitation, manipulation, precision, articulation and naturalisation. These three domains are progressive, according to Bloom et al. (1956), who sees learners progress through each of the six stages as their knowledge, attitudes and skills develop.

Cognitive	Affective	Psychomotor
Knowledge	Attitudes	Skills
1. Knowing	1. Receiving	1. Imitation
2. Understanding	2. Responding	2. Manipulation (follow instruction)
3. Applying	3. Valuing	3. Precision
4. Analysing	4. Organising personal value system	4. Articulation
5. Evaluating	5. Internalising value	5. Naturalisation
6. Creating	6. Characterising	

Bloom et al. (1956) Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain New York: Longan
Adapted by Chapman, A (2006) Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning Domains, Available from: http://www.businessballs.com/bloomstaxonomyoflearningdomains.htm, Date Accessed 21.6.2017

15.6 The Cognitive Approaches to GCE

UNESCO's cognitive dimension concerns learners' "acquisition of knowledge, critical thinking and critical pedagogy" (UNESCO 2015). UNESCO identifies global citizens as individuals who can "understand and critically think about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations" (UNESCO 2015). Global Citizenship Education empowers learners to investigate underlying assumptions and power dynamics and to develop skills for critical thinking and critical literacy. Similarly, Oxfam's (2015) GCE curriculum describes the "Global Citizens" as individuals who "have an understanding of how the world works and could be outraged by social injustice".

Oxley and Morris (2013) have defined the critical GC/GCE that advocates these similar concepts with UNESCO's cognitive dimension, such as critical thinking, dialogue and reflexivity. Oxley and Morris (2013) critically describe GC/GCE as promoting "counter-hegemony" that deconstructs "the oppressive global power structures." Critical GC/GCE thereby "emphasises critical thinking and interdependence; this idea is based on post-development theories" (Oxley and Morris 2013). These theories also based on post-structuralist critiques (e.g. by Derrida and Foucault); historical materialism and historicism (from the works of Marx, Hegel and Gramsci); and critical theory (from the "Frankfurt School"), such forms of critical GC/GCE explore and deconstruct imbalances of power and control (hegemony) in global society (Oxley and Morris 2013).

There is thus a connection between UNESCO's cognitive dimension of GCE and Andreotti's theories on critical literacy. However, Andreotti's approach is more radical, based on postcolonial critiques of western liberal and humanist tradition, which is not explicitly recognised by UNESCO's literature. Andreotti (2006a) developed the theories of critical literacy based on the view that "all knowledge is somehow partial, developed in our limited contexts, cultures and experiences". Learners should make decisions and take actions after "*a careful analysis of the context of intervention, of different views, of power relations (especially the position of who is intervening) and of short- and long-term (positive and negative) implications of goals and strategies*" (Andreotti 2006a, b). Andreotti (2006b) further suggests that "the role of educators should be cultural brokers, who can encourage learners to see the world from different perspectives and to critically engage in debates and take global responsibility". This approach is further developed as the teaching methodologies, namely "Open Space for Dialogue and Enquiry" and "Through Other Eyes" (Andreotti 2006a, b), both are based on postcolonial theory, critical engagement and dialogic learning.

UNESCO's cognitive dimension of global citizenship education recognises the importance of critical thinking. Critical thinking in education refers to "teaching students the rules of logic and rationality" (Kurfiss 1998). The first wave of critical thinking advocated a logical approach in which "thinking is legitimate only when it conforms to the necessary logical procedures" (Kurfiss 1998). Critical thinking challenges us to question all of our assumptions; differing opinions are sought out; questioning does not favour any particular outcome or result (Kurfiss 1998). Critical

thinkers aim for appraisals that are analytical, abstract, universal and objective (Walters 1994). Scholars began to figure out what skills constituted critical thinking in the second wave of critical thinking. The skills' critical thinking develop should reduce bias stemming from culture and upbringing. Knowledge and evidence that is based in reality are sought; scepticism is embraced, while the thinking process is founded on a solid and consistent logic, not on emotions or peer pressure (Walters 1994). Educators have recognised that curricula aim at building cognitive skills and habits of inquiry associated with critical thinking would benefit the individual learners, the community and the entire society.

15.7   The Socio-Emotional Approaches to GCE

UNESCO's socio-emotional dimension of GCE places great emphasis on identity, attitudes and values. The socio-emotional dimension relates to "the learners' sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity" (UNESCO 2015). Both UNESCO and Oxfam, among others, identify global citizens as those who "have a sense of their own role as world citizens, and respect diversity" and the Oxfam model, in particular, emphasises the value of "empathy", "outrage" and "self-esteem" (Oxfam 2015).

Similarly, Oxley and Morris (2013) have defined spiritual GC/GCE as emphasising the connections between spirituality and faith and our relationship to the world, which can be found within character education and religious education. In character education, Danesh (1997, p. 81) and Golmohamad (2004, p. 140) conceive spiritual GC/GCE as "combining altruism, empathy and maturity, leading towards an integrative attitude". In religious education, the "Golden Rule" ("treat others as you would like them to treat you") becomes a foundation for many faith-based manifestations of GC/GCE, which tend to "emphasise humility, empathy and charity towards all humanity and focus on the pursuit of global social justice" (Oxley and Morris 2013).

UNESCO's socio-emotional conceptual dimensions of citizenship education recognise the attitude of empathy. "The state of empathy, or being empathic, is to perceive the internal frame of reference of another with accuracy and with the emotional components and meanings which pertain thereto as if one were the person, but without ever losing the 'as if' condition" (Rogers 1975). Being empathic means that "for the time being you lay aside the views and values you hold for yourself in order to enter another's world without prejudice" (Roger 1975). There are two main components to the process known as empathy: affective and cognitive. Affective empathy is the ability to respond appropriately to another person's emotions, i.e. the emotional process of feelings with or feelings for someone/something else (Zillmann 1991). Cognitive empathy is the capacity to understand another's perspective, the process perspective-taking (Nathanson 2003), imagining oneself in the place of another (Hoffman 2000), and making the differences between the self and the other less distinct (Hodges and Klein 2001). Our morality is based on the cognitive evaluation and emotional assessments to

which empathy leads; moral principles meanwhile stabilise our empathetic response, this ensures a reduced likelihood of an inappropriate or disproportionate emotional response (Hoffman 2000, p. 239). Duan and Hill (1996) believe that affective empathy is able to mediate altruistic behaviour.

Furthermore, UNESCO's socio-emotional conceptual dimensions of citizenship education reflect the idea of cosmopolitanism. The term "cosmopolitanism" is derived from the Ancient Greek, stemming from the idea that the "cosmos" (world) is one's "city" (living place). There are three types of cosmopolitan citizenship identified by Peters, Blee and Britton (2008): political, moral and economic. A further kind (aesthetic-cultural) has been identified by Waks (2008, p. 204). The use of "cosmopolitanism" has increased in popularity because of scholars such as Nussbaum (2002), Osler and Starkey (2008) and Appiah (2006). The universalist perspective that states all humans share common fundamental values has led some scholars to advocate a new imperial form of global citizenship, but these values are rooted in a series of Western-centric institutions and practices (Arneil 2007). However, some like Humes (2008) takes a positive view of cosmopolitanism: he acknowledges that political globalisation is able to bring universal values of democracy, rule of law, and freedom of speech to oppressive regimes, giving hope to those who suffer from political persecution.

UNESCO's own conception of socio-emotional global citizenship rejects both the idea of a "world state" and anarchy, adopting instead a less radical form of political cosmopolitanism. UNESCO recognises the importance of global governance, which means strengthening current international institutions such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organisation and the World Bank into a well-ordered world society. Self-identified cosmopolitans see themselves as belonging to a global community as global citizens, sharing a common humanity. Both Nussbaum (2002) and Appiah (2006) have claimed "a global identity is as important as one's national identity". Cosmopolitans "are allegiant to the worldwide community of human beings", and they "are ready to broaden the definition of public, extending their loyalty beyond far and near" (Parker 2002).

These socio-emotional conceptions also have an important moral dimension, which can be said to derive from the Greek Stoics. The oneness of the universe and people's dual identities as a member of one's state and of humanity as a whole formed a key part of the Stoic philosophy (Heater 2002). Immanuel Kant is quoted as saying "human beings belong to a single moral community" (Peters et al. 2008, p. 3), and according to him, "the idea of a global ethic is necessarily universal, while moral values would need to be accepted by all human beings in order to be truly effective". Waks (2008) identifies two forms of moral cosmopolitan: the "*strong cosmopolitans*" and the "*new cosmopolitans*" "*strong cosmopolitans*" implies: "special obligations are morally arbitrary and that patriotism, for example, is an unacceptable moral position" (Waks 2008). For the "new cosmopolitans", their sense of global moral ethics are drawn from a "synthesis of liberal universalism and communitarianism" (Waks 2008, p. 209) in which special obligations are inescapable components of a moral life. Papastephanou (2008, p. 179) argues that "particularity is not the opposite of universality, as is usually theorised, but rather a subset of it": this, for example,

means that patriotism as a moral particularity can easily coexist with a globalised ethic system. UNESCO's socio-emotional conceptual dimension of GCED is compatible with these new cosmopolitans' communitarian ideals, since these ideals can be situated in local and national contexts.

The aesthetic-cultural cosmopolitan dimension of global citizenship provides a theoretical foundation for UNESCO's principles of respecting differences and diversity. Mill (1867), in his works on education for cultural aesthetics, is the starting point for the concept of aesthetic-cultural cosmopolitan global citizenship. It is further described by Waks (2008):

> To be cosmopolitan in this sense is to be open to those from other places, take an interest in their cultural practices, learn about these practices through reading, travel and personal contact, and even to shape a personal identity as a cosmopolitan through such experiences. (Waks 2008, p. 204)

Furthermore, De Ruyter and Spiecker (2008) describe a global citizen as "a culturally and intellectually well-developed person" who "actively plays a modest part in the cultural flourishing of the society" (De Ruyter and Spiecker 2008, pp. 354; 355). The global citizens not only live in a "genre-rich society" (De Ruyter and Spiecker 2008, p. 359), but actively widen access to a variety of cultures. Global citizen education should teach the learners to "respect the rights of others and evaluate the political, social and moral qualities of societies" (De Ruyter and Spiecker 2008, p. 360).

15.8   The Behavioural Approaches to GCE

UNESCO's behavioural dimension emphasises participation, engagement and responsibility. UNESCO defines global citizens as individuals who can "act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world" (UNESCO 2015). Similarly, Oxfam's (2015) GCE curriculum identifies Global Citizens as "individuals who are willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place, take responsibility for their actions and participate in the community from the local to the global levels". Oxfam (2015) claims that young people's learning, thinking and actions are critical for "contributing to a more just, peaceful and sustainable world". Therefore, alongside having a critical understanding of global issues, GCE must instil in young people the power to develop their own skills to act as agents for change, while also being able to reflect critically on how they are global citizens (Oxfam 2015).

UNESCO's behavioural dimension of GCE recognises Gaventa's theory on citizenship engagement. Globalisation has caused power to change forms; transnational social movements are creating new opportunities in which citizens can engage. These opportunities to participate in global governance are more easily found which causes participants to have new sense of global citizenship and solidarity (Gaventa and Tandon 2010). This multidimensional power structure transcends the nation state as sole

custodian and arbitrator of citizenship; instead, it emphasises non-state participants to actively engage in claiming, monitoring and enforcing rights (Gaventa and Tandon 2010). Global engagement requires interconnected global, national and local participants reshaping forms of power.

UNESCO's behavioural dimension of GCE shows a more active definition of citizenship: citizens are not "users and choosers" but rather "makers and shapers" (Cornwall and Gaventa 2000). Dower (2000, p. 559, 2008, p. 39) emphasises the importance of "active commitment" and "active engagement"; and Dei (2008, p. 489) puts forward ideas of "collective and community action". Furthermore, Temple and Laycock (2008, p. 104) identify global citizenship education as a metaphorical "journey" of acting on our global responsibilities from a "passive status" to a "full, active status". The idea of action necessitates treating the student as a present citizen, rather than as a future citizen "on the waiting list" for adult life (Dewey 1916, p. 27).

UNESCO's behavioural dimension of global citizenship education reflects Banks' transformative citizenship education. Banks developed the theories of transformative citizenship education based on cosmopolitan values (Banks 2008). On the cosmopolitans' accounts, global citizenship education should play a fundamental role in helping learners to develop an identity and attachment to the global community. Transformative citizenship education must provide learners with knowledge about both their home community and global society. It should help learners to develop skills needed to solve global problems: critical thinking, decision-making and problem-solving skills (Banks 2008). Active and transformative citizenship differ in that active citizens are limited by existing laws, customs and conventions, and transformative citizens challenge existing laws and beliefs through promoting values and moral principles (Banks 2008).

Civil society organisations are highly active in GCE by placing great emphasis on engagement, responsibility and participation. Many development NGOs have adopted a critical and advocacy-based approach to GCE (Bourn 2016). An example of this is the DEEEP Projects, which focus on creating a global movement of citizens who work together for change (Bourn 2016). However, the lack of funding for long-term term projects and the uncritical engagement can result in a lack of sustained engagement (Bourn 2016). The advocacy-based approach can only facilitate effective and responsible participation, alongside with the critical engagement with global issues and teacher's support in delivering these projects (Bourn 2016).

15.9 Conclusion

UNESCO's framework has clarified the conceptual basis of GCE, and this presents practical ways to integrate GCE into Member State's national curriculum. UNESCO's conception of global citizens is not as strongly linked to the ideas of legal rights and responsibilities, while "global citizenship can be understood as the outcome of an educational trajectory" (ibid., p. 72). In applying this framework, global citizenship is perceived as an identity (a sense of belonging to a global community and

a common humanity), a set of values and attitudes empathy, solidarity, respect for difference and diversity), a set of competences (intercultural communication, critical and creative thinking, problem-solving and decision-making skills), and as a kind of active behaviour (participation, responsibility and engagement). It is therefore clear that UNESCO's conceptual framework has already laid the basis for GCE and has provided much guidance for developing GCE curriculum frameworks.

Furthermore, UNESCO's conceptual framework can be seen as an useful reference model for learners' different stages of learning, and it fits in UNESCO's transformative approach to GCE. UNESCO provides a strong normative vision of GCE by focusing on and advancing the cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural dimensions of GCE. UNESCO's conceptual framework is progressive, based on three domains of learning, namely cognitive (intellectual capability, i.e. knowledge or think), affective (feelings, values and attitudes) and psychomotor (skills and behaviours). These three conceptual dimensions are compatible with the four pillars of learning: Learning to know, Learning to do, Learning to be and Learning to live together. Each of these domains' six stages' chart the learner's growth and progress as their knowledge, attitudes and skills development. The key learner attributes, topics' and learning objectives suggested in this UNESCO's guidance are based on the three dimensions mentioned above. They are interlinked and integrated into the learning process and can be seen as an useful reference model for learners' different stages of learning.

UNESCO's conceptual framework of GCE has provided guidance for Member States on how to "ensure learners can become informed, critically literate, socially connected, ethical and engaged global citizens" (UNESCO 2015). UNESCO's cognitive dimension concerns learners' acquisition of knowledge and critical thinking (UNESCO 2015). With critical engagement with global issues, GCE empowers learners to investigate underlying assumptions and power dynamics and to develop skills for critical thinking and critical literacy. Furthermore, the socio-emotional dimension emphasises "the learners' sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity" (UNESCO 2015), which leads to learners' ethical and altruistic behaviour. Moreover, UNESCO's behavioural dimension places great emphasis on participation, engagement and responsibility. With a more active notion of citizenship, GCE would empower young people to develop practical skills as agents of change for a more peaceful and sustainable world. Each dimension as more detailed points of reference to aid in curriculum design and development presents practical help to integrate GCE into age-specific topics and objectives.

However, it would not be possible to adopt the conceptual framework into local contexts by simply translating it into local languages. It is also required to meet the culturally specific needs of Member States and locate "global citizen education" into local context.

Bibliography

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., et al. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of bloom's taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (abridged edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Pearson Education Group.

Andreotti, V. (2006a). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. [Online]. *Development Education, Policy and Practice, 3*(1). Available at: http://www.osdemethodology.org.uk/texts/softcriticalvan.pdf. Last accessed July 2015.

Andreotti, V. (2006b). *A postcolonial reading of contemporary discourses related to the global dimension in education in England* (Unpublished Ph.D. University of Nottingham).

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* New York, W. W. Norton.

Arneil, B. (2007). Global citizenship and empire. *Citizenship Studies, 11*(3), (pp. 301–328). Taylor & Francis.

Banks, J. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher,* 37(3), 129–139.

Bloom, B. S., & Krathwohl, D. R., et al. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals, by a committee of college and university examiners. *Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York, NY: Longmans, Green.

Bourn, D. (2016). *Global citizenship and youth participation in Europe.* DERC research. London: IOE.

Chen, (2011). The concept of "Datong" in Chinese philosophy as an expression of the idea of the common good. *University of Hong Kong, Faculty of Law Research Paper*. No.2011/020.

Cornwall, A., & Gaventa, J. (2000). From users and choosers to makers and shapers. *IDS Bulletin, 3*(4), 50–62.

Danesh, H. B. (1997). *The psychology of spirituality: From divided self to integrated self*. Victoria, BC: Paradigm

Dave, R. H. (1970). Psychomotor levels. In R. J. Armstrong (Ed.), *Developing and Writing Behavioral Objectives*, (pp. 20–21). Tucson, AZ: Educational Innovators Press.

DEEEP. (2015). *Monitoring education for global citizenship: A contribution to debate*. Concord.

Dei, G. (2008). Anti-Racism Education for Global Citizenship. In M. Peters, A. Britton, & H. Blee (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy* (pp. 477–490). Rotterdam: Sense.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: MacMillan.

De Ruyter, D. J., & Spiecker, B. (2008). The world citizen travels with a different view. In M. Peters, A. Britton and H. Blee (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Dower, N. (2000). The idea of global citizenship: A sympathetic assessment. *Global Society,* 14(4), 553–567.

Dower, N. (2008). Are we all global citizens or are only some of us global citizens? The relevance of this question to education. In A. A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship* (pp. 39–54). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Duan & Hill. (1996). The current state of empathy research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(3), 261–274.

European Commission (EC). (1997). *Communication Towards A Europe of Knowledge.* Brussels, EC.

Fei, X. (1990). *Globalisation and Cultural Self-Awareness*. China: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Gaventa, J. (2002). Exploring citizenship, participation and accountability. *IDS Bulletin, 33*(2), 1–14.

Gaventa, J., & Tandon, R. (2010). *Globalizing Citizens: New Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion*. Zed Books Ltd.

Golmohamad, M. (2004). World citizenship, identity and the notion of an integrated self. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 23* (2/3), 131–148

Harrison, D. (2008). *Oxfam and the rise of development education in England from 1959 to 1979* (unpublished Ph.D.), Institute of Education, University of London.

Harrow, A. (1972). *A Taxonomy of Psychomotor Domain: A Guide for Developing Behavioural Objectives*. New York, NY: David McKay.

Heater, D. (2002). *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and its Opponents*. London: Continuum.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hodges, S. D., & Klein, K. J. (2001). Regulating the costs of empathy: The price of being human. *Journal of Socio-Economics*. 30 (2001) 437–452

Humes, W. (2008). The discourse of global citizenship. In M. A. Peters, A. Britton and H. Blee (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, the classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York, NY: David McKay Co., Inc.

Kurfiss, J. C. (1988). Critical thinking: Theory, research, practice, and possibilities. *ASHE- ERIC Higher Education Report, 2*.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*. London: Cambridge University.

Mill, J. S. (1867). *Inaugural address delivered to the University of St. Andrew's*. Feb. 1st, 1867. London, Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country* (pp. 2–17). Boston, MA: Beacon.

Nathanson, A. I. (2003). Rethinking empathy. In J. Bryant, D. Roskos-Ewoldson, & J. Cantor (Eds.), *Communication and emotion: Essays in Honor of Dolf Zillmann* (pp. 107–130). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2008). Education for cosmopolitan citizenship. In V. Georgi (Ed.), *The making of citizens in Europe: New perspectives on citizenship education* (pp. 204–212). Berlin: BundeszentralefürpolitischeBildung (BPB) (German Federal Agency for Civic Education).

Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 61(3), 301–325.

Oxfam. (2015). *Education for global citizenship: A guidance for schools. Available* at: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides.Access February 01, 2017.

Papastephanou, M. (2008). Cosmopolitanism: with or without patriotism? In M. Peters, A. Britton and H. Blee (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Parker, W. C. (2002). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Peters, M. A., Blee, H., & Britton, A. (2008). Introduction: many faces of global civil society: possible futures for global citizenship. In M. A. Peters, A. Britton & H. Blee (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy* (pp. 1–13). Rotterdam, Sense.

Roger, R. C. (1975). *Empathic: An unappreciated way of being*. La Jolla, CA: Centre for Studies of the Person.

Simpson E.J. (1972). *The classification of educational objectives in the psy-chomotor domain*. Washington, DC: Gryphon House.

Temple, G., & Laycock, A. L. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Towards a clearer agenda for change. In D. Bourn (Ed.), *Development education: Debates and dialogue*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Turiel, E., & Killen, M. (2010). Taking emotions seriously: The role of emotions in moral development. In W. F. Arsenio & E. A. Lemerise (Eds.), *Emotions, aggression, and morality in children* (pp. 33–51). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tye, K. (1999). *Global education: A worldwide movement*. Orange, CA: Interdependence Press.

UNESCO. (1974). *Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms.* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2013a). *Global citizenship education: An emerging perspective*. Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002241/224115E.pdf. Access November 20, 2016.

UNESCO. (2013b). *UNESCO forum on global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenge of the 21st century*. Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729E.pdf. Access November 20, 2016.

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.

UN. (2012). *Global education first initiative*. New York: UN.

Waks, L. J. (2008). Cosmopolitanism and citizenship education. In M. Peters, A. Britton & H. Blee (Eds.), *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy.* Rotterdam: Sense

Walters, K. S. (1994). *Re-thinking reason: New perspectives in critical thinking.* State University of New York Press.

Zillmann, D. (1991). Empathy: Affect from bearing witness to the emotions of others. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Responding to the screen: Reception and reaction processes* (pp. 135–167). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.