



In support of
**UNESCO'S 70th
Anniversary Celebrations**



Rapporteur Report

Implementation of Global Citizenship Education

Wing On Lee
Open University of Hong Kong
30 January 2015

The Problematic of Implementation

Classical Issue:

- **Planned / Intended curriculum** vs Implemented curriculum – not implementing the curriculum
- **Hidden curriculum** – what's implemented is not in the curriculum
- **Hidden Assumption:** Teacher as passive recipient of the curriculum to be implemented
- **Reality:** Teacher as curriculum gatekeeper
- **Wrong Assumption:** What is taught = what is learned

The Problematic of Teaching Citizenship & *Global Citizenship*

- A citizenship curriculum can definitely be configured, but can citizenship be *taught? Or caught?*
- The same question can be asked for values, virtues and beliefs.
- Does teaching citizenship necessarily lead to learning or acquisition of citizenship?
- Classical issue: students' moral belief or values have no direct correlation with behaviour

CERC Studies in Comparative Education 28

CITIZENSHIP PEDAGOGIES IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Edited by

Kerry J. Kennedy
Wing On Lee
David L. Grossman



Springer

Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong



Global citizenship vs National citizenship

- The term citizenship historically stemmed from nation-state, and is therefore by nature national citizenship. It largely focuses on homogeneity.
- The term global citizenship, on the contrary, is a post-national and multi-dimensional. It largely focuses on diversity and heterogeneity.

Implementation Problems and Obstacles

Concurrent sessions:

- Citizenship education is a sensitive, political issue; in particular in countries where national cohesion is already a challenge; Many countries may still be grappling with the challenge of national unity and internal diversity and are not able/willing to focus on global dimensions of citizenship education and our common humanity.
- Fady Yarak, Director-General of Education, Lebanon, highlighted the challenges impacting the quality of learning in Lebanese schools in the face of refugee crisis since 2010 and challenges of implementing GCED at national level, including the lack of enabling conditions and multiple and complex levers of change (formal education, religion, language etc. in the domestic context as well as international forces including social media).

Formal vs Non-formal and Informal Education

- Many participants challenged the present format of GCED as very similar to conventional citizenship education, and configured from the perspective of formal education, and aiming to train teachers to *teach* GCED.
- Colleagues asked: are we bold enough to think of “new GCED” that is not bound by conventional notions of citizenship education?
- GCED should be nonformal and informal, thus should be seen and taught very differently

Uniqueness of GCED: Ways Forward 1

- It largely belongs to the affective domains (and its content knowledge is not yet well developed).
- It largely focuses on soft skills, in line with many attributes of 21st century competences, e.g. critical thinking, problem solving, divergent thinking, collaborative learning, peer coaching and teamwork, etc.
- It crosses borders, not only national borders but schooling and curriculum borders.

Uniqueness of GCED: Ways Forward 2

- It is values/belief oriented: being visionary to build a better globe for the humankind, a world of inclusivity of diversity, a world of respect for differences, and a world of collaboration for the better good.
- It is idealistic and is a new ideal for today's world – a world moving towards knowledge economy, which make us more interdependent than the past, and requires more mutuality than before.

Uniqueness of GCED: Ways Forward 3

- Environmental protection and sustainability cannot be achieved by one nation alone – it requires the world to work together.
- GCED goes with Peace Education, and it is only with peace that we can launch global citizenship