

**Global Citizenship Education and Human Rights Education: Are They Compatible with U. S.**

**Civic Education?**

**William R. Fernekes,**

Rutgers Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

---

**Abstract:** Global citizenship education (GCE) and human rights education (HRE) offer substantive contributions to civic education. Interconnections between the fields exist in curricula from intergovernmental organizations (UNESCO), non-governmental organizations (Oxfam Great Britain) and national ministries (Learning and Teaching Scotland). This essay explores how civic education curricula, learning outcomes, and teacher preparation can be developed to enhance the roles played by GCE and HRE in U. S. civic education. Analysis of the relationships between GCE and HRE yields these conclusions: (1) global citizenship education programs share a philosophy of cosmopolitanism, commitments to universal human rights norms, respect for cultural diversity and sustainable development, and issues-based curriculum designs; (2) a high degree of compatibility exists between GCE program goals and the goals of the values-awareness-socialization HRE model, and (3) this strong compatibility does not extend to the accountability-professional development or the activism-transformation models of HRE. Implementing GCE faces major obstacles, notably emphases on national identity in nation-state civic education, the potential incompatibility between national interests and cosmopolitan commitments in the study of global issues, and the low commitment to GCE or HRE in teacher preparation.

*Key words:* global citizenship education, human rights education, civic education

---

**Introduction**

The shocking photograph of 5 year old Omran Daqneesh, a Syrian child rescued after an airstrike on the rebel-held city of Aleppo, was published on August 18, 2016, and was soon distributed worldwide. Three days later, the *New York Times* published a follow-up story highlighting seven other children who had also suffered from airstrikes and related violence in Aleppo. (Barnard & Saad, *New York Times*, Aug. 22, 2016) The photos of these traumatized children illustrate the failure of the world community to respond effectively to the egregious human rights violations resulting from the Syrian civil war, a conflict which has produced over 200,000 casualties and has led to the displacement of over four million Syrians. However, simultaneous with the ongoing violence in Syria, the XXXI Olympiad was underway in Rio De Janeiro, Brasil, where athletes from over 200 world states assembled to compete in a setting where harmony, cooperation, and respect for universal human rights set the standard for daily conduct, and where the fear and violence that characterizes everyday life in Syria were noticeably absent.

For both young people and adults, the contradictions apparent in the coexistence of the vicious Syrian civil war and the peaceful events of the XXXI Olympiad raise serious questions about how the future

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

of the world can be shaped by citizen action. Can humanitarian crises such as the Syrian Civil War and environmental challenges such as global warming be effectively addressed through proposals developed within the context of traditional conceptions of citizenship education? Are traditional conceptions of citizenship that are tied to nation-state identities sufficient in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, or is it timely to consider the concept of “global citizenship,” whose foundation in universal human rights and cosmopolitanism may offer a more effective approach to educating citizens about global problems and their potential solutions? Or can nation-state citizenship and global citizenship coexist, with national commitments being balanced with broader commitments to the overall welfare of humanity and the planet as a whole?

To address these questions, this essay examines the relationship between the concept of global citizenship and human rights education, and suggests how the implementation of GCE and HRE can impact the delivery of civic education programs, focusing specifically on social studies education in the United States.

### **Design of the Study**

The concept of global citizenship has gained prominence in the discourse of both citizenship and global education. Scholars in political science (Appiah, 2007; Cabrera, 2012; Dower, 2003) and education (Andreotti, 2014; Gaudelli, 2009 & 2016; Merryfield, 2002); non-governmental organizations, such as Oxfam Great Britain; and intergovernmental agencies, such as UNESCO, have introduced and discussed a) models of what constitutes global citizenship, b) comparisons between global citizenship and more traditional conceptions of citizenship in democratic nation-states, and c) connections between global citizenship and other fields, including global education, peace education and human rights education.

Three approaches to global citizenship education were chosen for study—one from an intergovernmental organization (UNESCO), a second from a non-governmental organization (Oxfam Great Britain) and a third representing the official policy of a ministry of education (Scotland). Each represents a different approach to defining and integrating GCE within formal educational programs. Each incorporates elements of human rights education (HRE) within their conceptual frameworks. As a group, they all illustrate a cross-section of efforts by entities at the intergovernmental, non-governmental, and national levels to influence educational policy and practice.

### **Comparative Characteristics of GCE and HRE**

#### ***Global Citizenship Education***

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) refers to global citizenship as “a sense of belonging to the global community and common humanity, with its presumed members experiencing solidarity and collective identity among themselves and collective responsibility at the global level. Global citizenship can be seen as an ethos/metaphor rather than a formal membership” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 3). Being a global citizen does not entail legal or political standing comparable to that enjoyed by citizens of nation-states. UNESCO recognizes that global citizenship is more of a “psychosocial framework for collectiveness” whose purpose is to motivate individuals who embrace the concept to utilize “civic actions in the public domain to promote a better

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

world and future” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 3). Building upon these ideas, it follows that global citizenship education has as its primary goal “to empower learners to engage and assume active roles both locally and globally to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 3). In doing so, UNESCO argues that global citizenship education is “transformative”—in other words, it provides learners with the skills, content, and dispositions to “realize their rights and obligations to promote a better world and future” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 3).<sup>1</sup>

The content of global citizenship education is interdisciplinary, drawing upon fields of inquiry such as human rights education, peace education, education for sustainable development, education for intercultural understanding, and international education. With its foundations heavily rooted in the study of cosmopolitanism, a concept dating from the time of the Roman Empire, one can add philosophy as a key subject field contributing to the ‘intellectual foundation’ of global citizenship education (Nussbaum, 1997). For Brown and Held (2010), cosmopolitanism “maintains that there are moral obligations owed to all human beings based solely on our humanity alone, without reference to race, gender, nationalist, ethnicity, culture, religions, political affiliation, state citizenship or other communal particularities” (p. 1).<sup>2</sup> The universalist orientation of cosmopolitanism permeates the three programs examined in this essay, constituting a key element of program goals and learning outcomes.

The evolving field of global citizenship education includes but is not limited to the following competencies:

- a) knowledge and understanding of specific global issues and trends, and knowledge of and respect for key universal values (e.g., peace and human rights, diversity, justice, democracy, caring, non-discrimination, tolerance);

---

<sup>1</sup> UNESCO’s definition of global citizenship education, and the organization’s elaboration of its salient characteristics is the outgrowth of a series of international meetings they conducted where diverse models and approaches to global citizenship were discussed and debated (2013-2015). Competing definitions and conceptions of GCE were shared, and the resulting definition offered by UNESCO at this point in time appears to be one that is broadly representative of work being done in the field. These meetings were part of UNESCO’s involvement in the United Nations Secretary-General’s Global Education First Initiative, which commenced in 2012. A technical consultation occurred in 2013, with forums following in December 2013 and January 2015. The documents referenced in this essay emerged from these meetings, as well as from expert input solicited by UNESCO.

<sup>2</sup> Cosmopolitan political theory is defined by these principles/perspectives:

- Cosmopolitans believe that the primary units of moral concerns are individual human beings, not states or other forms of communitarian or political association.
- Cosmopolitans maintain that this moral concern for individuals should be equally applied to every human being.
- Cosmopolitanism is universal in its scope, maintaining that all humans are equal in their moral standing and that this moral standing applies to everyone everywhere, *as if we are* all citizens of the world (Brown and Held, 2010, p. 2).

- b) cognitive skills for critical, creative, and innovative thinking, problem solving, and decision-making;
- c) non-cognitive skills such as empathy, openness to experiences and other perspectives, interpersonal/communicative skills, and aptitude for networking and interacting with people of different backgrounds and origins; and
- d) behavioral capacities to launch and engage in proactive actions (UNESCO, 2014, p. 4).

At the core of global citizenship education rests a fundamental tension between universality and particularity. Universality concerns the development of a common or collective identity and embracing values that are common to all humanity (respect for human life, preservation of the planet, and others) while particularity concerns priorities such as the maintenance of cultural identity and the guarantee of individual rights, among others. Tensions also arise between the development of collective identities and universal values that could clash with national interests and priorities promoted in national educational systems or engendered by other means (e. g., through government-sponsored media). The accelerating pace of globalization from the mid-twentieth century to the present underscores efforts to reconcile these tensions, particularly when humanity is faced with challenges requiring both international cooperation and the resolution of conflicts between the competing interests of nation-states.

### ***Human Rights Education***

The United Nations (UN) defines human rights education and training as “all educational, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities aimed at promoting universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus contributing, inter alia, to the prevention of human rights violations and abuses by providing persons with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviors, to empower them to contribute to the building and promotion of a universal culture of human rights” (United Nations General Assembly, Dec. 2011). The content of human rights education and training is summarized here:

- a) Education about human rights, which includes providing knowledge and understanding of human rights norms and principles, the values that underpin them, and the mechanisms for their protection;
- b) Education through human rights, which includes learning and teaching in a way that respects the rights of both educators and learners;
- c) Education for human rights, which includes empowering persons to enjoy and exercise their rights and to respect and uphold the rights of others (United Nations General Assembly, Dec. 2011).

As with GCE, human rights education (HRE) seeks to empower the learner to embrace universal commitments and take action to secure them, in this case to “enjoy and exercise their rights and to respect and uphold the rights of others” (United National General Assembly, Dec. 2011). In contrast with global citizenship education, human rights education has a legal and normative foundation in the expanding body of international human rights law and the international human rights treaty framework, much of which has developed since 1945. Thus, nation-states who have signed and ratified international human rights conventions and treaties are expected to bring their domestic laws and practices into conformity with these agreements, since these nation-states have voluntarily consented to support and uphold them (Tibbitts, 2015).

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

An area where GCE and HRE clearly coincide is their common commitment to engaging all humans as defenders of universal priorities, such as respecting and upholding the rights of others, whether those persons are formal (legal) citizens of nation-states or not. This commitment requires that individuals who deem themselves to be global citizens take considered action on behalf of persons who have no legal standing as citizens in a particular nation-state, a position that can lead to conflict with the interests of governments at the national, state, and local levels. Similarly, persons who embrace the goals of human rights education may not be affiliated with a state-sponsored educational institution, preferring to act on behalf of what are termed “non-state actors”—non-governmental organizations, labor unions, religious groups and others. The specific goals of these “non-state actors” may clash with those of nation-state educational institutions, such as when NGOs seek to educate the public about guaranteeing the human rights of migrant populations seeking refuge from war, conflict, and natural disasters.

As noted earlier, global citizenship education is an emerging field of inquiry that by definition embraces content from human rights education. At the broadest level of analysis, it appears that a global citizen is expected to a) embrace a set of universal commitments to uphold international human rights, b) educate others about human rights content, and c) develop the competencies to educate in a manner that respects the rights of teachers and learners and supports their social activism on behalf of human rights. Operationalizing such commitments require that they become part of actual curricula in formal educational settings, such as elementary, middle and secondary schools. See the Appendix for a chart highlighting key comparisons between GCE and HRE.

#### **Analysis of Selected Models of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) and Human Rights Education (HRE)**

GCE and HRE curricular and instructional school program guides were examined to determine (1) how human rights education does or does not mesh with the broader goals of global citizenship education, and (2) how human rights education may raise troubling challenges for global citizenship education when put into practice.

The GCE models selected for analysis include a 2015 UNESCO GCE report and two global citizenship programs—one initially developed in 1997 by the non-governmental organization (NGO) Oxfam Great Britain, and the other, a ministerial initiative by the Government of Scotland (Learning and Teaching Scotland). *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools* (Oxfam) can be used by teachers who embrace its goals, content, and pedagogical approaches. The approval of state education authorities is not required for implementation. In contrast, *Developing Global Citizens with Curriculum For Excellence* (Learning and Teaching Scotland) was designed by and supported with funds from the Scottish government, and the program is intended to serve the existing curricular goals of Scotland’s national “Curriculum for Excellence” initiative.

## Approaches to Global Citizenship Education

### UNESCO

In 2015, UNESCO published *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Objectives*, a report summarizing research about existing global citizenship education programs across the globe and offering guidance to education departments and educational program developers regarding the design and implementation of global citizenship education programs (GCE). The report built upon earlier work by UNESCO (UNESCO 2014), and it provides a useful summary of the current state of global citizenship education. In preparing this document, UNESCO noted that while the report's guidance was field tested by stakeholders in selected countries in all regions of the world, the authors' intent is for the report to function "as a living document." Continuing, the authors stated that "Further editions will be produced as necessary and as we learn more from experience of implementing global citizenship education in different contexts" (UNESCO, 2015, p. 17). This is an important qualifier, since global citizenship education programs have not been uniformly adopted by UN member states. GCE has a very limited presence in the United States, for example.

The UNESCO 2015 report organizes the aims and content of GCE into three sections: learner outcomes, learner attributes, and topics (See Tables 1, 2 and 3). They also include a set of specific learner objectives organized by four levels of schooling (primary, ages 5-9; upper primary, ages 9-12; lower secondary, ages 12-15; and upper secondary, ages 15-18). This analysis focuses on outcomes, attributes, and topics, since specific learning objectives will likely need further refinement as GCE curricula in UN member states are developed and feedback on these specific objectives is collected and reviewed (See Tables 1, 2 and 3).

**Table 1: Key Learner Outcomes of the UNESCO Report**

<p><b>Key Learner Outcomes</b>--defined by UNESCO as "the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that learners can acquire and demonstrate as a result of global citizenship education" (UNESCO, 2015, p. 22).</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Learners acquire knowledge and understanding of local, national, and global issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations</li><li>2. Learners develop skills for critical thinking and analysis</li><li>3. Learners experience a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, based on human rights</li><li>4. Learners develop attitudes of empathy, solidarity, and respect for differences and diversity</li><li>5. Learners act effectively and responsibly at local, national, and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world</li><li>6. Learners develop motivation and willingness to take necessary actions</li></ol>

**Table 2:** Key Learner Attributes of the UNESCO Report (2015)

<p><b>Learner Attributes</b>--defined by UNESCO as “the traits and qualities that global citizenship education aims to develop in learners and correspond to the key learning outcomes mentioned earlier” (UNESCO, 2015, p. 23).</p> <p>Learners who are educated to become global citizens should display these attributes:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Become informed and critically literate: Knowledge of global governance systems, structures and issues; understanding the interdependence and connections between global and local concerns; knowledge and skills required for civic literacy, such as critical inquiry and analysis, with an emphasis on active engagement in learning (UNESCO, 2015, p. 23).</li><li>2. Become socially connected and respectful of diversity: Understanding of identities, relationships, and belonging; understanding of shared values and common humanity; developing an appreciation of, and respect for, difference and diversity; and understanding the complex relationship between diversity and commonality (UNESCO, 2015, p. 23).</li><li>3. Become ethically responsible and engaged: Based on human rights approaches and including attitudes and values of caring for others and the environment; personal and social responsibility and transformation; and developing skills for participating in the community and contributing to a better world through informed, ethical, and peaceful action (UNESCO, 2015 p. 24).</li></ol>

**Table 3:** Core Curriculum Topics of the UNESCO Report (2015)

<p><b>Curriculum Topics:</b> The curriculum topics in the UNESCO 2015 report are organized by the three learner attributes, and are listed here (UNESCO, 2015, p. 25).</p>
<p><u>Informed and Critically Literate:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Local, national and global systems and structures</li><li>2. Issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national, and global levels</li><li>3. Underlying assumptions and power dynamics</li></ol>
<p><u>Socially Connected and Respectful of Diversity:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Different levels of identity</li><li>5. Different communities people belong to and how these are connected</li></ol>

6. Difference and respect for diversity
<u>Ethically Responsible and Engaged:</u>
7. Actions that can be taken individually and collectively
8. Ethically responsible behavior
9. Getting engaged and taking action

The UNESCO GCE document embraces universal norms as a core element of global citizenship education. Learning outcomes three, four and five specifically use language such as “a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing value and responsibilities based on human rights” (#3), “respect for differences and diversity” (#4), and “act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world” (#5). These outcomes are buttressed by the content of learner attributes two and three, which mention “understanding of shared values and common humanity and developing an appreciation of, and respect for, difference and diversity” (outcome #2); and “developing skills for participating in the community and contributing to a better world through informed, ethical, and peaceful action” (outcome #3). For the core curriculum topics, examples of those emphasizing universal norms and priorities are “issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national, and global levels” (Topic #2), “different communities people belong to and how these are connected” (Topic #5), and “difference and respect for diversity” (Topic #6).

Another common thrust of GCE is the imperative of understanding and examining the processes of globalization. This is evident in learning outcome #1, “learners acquire knowledge and understanding of local, national and global issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations”; learner attribute #1, “become informed and critically literate: knowledge of global governance systems, structures and issues; understanding the interdependence and connections between global and local concerns...”; and in curriculum topic #1, “local, national, and global systems and structures” and curriculum topic #2, “issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national, and global levels.”

GCE also displays a strong commitment to issues-based education, particularly in educating the learner to be an active, engaged citizen who is committed to taking action about global concerns at the local, national and global levels. This is evident in learner outcome #5, “learners act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world,” and outcome #6, “learners develop motivation and willingness to take necessary actions” (UNESCO, 2015). Learner attribute #3 is entirely about this form of active learning, when it states that the learner should: “become ethically responsible and engaged-- based on human rights approaches and including attitudes and values of caring for others and the environment; personal and social responsibility and transformation; and developing skills for participating in the community and contributing to a better world through informed, ethical, and peaceful action.” Finally, the topics listed under “ethically responsible and engaged” are consistent with an issues-centered, active learning approach: specifically, #7, “actions that can be taken individually and collectively”; #8, “ethically responsible behavior”; and #9, “getting engaged and taking action” (UNESCO, 2015).

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---



Another important GCE focus in the UNESCO report is socio-emotional learning (SEL). It identifies the SEL goals of engaging the learner in developing empathy, respect for diversity, and solidarity in addressing global concerns. These goals extend beyond the cognitive dimension. “Understanding the complex relationship between diversity and commonality,” for example, requires that learners develop an appreciation for ambiguity and recognize the importance of engaging diverse perspectives.

***Oxfam Great Britain and Teaching and Learning Scotland***

Oxfam Great Britain’s *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools* can be used by individual teachers or teams of teachers who embrace its goals, content, and pedagogical approaches, but it does not require approval by state education authorities for implementation. In contrast, *Learning and Teaching Scotland’s Developing Global Citizens with Curriculum For Excellence* was designed and supported with funds by the Scottish government, and the program is intended to serve existing curricular goals in Scotland’s national “Curriculum for Excellence” initiative. In terms of learner outcomes, Oxfam subdivides their curriculum into knowledge and understanding, skills, and values and attitudes. The major topics under each of these headings are provided in Table 4. The Scottish Ministry document does not contain as explicit a delineation of knowledge and understanding, skills, and values and attitudes. In contrast, their students’ goals are linked to a set of core principles underlying their GCE program (See Table 5). Table 4 includes a summary of the Oxfam Great Britain Global Citizenship Education Curriculum Framework.

**Table 4: Oxfam Global Citizenship Education Curriculum Framework**

<b>Knowledge/Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Values and Attitudes</b>
Social Justice and Equity	Creative and Critical Thinking	Sense of Identity and Self-esteem
Identity and Diversity	Empathy	Commitment to Social Justice and Equity
Globalization 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

Source: Oxfam (2015). *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools*. Oxford UK: pp. 16-21.

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

An examination of the Oxfam and Scottish ministry documents reveals more similarities than differences. Oxfam summarizes the attributes of the global citizen as a person who:

- Is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen
- Respects and values diversity
- Has an understanding of how the world works
- Is passionately committed to social justice.
- Participates in the community at a range of levels, from the local to the global.
- Works with others to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place.
- Takes responsibility for their actions (Oxfam, 2015).

Learning and Teaching Scotland, although not as specific as Oxfam’s program, presents a similar set of attributes of the globally educated citizen:

In our fast-changing world, it is necessary for children and young people to acquire the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes to adapt and to thrive. Their education should prepare them for living and working in a global society. The big issues affecting our planet, such as climate change and global poverty, require an innovative generation that knows how to find solutions. Our democratic societies need creative people who recognize the importance and value of participation and making their voices heard. The injustice and inequalities in society require people who care about human rights and who recognize that our lives are linked together in our increasingly interdependent and globalized world (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2011, p. 8).

A summary of the Learning and Teaching Scotland curriculum is presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Core Principles and Program Goals of the Scottish Ministry Program**

<b>Principle</b>  Know, respect and care for the rights, responsibilities, values, and opinions of others and understand Scotland’s role within the wider world
<b>Desired Results (Program Goals)</b>  -develop learners’ understanding of equality and human rights issues and make links to rights and responsibilities locally, nationally and globally  -demonstrate the values of wisdom, justice, compassion and integrity both within and outside of the school community  -provide opportunities that foster self-esteem, respect, and identity  -cultivate knowledge and understanding of how Scotland contributes effectively to the global community  -enable learners to appreciate the values and opinions of others with particular reference to environments and cultures

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

**Principle**

Develop an awareness and understanding of engagement in democratic processes and be able to participate in critical thinking and decision making in schools and communities at local, national, and international levels

**Desired Results (Program Goals)**

- demonstrate democratic principles through pupil voice and participation in all aspects of classroom practice
- provide meaningful opportunities for children and young people to contribute to decision-making processes
- motivate learners to engage in local, national, and global issues
- foster political literacy in learners

**Principle**

Understand the interdependence between people, the environment, and the impacts of actions, both local and global

**Desired Results (Program Goals)**

- engage children and young people in learning about the interconnectedness of biodiversity, climate change and global poverty issues
- promote the concept of shared humanity
- provide opportunities to discuss the impacts of local and global actions
- develop empathy

**Principle**

Appreciate and celebrate the diversity of Scotland's history, culture, and heritage and engage with other cultures and traditions around the world

**Desired Results (Program Goals)**

- cultivate positive attitudes towards difference and diversity
- explore the rich cultural diversity in Scotland
- encourage learners to be confident in their own identity and actively engage in exploring a variety of traditions and cultures from around the world

<p><b>Principle</b></p> <p>Think creatively and critically and act responsibly in all aspects of life, politically, economically, and culturally</p>
<p><b>Desired Results (Program Goals)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-develop in learners a range of literacies that will enable and empower them to act responsibly on local and global issues (e.g., political literacy, financial literacy and media literacy)</li><li>-engage learners in developing solutions to the challenges they face as global citizens</li><li>-encourage the development of informed opinions on complex ethical and scientific issues</li></ul>

Source: Learning and Teaching Scotland (2011). *Developing Global Citizens Within Curriculum For Excellence*. Glasgow, UK: p. 14.

Similar to the findings about the UNESCO report, analysis of the Oxfam and Scottish Ministry GCE programs reveals these common content areas: human rights, cultural diversity and identity, social justice, environmental stewardship, and globalization and global interdependence. Both programs advocate a “whole school” commitment to GCE, recognizing that it should not be limited to history and social science curricula.

Both programs are designed for learners to become critical thinkers, to develop capacities for empathy and self-reflection, to think creatively when seeking solutions to problems and resolve conflicts, to promote the democratic processes of engagement (for example, the inclusion of all stakeholders), and to develop the capacities to take informed action to improve the quality of life on the planet. There is a strong emphasis on universal norms, such as those in international human rights documents and principles of sustainable development, while simultaneously articulating the importance of respecting cultural diversity.

Lastly, both reports retain the issues-based emphasis evident in the UNESCO report, with Oxfam noting that due to the intensification of globalization, “We live in an increasingly globalized and interconnected world in which the global is part of our everyday lives, and analysis of seemingly local issues benefits from global perspectives” (Oxfam, 2015, p. 6). The Scottish report similarly states that a core principle of their curriculum design is to employ “complex, ethical, global issues [that] provide rich, relevant, and meaningful contexts for learning in accordance with the principles of curriculum design” (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2011, p. 12).

However, there are two important areas where the Oxfam and Scottish programs diverge. One concerns the scope of curricular application for the programs, with the Oxfam GCE program being specifically designed for use at all grade levels and in any school setting, irrespective of who governs or funds the school. In contrast, the Scottish GCE program is specifically designed to enhance the delivery of GCE within Scottish schools. The principle “appreciate and celebrate the diversity of

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

Scotland’s history, culture, and heritage and engage with other cultures and traditions around the world” makes clear that the study of global citizenship should not be removed from the study of Scottish culture and history, and that global issues must include the national history, culture, and heritage of Scotland (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2011, p. 16).

A second distinction is the inclusion of financial literacy skills within the Scottish Ministry GCE program that are not found in the Oxfam program. How “financial literacy” is defined and in what context it is taught and learned is problematic, particularly given the important role both programs assign to critical thinking about global issues, and whether or not critical approaches to the study of economic inequality, global finance, and multinational corporations are employed.

This analysis of GCE programs reveals that human rights education is prominent in all three programs. However, do the predominant models of human rights education as discussed in the professional literature also reflect the stated aims and content of GCE?

### **Predominant Models of Human Rights Education**

Human rights education (HRE) has been viewed as a central element of global education curricula and programs for some time (Landorf, 2009; Heilman, 2009), and recently the burgeoning literature on global citizenship education rooted in a cosmopolitan ethos has also underscored the importance of human rights education in GCE programs. The reliance of human rights education on universal norms and its international focus in terms of legal and compliance procedures closely link GCE and HRE (Gaudelli & Wylie, 2012; Gaudelli, 2016).

Recognizing the issues-based emphasis of much GCE, Tibbitts and Fernekes noted that HRE is consistent with a “conception of citizenship education that places the study of critical social issues at the center of curriculum design” (2011, p. 92). This approach, which relies on the development of a “critical stance towards governments and institutional abuses of power,” is founded on the premise that students should not only learn human rights content, but also develop the capacities to value human dignity and human rights, participate effectively in civil society at the local, national, and international levels to redress human rights violations, and balance self-interest with the priorities of human interdependence and global responsibility (Tibbitts & Fernekes, 2011, p. 91).

Tibbitts has identified and described three predominant models of HRE, and in the process delineated their primary target audiences, learning goals and content emphases, and teaching and learning processes (Tibbitts, 2015, in press). These three models are Values and Awareness-Socialization (VAS), Accountability-Professional Development (APD), and Activism-Transformation (AT) (See Table 6).

**Table 6: Key Features of Human Rights Education Models**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Learning Goals/Content Emphases</b>	<b>Teaching and Learning Processes</b>
VAS	Students in Formal Schooling	Human Rights Theory and History, History of the UN, Human Rights Standards, Human Rights Institutions and NGOs, Human Rights	Didactic to Participatory  Emphasis on promoting positive social behavior by learning one’s rights

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

		Violations (Historical and Globally)	Critical stance not often evident  Strategy for reducing human rights violations is passive
APD	Civil servants Law enforcement Justice system Health/social workers Educators Journalists Religious leaders	Varies with audience: human rights content and as background-  Links with national protection systems and codes of ethics for specific professionals	Participatory to empowering  Capacity building in areas of skills and values focused on the agency in which the learner works  Strategy for reducing human rights violations is active—applying human rights standards to eliminate human rights violations in one’s professional role
AT	Marginalized populations  Youth	Varies with audience: human rights content as background  Focus on the learner’s own rights  Contemporary human rights violations  Work of groups combating these violations	Oriented to transformation that includes increased self-confidence, developing capacities for taking action, and participation in human rights activism  Focus on empowering learners to transform their lives through activism to reduce human rights violations in their personal lives and in the public domain

Source: F. Tibbitts, (2015, in press). Evolution of human rights education models. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Human Rights Education: Theory, Research, Praxis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

### **GCE Programs and HRE Models Compared: Findings**

A comparison of Tibbitts' three models of HRE with the program goals of the UNESCO, Oxfam Great Britain, and Learning and Teaching Scotland documents indicates that these GCE program goals are compatible with the Values and Awareness-Socialization (VAS) model of HRE. All three GCE programs list human rights as a core content element, and they all conceive of human rights content as a set of universal norms providing connections between learners across the globe. Yet, there are differing emphases in the three programs regarding the role of human rights in challenging systems of power and privilege.

The UNESCO report makes it clear that a global citizen who is critically informed and literate needs to identify underlying assumptions about power and power dynamics, while developing a deeper understanding of the interrelationships between local, national, and global systems. The Oxfam program lists power and governance as a key topic for knowledge and understanding, along with the belief that people can create change. Principles from the Learning and Teaching Scotland program include a) developing "an awareness and understanding of engagement in democratic processes," b) learning how to "participate in critical thinking and decision making in schools and communities at local, national and international levels," and c) fostering political literacy, but they do not include the concepts of power and governance. The UNESCO and Oxfam program goals exhibit greater potential for developing critical perspectives than those of the Learning and Teaching Scotland program.

While each GCE program endorses the development of active, participatory citizens, there is little discussion of how human rights content can serve as a foundation for the development of critical stances toward local, national, and global political and governing institutions. UNESCO claims that they want students to "act effectively and responsibly at local, national, and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world" and to "develop motivation and willingness to take necessary actions," but they do not explicitly argue for the application of human rights standards and the use of action strategies to challenge prevailing systems of power and privilege. Oxfam Great Britain goes further than UNESCO when they state that a global citizen is one who is "passionately committed to social justice," but how that translates into developing human rights action strategies beyond the topics of globalization and interdependence (where respect for human rights is listed as a value/attitude to be developed) is unclear. Learning and Teaching Scotland, while endorsing the development of learners who are "able to participate in critical thinking and decision making in schools and communities at local, national and international levels," provides no statement or suggestion regarding how human rights standards and action strategies could help learners to develop critical perspectives toward existing political and governing institutions.

Thus, while at least two of these programs (UNESCO and Oxfam Great Britain) have the potential to use human rights learning to develop a more critical stance toward networks of political power and governance, none of the three sponsoring groups have embraced a conception of HRE as "transformational." HRE in all three programs focuses more on reinforcing "social cohesion" (where state institutions are viewed as capable of being reformed using existing processes of political and social change), than on envisioning HRE as "transformative" (the traditional stance of human rights activists who apply international standards and norms to the activities of political and governing institutions and who educate individuals and groups to fundamentally refashion or remove existing networks of political power and related institutions of governance).

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

Tibbitts has raised concerns about the use of HRE to promote social cohesion;

Already within the formal schooling sector, one sees a tendency for HRE to be “reduced” to the principle of social cohesion, promoting values such as positive inter-personal relationships and behavior. These are very worthwhile goals but to reduce HRE to such values denies its praxis in relation to its call for critical review and transformation. Similarly in schools, HRE can sometimes be reduced to the treatment of historical content such as the philosophy of human rights, the founding of the United Nations, and so on. I would not consider this approach to be HRE but rather only teaching about human rights. But my point is that if GCE goes the same route, if it will become one that is entirely palatable to school systems – for example, by promoting second language learning – without necessarily promoting a critical analysis of global politics and trends, then it may not end up encouraging students’ agency to influence the environment around them” (F. Tibbitts, personal communication, January 9, 2016).

Tibbitts’ concern is well founded, particularly when one looks at the dearth of global citizenship education content in existing social studies curriculum standards in the United States.

### **Implications for Social Studies Education (USA)**

#### ***GCE, HRE and U. S. Social Studies Standards***

Several studies have identified the presence of HRE and GCE in state social studies standards (USA). However, Rapoport (2009) examined standards documents and discovered that the term “globalization” appeared in only fifteen of them, while the phrase “global citizen(ship)” was confined to just two. Banks (2007) found that “human rights” content was evident, at least to some degree, in thirty-five state social studies standards documents. And recent research commissioned by Human Rights Educators USA and completed by The Advocates for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization based in Minnesota, updated previous studies to document the presence of human rights education in the state social studies standards. While research by The Advocates for Human Rights supported Banks’ contention that thirty-five U. S. states continued to include the term “human rights” in their state standards documents by 2016, they also noted room for significant improvement.

Eight states do not address human rights topics at all. Other states focus on only one of the topics or present human rights in an extremely limited fashion. Twenty-one states, for instance, teach about human rights without teaching about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Historical examinations of human rights topics are more frequent and more likely to be required than standards that ask the students to view human rights as an ethical framework. Human rights topics were also almost always international in content; standards included very few examples of human rights issues in the United States. Very few states approach human rights comprehensively from kindergarten through 12th grade. (Advocates for Human Rights, 2016, p. 2)

Given these findings, there is little evidence to suggest that HRE is treated comprehensively in social studies education or that discussions of the relationship between HRE and GCE are present in state level social studies standards. Human rights content in state social studies standards still fails to move beyond the VAS model. As a result, it appears that the other two models of HRE conceptualized by Tibbitts, Accountability-Professional Development (APD), and Activism-Transformation (AT), are hardly present in most U. S. state social studies standards.

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---



The subject field most often linked to civic education in formal schooling is social studies, so questions of how social studies education could be transformed by a robust global citizenship emphasis are of great significance. While this discussion is primarily focused on the U. S. context, the implications presented here may be relevant to other civic education systems, notably those where there is a clearly stated commitment to enhancing democratic citizenship education.

*HRE, GCE, and Social Studies Education in the United States of America*

Reflecting on his many years as a global education leader, Graham Pike recently stated, “Clearly, nationalism is still a formidable force in shaping public education and, perhaps, poses the most direct challenge to the promotion of the concept of global citizenship in schools” (Pike, 2014, p. 11). Richardson supports that claim, noting that a serious challenge to the implementation of global citizenship education is the close relationship between nation-building, citizenship, and schooling that has been a pervasive feature of modern educational systems since the Mid-Nineteenth Century (Richardson, 2008, p.57). Richardson adds that the relationship between national identity and citizenship education contributes to the development of civic pride, national unity, and a patriotism that binds the citizen to the nation-state (Richardson, 2008, p. 58).

Pike’s discussion of two forms of nationalism is helpful in clarifying where global citizenship education may be situated within existing citizenship education programs. For Pike, “naked nationalism” represents “an unquestioning patriotism and belief in the moral superiority of one’s own nation or culture,” while “nuanced nationalism does not preclude a love of one’s own country and people, but it demands a critically reflective analysis of the nation’s history and contemporary values, as well as an understanding of how the nation is nested in a wider system of global responsibilities” (Pike, 2014 , p. 11). “Naked nationalism” would be incompatible with the global citizenship programs discussed in this essay, because they would require students to consider themselves citizens of the world, with responsibilities encompassing universal priorities that could easily conflict with national self-interest. On the other hand, “nuanced nationalism” provides some space for the development of multiple allegiances, not denying the importance of sustaining national civic identities, but balancing them with the development of a global civic identity founded on cosmopolitanism.

The cosmopolitan foundation of global citizenship education is a serious challenge to the content of social studies programs in the United States that prioritize the nation-state as the focus of citizenship education. The study of local, state, and national governmental institutions and practices, the practice of patriotic rituals, and the dominant role of historical narratives stressing “American exceptionalism,” would no longer be the sole focus of citizenship education in schools. Instead, students would a) learn how individuals and groups could develop and practice activist strategies that challenge existing networks and structures of political power; b) examine universal human needs and priorities along with strategies for conflict resolution; c) develop enhanced respect for cultural diversity that is balanced by a commitment to universal human rights; and d) study critical approaches to national and global histories using an issues-centered approach whose content reflected multiple perspectives about social experience.

The idea that global citizenship education could support Pike’s idea of “nuanced nationalism” would be consistent with Ochoa-Becker’s issues-based approach to citizenship education in *Democratic Education for Social Studies* (2007), a revised version of the earlier work she co-authored with Shirley Engle in 1988. Engle and Ochoa-Becker make the case that early grades “socialization” must be balanced with “counter-socialization” in the upper middle and secondary school grades. They argued

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

that in the elementary and early middle grades, “socialization” functions

as “a conserving process. It transmits traditions and values that are common place in the experiences of the community and the larger society. However, it does not explicitly prepare the next generation for the unknown future and the changes it might bring.” (Ochoa-Becker, 2007, p. 66).

In contrast, counter-socialization for Engle and Ochoa

“emphasizes creative and independent thinking as well as social criticism that is based on reason and evidence. These are fundamental to improving the quality of democratic life in a changing pluralistic society while continually increasing connections with the rest of the world creates a future of persistent issues and challenges.” (Ochoa-Becker, 2007, p. 67)

In Engle and Ochoa’s rationale, the concept of “counter-socialization” does not imply absolute rejection of what was learned earlier in life through socialization. Rather, it presumes that the reflective examination of ideas, supported by a critical sensibility and in the case of global citizenship, a selection of content that consciously challenges the foundations of traditional national and civic identity, would lead to the development of citizens who can act responsibility in addressing complex issues and contribute meaningfully to democratic society because they are better equipped to address global problems and propose potential solutions for them.

What would students know and be able to do after experiencing a GCE program? First, they would develop a deeper understanding of the interconnectedness of human life across national boundaries, and of the impact of human activity on the natural world. Second, they would develop the capacity for critical reflection about how civic identity is constructed and sustained, suggesting that alternatives to the close identification of civic identity with the nation-state could emerge. Third, the study of universal human rights and social justice would provide a platform for individual and group social activism at local, national, and global levels of engagement through national and international political structures, as well as non-governmental organizations. Fourth, they would develop the capacity to empathize with cultures and experiences outside their local and national environment, while simultaneously improving their skills of intercultural communication, creative thinking, and collaboration and conflict resolution. In effect, they would be guided by a re-conceptualized view of citizenship.

These expected outcomes of a GCE program are consistent with the definition and attributes of cosmopolitanism, since cosmopolitan global citizens could legitimately prioritize their moral commitments to individuals across the globe over those to citizens of a given nation-state, or view such commitments as of equal importance. Where and when these two sets of commitments may clash represents an important area for the future development of global citizenship education, particularly when addressing issues that bring such dissonance into sharp focus (See Table 7).

**Table 7: Potential Conflicts between Cosmopolitan and Nationalistic Approaches to Civic Education As Posed in Policy Questions**

1. Should the citizen support national security initiatives that enhance the capacity of a national government to advance its own interests when such initiatives can degrade the lives of others, such as the use of unmanned drones in the war on terror?
2. Should the citizen advocate arms sales to allied nation-states as a foreign policy strategy knowing that those arms can be used by security forces to violate the human rights of individuals?
3. Should the citizen challenge policies that limit the entry of migrants seeking peace and security from violence in other countries even when those migrants violate national laws regulating immigration?

In these cases, a cosmopolitan global citizen would likely face conflicts with citizens educated from a nationalistic perspective, and the global citizen could easily be labeled as having an insufficiently developed national civic identity. Equally important is the question—how would the global citizen respond to such dilemmas?

This relates to the issue raised by Felisa Tibbitts about how HRE is carried out (and by extension, GCE): are we simply educating students to learn about such dilemmas (limits of social cohesion), or will global citizenship programs embrace a transformative approach to human rights education and educate students as well as teachers to become activists? The answer to this question will depend upon the capacity of GCE programs to embrace a more transformative approach to HRE—not abandoning the study of the history of human rights and its international framework of treaties and laws, but complementing it with a detailed examination of human rights standards and their applications to local, national, and global contexts, along with the development and practice of activist strategies by students.

Further, since most pre-service social studies educators receive training in formal college and university certification programs, it is reasonable to expect that the study of global citizenship (theory and practice) should be included in their training. Since global citizenship education is issues-based, it follows that the content of a pre-service global citizenship course or series of courses would require an interdisciplinary orientation and draw upon fields such as history, geography, economics, political science, anthropology, policy studies, sociology, and others from the humanities and social sciences. The program would necessarily include a study of the diverse models of issues-based education, such as those developed by scholars such as Engle and Ochoa, Oliver and Shaver, Hunt and Metcalf, Massialas and Cox.<sup>3</sup> Ideally, pre-service educators would also participate in study-abroad

---

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed examination of these models of issues-centered social studies education, consult S. Totten and J. Pedersen (Eds.), (2011), *Teaching and studying social issues: Major programs and approaches*. Charlotte NC: Information Age.

programs that engaged them as interns with non-governmental organizations or intergovernmental organizations, addressing the challenges of globalization, human rights issues, and trans-national global problems.

One should not minimize the difficulties of implementing such changes into pre-service programs. A study of social studies teacher preparation programs in New Jersey colleges and universities, found significant obstacles to incorporating new HRE academic content and pedagogical strategies (Fernekes, 2014). Obstacles included a) a lack of available courses in certification programs that could be modified to include new content, b) variations in teacher education faculty's understanding of human rights education content and strategies, and c) the failure of colleges and universities to require that certification candidates actually study human rights content in their major and/or minor fields (Fernekes, 2014, pp. 25-26).

These findings replicated those submitted for the United Nations Universal Periodic Review (22<sup>nd</sup> session) on Human Rights Education by Human Rights Educators USA and the U. S. Human Rights Network. Their report showed clearly that the United States government had not met its international obligations regarding human rights education in teacher preparation stating, "There is a lack of concerted effort at all levels to infuse HRE into the formal education sector in order to meet international and national human rights education obligations. Areas for improvement include curricular standards, teacher training, and school environment" (HRE USA and U. S. Human Rights Network, 2014, p. 2). Regarding program characteristics, it reported that current teacher preparation "rarely includes the incorporation of human rights into teaching pedagogies, content about international human rights standards, or strategies to develop student skills and values so that they learn to apply human rights principles in local, national, and global society" (HRE USA and U. S. Human Rights Network, 2014, p. 6). Consequently, it appears likely that GCE, which includes not only human rights education, but many other complex topics, would face similar obstacles in becoming a mainstream component of social studies teacher preparation.

## Conclusions

In examining the degree of compatibility between selected programs in global citizenship education and dominant models of human rights education, these findings emerged.

1. Global citizenship education programs share a foundation in the philosophical stance of cosmopolitanism, along with commitments to universal norms in the areas of human rights, respect for cultural diversity and sustainable development, as well as issues-based curriculum design.

2. A high degree of compatibility exists between the goals of GCE programs and the values-awareness-socialization model of HRE, but such compatibility declines for the accountability-professional development and activism-transformation models of HRE.

3. Major obstacles to implementing global citizenship education are the continuing reliance in nation-states on strong links between national identity and civic education in schools, the potential for dissonance between national interests and cosmopolitan commitments as learners confront global policy issues, and the lack of commitment in teacher preparation programs to incorporating either GCE or HRE in pre-service training.

If GCE and HRE become more prominent features of civic education programs in schools and in social studies teacher preparation, challenges to the overtly nationalistic content and tone of existing

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

programs in the USA and other societies would become more prevalent. The development of a cosmopolitan orientation among educators, and potentially their students, would force a serious reconsideration of national identity formation that is currently carried out through social studies education programs and related activities, such as patriotic rituals. It would also affect the study of national history and the minimal attention given to universal norms and priorities, such as those articulated in international human rights standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related United Nations human rights treaties.

Global citizenship education and human rights education have the potential to transform the beliefs and practices of young people, challenging the strong links that exist between civic education and national identity. If global citizenship education and human rights education are to develop further as realistic alternatives to existing civic education programs, further debate and discussion about the value of cosmopolitanism as an intellectual foundation for global citizenship is needed. Human rights education must also develop a richer body of research and practice, addressing the effectiveness of approaches that emphasize social cohesion and/or activism. Further, civic education scholars should pursue research on the impact of global citizenship programs currently being implemented in schools to learn whether or not they are realizing the knowledge, skill, attitude, and value goals they claim are possible.

**Appendix: Global Citizenship Education (GCE) and Human Rights Education (HRE) Compared**

Topic	GCE	HRE
Content Sources	Interdisciplinary (Includes HRE) and Issues-Based	Interdisciplinary, with legal and normative content from international law and treaties; Issues-based
Goals	Developing an active and engaged citizenry capable of acting locally and globally to address public issues	Developing citizens who are willing to advocate for universal human rights guarantees, defend against human rights violations and create a culture supporting universal human rights
Content Scope	Addresses learner knowledge, skills, and dispositions across curricular subject fields	Includes education about human rights, education through human rights, and education for human rights across the curriculum
Core Philosophical Commitments	Cosmopolitan ethos emphasizing a moral obligation to all people	Universalism balanced with cultural particularities—exercising one’s rights while upholding the rights of others

**References**

- Advocates for Human Rights and Human Rights Educators USA. (2016) *Human rights in state social studies standards: An analysis*. Minneapolis, MN: The Advocates for Human Rights.
- Barnard, A. and Saad, H. (2016, August 22) 1 riveted world. Here are other Syrian children who did not. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/22/world/middleeast/syria-omran-photo-children.html>.
- Brown, G. W., & Held, D. (2014). Editors' introduction. In G. W. Brown & D. Held (Eds.), *The Cosmopolitanism reader* (pp. 1-15). Malden, MA: Polity.
- De Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2014) Critical and transnational literacies in international development and global citizenship education. *Sisyphus Journal of Education*, 2( 3), 32-50.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Banks, D. (2007). *Promises to keep: Results of the national survey of human rights education 2000* (Updated 2007). Retrieved from <https://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/links/survey2007.html>
- Cabrera, L. (2012). *The practice of global citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dower, Nigel. (2003). *An introduction to global citizenship*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fernekes, W. R. (2014). *Human rights education and social studies teacher preparation: Is there any "there" there?* Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Human Rights Education, American University, Washington DC.
- Gaudelli, W. (2009). Heuristics of global citizenship discourses towards curriculum enhancement. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 25(1), 68-85.

Gaudelli, W. & Wylie, S. (2012). Global education and issues-centered education. In S. Totten & J. Pedersen (Eds.), *Educating about social issues in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries: A critical annotated bibliography* (pp. 293-320). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Gaudelli, W. (2016) *Global citizenship education: Everyday transcendence*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Heilman, E. (2009). Terrains of global and multicultural education: What is distinctive, contested and shared? In T. Fuss Kirkwood-Tucker (Ed.), *Visions in global education: The globalization of curriculum and pedagogy in teacher education and schools* (pp. 25-46). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Human Rights Educators USA and U. S. Human Rights Network (September 2014). *Human rights education: Submission to the UN universal periodic review, 22<sup>nd</sup> session—United States of America*. Boston: Human Rights Educators USA and U. S. Human Rights Network. Retrieved via email attachment from Felisa Tibbitts.

Landorf, H. (2009). Toward a philosophy of global education. In T. Fuss Kirkwood-Tucker (Ed.), *Visions in global education: The globalization of curriculum and pedagogy in teacher education and schools* (pp. 47-71). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2011). *Developing global citizens within curriculum for excellence*. Glasgow, UK: Learning and Teaching Scotland. Retrieved from [www.LTScotland.org.uk](http://www.LTScotland.org.uk).

Merryfield, M. (2002) Rethinking our framework for understanding the world. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 30(1), 148-151.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). "Citizens of the world." In M. C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education* (pp. 50-84). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ochoa-Becker, A. (2007). *Democratic education for social studies*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Oxfam Great Britain. (2015). *Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools*. Oxford UK:

Oxfam Great Britain. Retrieved from [www.oxfam.org.uk/education](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education).

---

Corresponding author email: [bill41@comcast.net](mailto:bill41@comcast.net) or [william.fernekes@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.fernekes@rutgers.edu)

©2012/2018 International Assembly Journal of International Social Studies

Website: <http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

---

Pike, G. (2014). Global education in times of discomfort. *Journal of International (Social Studies, 3(2), 4-17.*

Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and social studies standards. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 33 (1), 91-112.*

Richardson, G. (2008). Caught between imaginaries: Global citizenship education and the persistence of the nation. In A. A. Abdi & L. Schultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 55-64). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tibbitts, F. & Fernekes, W. (2011). Human rights education. In S. Totten & J. Pedersen (Eds.), *Teaching and studying social issues: Major programs and approaches* (pp. 87-118). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Tibbitts, F. (2015, in press). Evolution of human rights models. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Human rights education: Theory, research, praxis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

United Nations General Assembly (December 2011). *Declaration on human rights education and training*. New York, NY: The United Nations.

UNESCO. (2014). *Global citizenship education: An emerging perspective*. Paris, FR: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from [www.unesco.org/new/en/global-citizenship-education](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/global-citizenship-education).

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and objectives*. Paris FR: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from [www.unesco.org/new/en/global-citizenship-education](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/global-citizenship-education).