CHAPTER 10

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

10.1 WHAT IS A CITIZEN?

The concept of citizenship was born of the term *citoyen*, literally meaning a city dweller, which came to more broadly denote a group of individuals with certain rights and duties in the context of a given city. Different ideologies and legal, cultural and historical traditions have, over the years, created a profusion of sometimes conflicting, sometimes complementary, meanings connected to the idea of citizenship. Hence the definitions of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship vary depending on legal traditions (e.g. in Europe between Napoleonic codes and British common law) or political systems. Many people see citizenship as a status role, a synthesis incorporating a combination of rights and duties that all legally defined members of a nation-state hold. T.H. Marshall, in his influential 1950 essay, 'Citizenship and social class', condensed the rights of a citizen down to three core categories: civil, political and social. The civil element entails the rights necessary for individual freedom: freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and conclude contracts, and the right to justice. The political element entails the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a political body or as an elector of such a body. The social element entails a right to fundamental economic welfare and security, the right to share in social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society (Marshall, 1950).

For a long time, property ownership was considered a precondition of citizenship. Although this is no longer the case in most societies, it is clear that political and social influence are still largely predicated on wealth. Thus, we must ask 'What role can education play in transforming social structures that privilege ownership into sustainable post-growth societies animated by a vigorous global citizenship?'

The growth of civic culture in democratic environments cannot rely exclusively on either formal schooling or ALE, nor can it be taken for granted as a feature of the normal functioning of democracy. It is connected to the role of the public media in framing crucial political, social and economic issues, even as the media landscape has been transformed by the proliferation of new technologies and media forms, an epidemic of mistrust and misinformation, and the blurring of the distinction between media consumers and producers.

As so much civic participation moves online, one can argue that access to the internet and knowledge of how to use smartphones and computers become necessities in the modern world. Thus, ALE that addresses these areas not only assists learners in terms of employability but also provides vital skills for citizenship in the modern age – the knowledge and capability to use new media and digital tools and also the critical thinking skills that can sensitize people to the risks associated with internet use. For all these reasons, digital citizenship is attracting attention in current debates, raising important questions about the responsibilities of the state (Milana and Tarrozzi, 2020).

The concept of the state is associated with different concepts of governance and political systems. For some, the state is a self-regulating administrative system that reflects the institutional rules, regulations, laws and conventions that have been developed over centuries (Milana and Tarrozzi, 2020). Others understand the state as comprising institutional apparatuses, bureaucratic organizations and the formal and informal norms and codes that constitute and represent the public and private spheres of social life (Offe, 2019). Thus, the sovereignty of the state influences the formation and socialization of the individual citizen.

The state institutions that arguably do most to socialize individuals and create the political culture of a nation are those of education. In their classic book, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba (1963) argue that political culture is a set of 'attitudes towards the political system and its various parts, and attitudes toward the role of the self in the system. It is a set of orientation towards a special set of social object and processes.' Thus, an educated and active citizen is a prize asset in most political scenarios.

It would be naïve to assume that the question of what comprises citizenship is settled. Rather, it is still evolving, both in theory and practice, and is subject to multiple social, political and economic influences.

James Banks (2017) proposed a typology of *failed citizenship, recognized citizenship, participatory citizenship* and *transformative citizenship* to better understand this phenomenon. He argues that schools have a key role to play in promoting positive citizenship, through what he terms transformative civic education:

> Global migration, the quest by diverse groups for equality, and the rise of populist nationalism have complicated the development of citizenship and citizenship education in nations around the world. Many racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious groups are denied structural inclusion into their nation-state. Consequently, they do not fully internalize the values and symbols of the nation-state, develop a strong identity with it, or acquire political efficacy. They focus primarily on particularistic group needs and goals rather than the overarching goals of the nation-state.

Moreover, the 2016 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) found that citizenship education at school during pre-adolescence may play a fundamental role in fostering active and responsible citizenship during adulthood (Damiani et al., 2020).

There is no question that the construction of national citizenship should be considered unfinished business, and that both compulsory childhood education and adult learning and education have major roles to play in completing this project. An added value of global citizenship is that it creates another layer of support for a model of citizenship based on principles of liberty and equality for all, thereby helping to shore up the model of citizenship-building based on the nation-state.

The state plays a major role providing for the socialization of citizenship and creating the appropriate symbolic conditions for nurturing the political culture of the people (Torres, 1998). Therefore, any discussion of educational policies, programmes and practices entails an inquiry into the reasons for the growth of a given educational level – how programmes have been devised, by whom, for what purposes and for which clientele – to explore the determinants of educational policy formation and the nature of the state. In the coming sections we will discuss why the promotion of a lifelong learning culture and global citizenship education can help reinforce democratic political culture through a community-centred, ecologically balanced and culturally sensitive policy, and ultimately contribute to a more just, equitable, sustainable and peaceful world.

10.2 CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND ALE

Democracy and human rights are the bedrock of citizenship education and, even more so, of global citizenship education. In order for this model of citizenship to take root in societies, it must be implanted via schooling, non-formal education, adult and lifelong learning, as well as informally within families and communities.

The seeds for active and global citizenship must be planted very early. In 2009, the IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) conducted the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), the first of its kind to investigate how young people see their roles as citizens in the world (Schulz et al., 2010). Follow-up studies were conducted in 2016 (Schulz et al., 2018) and a third iteration is planned for 2022. The findings of the first two studies are very encouraging. Across 38 participating countries, most respondents (students aged 13–14) rated as important 'taking part in activities to protect the environment' (86%), 'taking part in activities promoting human rights' (84%), 'participating in activities to benefit people in the local community' (82%) and 'participating in peaceful protests against laws believed to be unjust' (62%). Most also strongly agreed with the statements 'men and women should have equal opportunities to take part in government' (75%), 'men and women should have the same rights in every way' (72%) and 'men and women should get equal pay when they are doing the same jobs' (71%).

The significance of education in promoting and providing guidance for social justice is expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26, para 2, which states:

> Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all..., and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
> (UN, 1948)

UNESCO's Constitution, signed just three years earlier in November 1945, already mentions that 'the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of the individual and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern' (UN, 1945). Adult education was seen as a solution to the challenge of democratization.[8] It was also regarded as a bulwark

against the abandonment of civility and slide into barbarism that marked the first half of the twentieth century. One of the central preoccupations of the post-war period was how to advance the cause of democracy through pedagogical means to prevent the emergence of further fascist or authoritarian regimes. One of the premises was to educate the population at large in the civic culture of democracy (Almond and Verba, 1963).

The animating principle of those pedagogues was that citizens who not only knew of but actively experienced their rights would be more likely to defend those rights and those of others (Chong, 1993). As Felisa Tibbits (2020) mentions in her background paper to this report, adult education makes possible the experience of the right to education, in particular lifelong learning, for citizens. The results of adult learning – along the dimensions of knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviours – enhance the capacities of adults to know, claim and enjoy other civil rights, such as the right to work and to participate in community life. ALE is intrinsically rights-oriented and thus ALE programming content should be explicitly linked to human rights education.

Though practices and institutions of adult learning and education first emerged in the nineteenth century, pioneered by educators such as N.F.S. Grundtvig in Denmark and Jean François Macé in France, it was only formulated as a systematic international policy and praxis following the Second World War under the auspices of the United Nations system, particularly UNESCO. Since its creation, UNESCO has focused on the right to education for all throughout life. It was the first international organization to develop the concept of continuing education, present already in the idea of 'fundamental education' defined as 'a campaign to raise educational standards both at level of children and adults' (UNESCO, 1947, p. 159).

Citizenship education may be seen as a natural extension of 'civic education'; namely, knowledge of constitutional democracy and loyalty to the nation-state. Civic education is typically divided into a typology of four: civic knowledge (of basic concepts on practice of democracy such as public elections, citizenship rights and obligations); civic skills (the intellectual and participatory skills that facilitate a citizen's judgment and actions); civic virtues (usually based on liberal principles such as self-discipline, compassion, civility, tolerance and respect); and citizenship education (to make citizens aware of the consequences of governments' actions and policies) (Milana and Tarrozzi, 2020). A typically conservative view of citizenship education is that it should focus on building character, on responsibilities as much as rights and on civic virtues (courage, law-abidingness, loyalty), social virtues (autonomy, open-mindedness), economic virtues (work ethic, capacity to delay self-gratification) and political virtues (capacity to analyse, capacity to criticize) (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004; Rhoads and Szelényi, 2011). More open and democratic cultures and political systems tend towards a more emancipatory view of citizenship that is more 'fluid' and an outcome of dialogue, negotiations, interactions and power dynamics (Wals, 2020).

Citizenship education also intersects with key aspects of lifelong learning, encouraging personal experiences in learning, promoting active learning, creating problem-solving orientation and self-directed learning. These aspects are reflected in characteristics of citizenship education that are commonly associated with lifelong learning, such as the centrality of the learner, the emphasis on process learning and the increasingly networked nature of contemporary learning processes (Rhoads and Szelényi, 2011). The relationship between citizenship education and lifelong learning is elegantly framed by Marcella Milana and Massimiliano Tarozzi (2020): 'Lifelong learning implies the development of reflexive and community-oriented attitudes, such as a concern for others and for a sustainable economy.' An important concern is how citizenship education can contribute to the development in each person of cognitive, socioemotional and behavioural abilities and competences facilitating greater social integration and cohesion, as a basis for collective actions that are democratic and transformative.

As Hanemann (2019) explains, citizenship education has been expressed in terms of democratic, active or global citizenship, each emphasizing specific intentions and approaches. While democratic citizenship education stresses the need to equip learners with democratic attitudes and values to enable them to exercise and defend their democratic rights and responsibilities, active citizenship education posits a view of citizens as social actors and seeks to foster civic participation at local, national and global level by building learners' capacity to think critically and creatively. The term 'critical' in critical citizenship education differentiates the notion of transformational learning from more conservative approaches. It gives emphasis to the need to challenge prevailing paradigms (Andreotti, 2006; Pashby, 2009; Shultz, 2007).

UNESCO's Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education (RALE) was one of the first international policy recommendations to explicitly position citizenship education within ALE. RALE defines three

8 This had been the rationale for the UN/UNESCO development as a mindset from the Global North with its strong focus on democracy. In particular in the 1950s and 1960s, with the decolonization in large parts of the world, the agenda of bringing democracy to all parts of the world had quite ambivalent qualities. Liberal democracy may not encompass all the progressive models of democracy, for instance participatory democracy.

key domains of learning and skills: literacy and basic skills, continuing education and vocational skills, and citizenship-related skills. RALE speaks of *active citizens*:

> Adult learning and education also includes education and learning opportunities for active citizenship, variously known as community, popular or liberal education. It empowers people to actively engage with social issues such as poverty, gender, intergenerational solidarity, social mobility, justice, equity, exclusion, violence, unemployment, environmental protection and climate change. It also helps people to lead a decent life, in terms of health and well-being, culture, spirituality and in all other ways that contribute to personal development and dignity. (UNESCO, 2016)

10.3 ACTIVE AND DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

The philosopher Immanuel Kant drew a clear distinction between 'passive' citizens, who are merely protected by the law, and 'active' citizens, who may also contribute to it (Weinrib, 2008). He attributed to active citizens the characteristics of freedom, equality and independence. In the scholarly literature, active citizenship is treated almost as a synonym for voluntary work. However, voluntary work, and the contributions of associations, NGOs, social movements and individuals making contributions to communities, while highly valuable and built on a concept of philanthropy for the common good, cannot and should not supplant the administrative role and educational responsibilities of government institutions. Ideally, the philanthropic activities of civil society should occur in partnership with state institutions and should not relieve these institutions of their responsibilities.

The 'good' active citizen may be defined as someone who shoulders personal responsibility, participates in social and civic activities and actively defends justice in theory and practice. These characteristics imply a set of capacities and commitments needed for democracy to flourish and similarly have implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation and educational policy (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004). However, active citizenship is not inherently good; it may also involve participation in actions that remove rather than protect the guardrails of democratic institutions – laws, policies and practices. Thus, the term 'active citizen' does not *per se* entail a democratic citizen respectful of civil rights.

10.4 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Active citizenship education seeks to foster civic participation at local, national and global levels through methodologies that involve learners actively in their own learning and build the capacity to think critically and creatively. A more recent coinage is the term 'digital citizen', which responds to the modes of civic participation enabled by digital devices that link users to platforms with massive amounts of data and enable online forms of civic participation such as petitions and campaigns (Herrera and Sakr, 2014). Cross-border networks facilitated by online communication have also created new forms of community, sometimes labelled 'post-national' (e.g. Sassen, 2002), since the state is typically not a central actor or reference point.

The conceptual antecedents of global citizenship can be traced to the Stoic philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome, who considered themselves first and foremost citizens of the world, rather than of a particular nation or polity.[9] But, until recently, global citizenship, even conceptually, was available only to a highly educated cosmopolitan elite. In our digital age, as Wals (2020) observes, global citizenship has become more inevitability than aspiration, as the relations and interactions of most citizens now span the globe, at least to some extent. If we think of global citizenship as a property of those interactions and relations then we need to examine the process of citizenship itself. Wals (ibid.) quotes the conclusion of Mannion et al. (2011, p. 453): 'In the outcome perspective, global education becomes the producer of global citizens; in the process perspective the first question to ask is what citizenship practices are possible within schools and society more generally, and only then to ask what and how [people] might learn from such practices.'

The idea of democratic global citizenship, enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, has been a key element of UNESCO's vision for education, right from the organization's inception. It has been conceptualized in four flagship reports: *Learning to be* (the Faure report) published in 1972; *Learning: The treasure within* (the Delors Report) in 1996; the 1974 *Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms*; and, most recently, in 2021, the report of the International

9 Seneca says to his disciples: 'Let us take hold of the fact that there are two communities – the one, which is great and truly common, embracing gods and humans, in which we look neither to this corner nor to that, but measure the boundaries of our citizenship by the sun; the other, the one to which we have been assigned by the accident of our birth.' https://immoderatestoic.com/blog/2013/7/21/citizen-of-the-world.

TABLE 2.1
Landmark declarations conceptualizing global citizenship education

EVENT	OUTCOME DOCUMENT	CORE MESSAGE
World Conference on Education for All Jomtien, Thailand 5–9 March 1990	World Declaration on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs	Universalize access to education for all children, youth and adults, and promote equity
Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V) Hamburg, Germany, 14–18 July 1997	Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning	The ultimate goal (of learning) should be the creation of a learning society committed to social justice and general well-being
The World Conference on Higher Education Paris, France, 5–9 October 1998	World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century: Vision and Action	Help protect and enhance societal values by training young people in the values of democratic citizenship, and provide critical perspectives to reinforce humanistic perspectives
World Education Forum Dakar, Senegal, 26–28 April 2000	Dakar Framework for Action on Education for All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments	All children, youth and adults should have the opportunity to learn, and UNESCO should act as the lead agency to coordinate international efforts to reach EFA
48th International Conference on Education, Geneva, Switzerland 25–28 November 2008	Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future	Inclusive education is an ongoing process aimed at offering quality education for all while respecting diversity and different needs and abilities
World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development Bonn, Germany, 31 March–2 April 2009	Bonn Declaration	Education and lifelong learning offer a means to achieve economic and social justice, food security, ecological integrity, sustainable livelihoods, respect for all life forms and strong values that foster social cohesion, democracy and collective action
First International Conference on Learning Cities, Lifelong Learning for All: Inclusion, Prosperity and Sustainability in Cities Beijing, China, 21–23 October 2013	Beijing Declaration on Building Learning Cities	Learning cities can facilitate individual empowerment, build social cohesion, nurture active citizenship, promote economic and cultural prosperity and lay the foundation for sustainable development
UNESCO World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development Aichi-Nagoya, Japan, 10–12 November 2014	Final Report on the UN Decade for Sustainable Development	Nations need to align education with sustainable development to ensure that education supports sustainable development objectives
World Education Forum Incheon, Republic of Korea, 19–22 May 2015	Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action	Post-secondary and tertiary education play a major role in lifelong learning
UN Sustainable Development Summit New York, USA, 25–27 September 2015	2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN Resolution A/RES/70/1)	Sustainable Development Goal 4.7 which calls on countries to 'ensure that all learners are provided with the knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development'.

Commission on the Futures of Education, *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. The concept of global citizenship has been further developed and promoted through a series of conferences and declarations (see **Table 2.1**).

Global citizenship has found increasing expression in education policy, notably at international level in the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI), launched in 2012 by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon. The three principles of the GEFI are to ensure that every child attends school, to improve the quality of learning, and to foster global citizenship. These three principles also form the fundament of the 2030 Agenda. The vision of global citizenship education set out by the GEFI is ambitious:

> Global Citizenship Education aims to equip learners of all ages with those values, knowledge and skills that are based on and instil respect for human rights, social justice, diversity, gender equality and environmental sustainability and that empower learners to be responsible global citizens. (UN, 2022)

It remained a challenge to define the scope and role of global citizenship. Shortly after the GEFI initiative was launched in 2012, UNESCO was designated the agency responsible for building this project, and since the core mandate of UNESCO is education, the focus became global citizenship education. UNESCO (2015b, p. 14) provides the following broad definition of global citizenship:

> Global citizenship refers to a sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity. It emphasizes political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global.

Global citizenship is not an alternative to national citizenship. Rather, it reinforces the democratic social pact of representative and participatory democracies worldwide. In other words, global citizenship adds value to national citizenship.

While global citizenship, as described above, is not a novel concept, its presence in the international development system is relatively recent. Global citizenship education was officially launched as a UN initiative in 2012, though UNESCO had been working for several decades seeking to expand access and quality of education, notably with the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990 (see **Table 2.1**).

The process of constituting the field of global citizenship education has been marked by conflicts, disagreements, multiple interpretations and confrontations. The struggle of UNESCO, with the responsibility to establish this new field, has been to reach for some sort of collective agreement that can guarantee a certain homogenous understanding and comparable practices.

Any theory of global citizenship as a model of intervention to promote global peace and sustainable development should address what has become the trademark of globalization: cultural diversity. Many scholars regard multiculturalism and interculturalism as paradigms that support social cohesion, means to facilitate new pedagogical models that are culturally sensitive and respectful of the diversity of identities we confront in our schools and societies.

Global citizenship education promotes a sense of belonging to a common humanity and a global community, which are intimately interconnected through the dialectics of globalization-localization. UNESCO calls for an active citizenship related to four areas: human rights, environmental issues, social and economic justice and cultural diversity. According to Hanemann (2019), it proposes that global citizenship education should be transformative, building the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that learners need to be able to contribute to a more inclusive, just and peaceful world. Global citizenship education should take 'a multifaceted approach, employing concepts and methodologies already applied in other areas, including human rights education, peace education, education for sustainable development and education for international understanding' and advance their common objectives. Global citizenship education should apply a lifelong learning perspective, beginning from early childhood and continuing through all levels of education and into adulthood, requiring both 'formal and informal approaches, curricular and extracurricular interventions, and conventional and unconventional pathways to participation' (UNESCO, 2015b, p. 15; UNESCO, 2014).

The goal of global citizenship education, Hanemann (2019) explains, is to empower learners to engage and assume active roles, both locally and globally, to face and resolve challenges, and ultimately to 'become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world' (UNESCO, 2014, p. 15). Globalization can be understood within a complex and dynamic set of relationships – international, national and local – which creates new patterns of inclusion and exclusion (Shultz, 2007). However, the critical and transformative view of globalization is not automatically reflected in global citizenship education.

We can observe a continuum of possible approaches to citizenship in education from more conservative to more progressive approaches. This draws attention to the political dimension of citizenship education as it is 'very much determined by the nature of national political systems, power constellations, and public policy decision-making processes' (Tawil, 2013, p. 3).

SDG Target 4.7 highlights the importance of global citizenship education (GCED), that, together with education for sustainable development (ESD), should promote lasting, informed and value-based changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviour of children, young people and adults: 'By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development' (UN, 2015, p. 17). The global indicator (4.7.1) established for Target 4.7 measures the extent to which GCED and ESD, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed in national education policies, curricula, teacher education and, student assessments (UN, 2021, p. 5). More than any other education target, SDG 4.7 links to the humanistic purposes of education, and their reflection in policies, programmes, curricular contents and teacher preparation. The target also emphasizes the important role of culture and the (inter-)cultural dimensions of education for peace, social cohesion and sustainable development. Lifelong learning, as a global educational paradigm and the overall guiding principle of SDG 4, also stands for this humanistic purpose of SDG Target 4.7, which is embraced by GCED (Hanemann, 2019).

There are a number of alternative rationales for the universality of global citizenship education. Since the installation of this concept in international organizations, as well as among the global public, the tension between global and local has been brought to the fore, with some scholars seeing this debate as a push back of a concept that has emerged from Western sources. In 2018, UNESCO published an advocacy report entitled *Global citizenship education: Taking it local*, which contained four recommendations:

1. Focus on the common values found in many local concepts as core entry points for GCED, including solidarity, respect for diversity and a sense of shared humanity.

2. Widen the angle of GCED to explicitly include local concepts that emphasize peaceful social relations and communities, as well as the environment.

3. Focus on the notion of 'interconnectedness between the local and the global' when possible, rather than on the idea of the 'global', which is often viewed as irrelevant at the local level.

4. Encourage implementation of the common values within the community, as well beyond the local and national context in order to demonstrate a shared sense of humanity. (UNESCO, 2018)

These four recommendations to locally embed the concept of GCED convey a general conviction that global citizenship education is a long-term aspiration of all societies, and not a particular concept external to the realities of countries.

10.5 TYPOLOGIES OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

How do people assess the diversity of experiences surrounding global citizenship education? Sung-Sang Yoo and Inyoung Lee (2018) present a straightforward typology of the field. In their analysis there are three main approaches to GCED: a competency-based approach; a moral approach; and a critical approach. Each is characterized on the basis of how a global citizen is described, the main global problems and conflicts it is addressing, and how it sees the purpose of education.

A *competency-based approach* is close to human capital theory. In this approach, 'GCED is mainly based on individuals' development and human capital, not on global conflicts or structural injustice. The possible educational topics of competency-based approach are global economy, international politics, international organizations and foreign languages.' In other words, a global competency approach appreciates international awareness, competitive job-related skills, a favourable but critical understanding of cultural diversity, and linguistic proficiency.

A *moral approach* is based on moral cosmopolitanism, endorsing a model of universalism, multiculturalism and humanitarianism. It emphasizes human rights, cultural diversity and moral responsibility. In this approach, global citizenship is premised on our common humanity; core concerns include world peace, poverty, war, gender equality and climate change.

A *critical approach* explains global citizenship on the basis of critical theory and post-colonialism. From this perspective, knowledge is insufficient to resolve current global problems. Rather, it is crucial to critically reflect on global structure and embedded power relations in

order to identify the root causes of those problems. A global citizen is, thus, an agent of social change, both locally and globally (Yoo and Lee, 2018).

UNESCO (2015b) defines global citizenship education in terms of three domains of learning, cognitive, socioemotional and behavioural:

- Cognitive: the knowledge and skills needed to understand the world and its complexities.
- Socioemotional: the values, attitudes and social skills that enable learners to develop affectively, psychosocially and physically, preparing them to co-exist respectfully and peacefully with others.
- Behavioural: practical application and engagement at local and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world.

While the first two domains of learning typically fall within institutional educational practices, and are easier to define and measure, the third, behavioural, domain falls both inside and outside educational institutions and programmes and is more difficult to assess and measure (UNESCO, 2015b). More recently, UNESCO, through its Futures of Education initiative, has promoted the concept of the knowledge commons (in contrast to the marketplace of knowledge and ideas much vaunted by neoliberals), a vast storehouse of epistemological possibilities, like a giant global library. As a repository of collective intelligence and culture, this commons is continuously transforming, all the while preserving cultural heritage and allowing many forms of knowledge to coexist. Commoning, or sharing and co-producing knowledge, is a defining characteristic of the knowledge commons. It recasts the process of knowledge acquisition from one that enables individuals to one that connects individuals to one another and inter-generationally to the common knowledge resources of humanity. The notion of commoning knowledge extends the vision outlined in the Faure and Delors reports and intersects with many non-Western philosophies of learning and being, such as *ubuntu* and *sumak kawsay*, which are discussed in Chapter 11 (Tawil, 2021).

Hanemann (2019) notes that UNESCO proposes nine topic areas for GCED (see **Table 2.2**), which are clustered into the three domains of learning and strive for the following key learning outcomes: to be informed and critically literate, socially connected, respectful of diversity and ethically responsible and engaged (UNESCO 2015b, p. 25).

While these foundational principles of global citizenship are well-meaning, a dilemma arises when the actions and responsibilities demanded by a state of its citizens, or the services and protection demanded by citizens of the state, come into conflict with the ethical responsibilities of individuals as global citizens (Singh and Duraiappah, 2020). For example, the pursuit of economic growth conflicts, in many if not most cases, with the global responsibility to prevent climate change. Yet, rather than undermine GCED, this very dissonance created by conflicting goals may add impetus and urgency to the notion of global citizenship. Emotional regulation, empathy and compassion, leavened with a good dose of critical inquiry, are in fact the set of traits most needed by a global citizen (Goleman and Davidson, 2017). For citizenship education to be truly transformative, rather than merely performative, it must be capable of inspiring changes not only in behaviour but also in mindset. It must instil in learners an understanding of the inherent interconnectedness and dignity of all life and create values of acceptance, equality, respect for diversity, empathy and compassion in us. Such sentiments are easily expressed, but a glance at the current state of the world is enough to reveal how difficult is its implementation.

As the UNESCO Mahatma Gandhi Institute argues, the concept of global citizenship education is nebulous in legal terms and should be defined around specific capabilities and a broader process of redefining the purpose of learning and education (Singh and Duraiappah, 2020). As Singh and Duraiappah (ibid) note:

> We describe global citizens as lifelong learners who possess the critical consciousness to drive 'active citizenship', to recognize the inherent interconnectedness and dignity of all life, and instil the values of acceptance, equality, respect for diversity, empathy and compassion. To build global citizenship, it is necessary that both learning and education be repurposed and redesigned.

A more holistic GCED that combines the approaches and dimensions discussed above offers the potential to 'rewire' the human brain – not just in the present but also for future generations. As radical as this may sound, it is hard to imagine realizing the peaceable and sustainable societies envisaged by SDG 4 without a radical shift in how we perceive each other and our place in the world.

TABLE 2.2
Comparative analysis of learning domains and topics in the Delors Report, Incheon Declaration and SDG 4.7

Delors Report	Education 2030 Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action		SDG 4.7
'Pillars of Learning'	Aims	Topics	Topics
	Cognitive domain		
Learning to know Learning to learn	To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations.	1. Local, national and global systems and structures 2. Issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national and global levels 3. Underlying assumptions and power dynamics	Human rights Gender equality Global citizenship
	Socioemotional domain		
Learning to live together	To have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.	4. Different levels of identity 5. Different communities people belong to and how these are connected 6. Difference and respect for diversity	Culture of peace and non-violence Appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development
	Behavioural domain		
Learning to do	To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world.	7. Actions that can be taken individually and collectively 8. Ethically responsible behaviour 9. Getting engaged and taking action	Education for sustainable development and lifestyles

Source: UIL and APCEIU, 2019, taken from Delors et al., 1998; UNESCO, 2015a, p. 48; UNESCO, 2015b, p. 15