Huitt, W. (2013). Curriculum for global citizenship. *International Schools Journal*, 33 (1), 76-81.

# Curriculum for global citizenship

William G Huitt

This paper proposes the need to focus on developing holistic standards as the foundation for creating a curriculum for global citizenship and proposes a set of attributes that can serve as a beginning for a discussion of those standards. The need to make decisions about what to include and exclude in any specific school's curriculum is also discussed.

The fast-paced change in the latter half of the 20th century that led to a technology-based, global society has continued unabated into the 21st century (Wagner, 2008). It is widely acknowledged that not only has the context of human activity changed, but children and youth have changed also (Tapscott, 2008). This dynamic interaction has left parents, educators, and concerned citizens throughout the world perplexed as to how best to prepare children and youth for successful adulthood. One alternative that has gained increasing support is to prepare children and youth for global citizenship. Discussions on precisely how to do that are often seen in their most concrete form in discussing curriculum.

Traditional approaches to curriculum have presented a list of courses to study (Collins English Dictionary, 2009; Merriam-Webster, 2012). However, some curriculum experts have suggested the focus should be on aims of learning (Cowan & Harding, 1986) or learning outcomes (Stefani, 2004-05). From this perspective, the identification of desired outcomes impacts all phases of curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and communication.

For example, as one identifies desired knowledge, attitudes, and skills that learners should acquire, one also identifies possible assessments by addressing not only what should be assessed, but also why and how. The implication is that one would include in the developed curriculum only those items for which the program or institution is willing to hold itself and its students accountable.

As those decisions are made, educators focus concurrently on understanding how learners would acquire those outcomes and developing an organized sequence of means and methods by which learners will acquire them. Evaluation is then addressed by deciding how to make judgments about the effectiveness of the teaching methods to guide learners to acquire the desired outcomes. Finally, decisions are made about communicating results to interested stakeholders. As this process is implemented, a new cycle in the decision making process would begin.

When considering the focus of the curriculum (*ie* the identification of desired outcomes), there are at least three different starting points:

- 1. Consider different theories of human potential or intelligences;
- 2. define human needs, motives, and what it means to thrive and flourish; or

Expanded version: http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/citizen/dev-curr-global-citizen.html

3. identify the demands of citizenship at a particular point in time such as the fast-paced, global information-based society.

When considering human potential or intelligences there are a number of well-known frameworks that could be considered. Perhaps the most well-known is Gardner's (1983, 2006) theory of multiple intelligences in which he identified first seven and then perhaps even more specific types of aptitudes for processing information.

Other well-known frameworks in this category include the Learner Profile developed by the International Baccalaureate (2009), the Habits of Mind framework developed by Costa and Kallick (2000), and the developmental assets framework developed by the Search Institute (2005, 2006a, 2006b). Included in the category of human needs and flourishing were such frameworks as Maslow's (1954, 1971) hierarchy of needs, Diener and Biswas-Diener's (2008) components of well-being, and Seligman's (2011) theory of human flourishing. Finally, the category of 21st century citizenship included the frameworks developed by the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2009) and Wagner (2008, 2012).

A list of attributes was developed from an analysis of the above mentioned frameworks (Huitt, 2012a) and organized using the domains of the Brilliant Star framework (Huitt, 2010). These domains consisted of self and self-views three components of mind (cognitive/thinking, affective/emotional, and conative/volitional), body (physical and kinesthetic), spirit (spirituality and transcendence), social (interpersonal), morality and character, and citizenship.

The first eight categories are all defined in terms of human potentials and competencies; the ninth category, citizenship, is seen as application of personal competencies in the active involvement of the individual in society (see p80). One of the most interesting features of this analysis was that only the International Baccalaureate advocated that children and youth be prepared to think like an artist, historian, mathematician, scientist, *etc*, a recommendation made by Gardner (2000) and supported by many of the professional societies.

As important as it is to identify potential desired outcomes, it is even more important to identify the methods and procedures that can be used to collect data on their development. Without the means to efficiently and effectively collect data on these outcomes, focus on their development remains haphazard and unsystematic. If there is one concept that has become a truism, it is that people and organizations do not do what is expected, they do what is inspected, or as Hummel and Huitt (1994) put it, What You Measure Is What You Get (WYMIWYG).

Unfortunately, it is the rare school that has the resources to focus on all of the desired attributes. Therefore, each school must make some decisions about what will be included in its statement about the non-academic or pastoral competencies the stakeholders expect students to develop. Inevitably, this leads to differences of opinion as to what is important.

I propose three different categories for making these decisions explicit: Justified, Just-in-Case, and Just-in-Time.

Justified competencies would be those that are expected to be needed by almost all individuals for adult success in the 21st century. Positive self-esteem, critical and creative thinking, appropriately displaying emotions, and the ability to effectively work in a group might be items that would be included in this category.

Just-in-Case competencies would be those that some of the students would need to be successful in a particular setting or career, but that might not be needed by everyone. The competency to think like a master artist, philosopher, or mathematician might be examples that would be placed in this category.

Finally, there are Just-in-Time competencies that are needed for a particular activity, but that can be learned in a relatively short period of time just prior to that activity. A particular kinesthetic large or small motor skill needed to play a particular game might fit in that category.

The point is that not all of the identifiable competencies will be considered of equal value to all educators in all contexts for all students.

In summary, there is a need to define explicitly the qualities and competencies of what it means to prepare for global citizenship. Of course, the issue of academic competencies is vital, but the non-academic, more holistic desired outcomes discussed in this paper are just as critical in preparing children and youth for successful adulthood in the 21st century, perhaps even more so (Gardner, 1995; Goleman, 1998; Sternberg, Wagner, Williams, & Horvath, 1995).

In order to prepare for adult roles and active involvement as global citizens, children and youth must develop a rather complex set of competencies. Fortunately, these have been examined extensively in recent decades and the way has been prepared for their inclusion in K-12 curriculum standards. It is now up to educators to develop the pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) that will facilitate the development of these competencies in young people.

#### References

Collins English Dictionary. (2009). Curriculum. Complete and Unabridged 10th ed. Retrieved from dictionary.reference.com/browse/curriculum

Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (2000). *Habits of mind: A developmental series*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cowan, J., & Harding, A. (1986). A logical model for curriculum development. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 17(2), 103-109.

Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2008). Happiness: Unlocking the mysteries of psychological wealth. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic.

Gardner, H. (1995). Cracking open the IQ box. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *The bell curve wars* (pp. 23-35). New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (2000). The disciplined mind: Beyond facts and standardized tests: The K-12 education that every child deserves. New York: Penguin.

Gardner, H. (2006). Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice. New York: Basic Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam

Huitt, W. (2010). A holistic view of education and schooling: Guiding students to develop capacities, acquire virtues, and provide service. Paper presented at the 12th Annual International Conference sponsored by the Athens Institute for Education and Research (ATINER), May 24-27, Athens, Greece. Retrieved from www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/holistic-view-of-schooling.pdf

Huitt, W. (2012a, October). Becoming a Brilliant Star: Curriculum mapping project. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from www. edpsycinteractive.org/brilstar/CurrMap/index.html

Hummel, J., & Huitt, W. (1994, February). What you measure is what you get. *GaASCD Newsletter: The Reporter*, 10-11. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/wymiwyg.html

International Baccalaureate Organization. (2009). *IB learner profile booklet*. Cardiff, Wales, UK: Author. Retrieved from www.ibo.org/programmes/profile/documents/Learnerprofileguide.pdf

Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper.

Maslow, A. (1971). The farther reaches of human nature. New York: The Viking Press.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2012). Curriculum. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/curriculum

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2009). *P21 framework definitions*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from www.p21.org/documents/P21\_Framework\_Definitions.pdf

Search Institute. (2005). 40 developmental assets for early childhood (ages 3 to 5). Minneapolis, MN: Author. Retrieved from www.search-institute.org/system/files/40AssetsEC.pdf

Search Institute. (2006a). 40 developmental assets for adolescents (ages 12 to 18). Minneapolis, MN: Author. Retrieved from www.search-institute.org/system/files/40AssetsList.pdf

Search Institute. (2006b). 40 developmental assets for middle childhood (ages 8 -12). Minneapolis, MN: Author. Retrieved from www.search-institute.org/system/files/40Assets\_MC\_0.pdf

Seligman, M. (2011). Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being. New York: Free Press.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Stefani, L. (2004-05). Assessment of student learning: Promoting a scholarly approach. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1*, 51-66. Retrieved from www2.glos.ac.uk/offload/tli/lets/lathe/issuel/articles/stefani.pdf

Sternberg, R., Wagner, T., Williams, W., & Horvath, J. (1995). Testing common sense. *American Psychologist*, 50(11), 912-927.

Tapscott, D. (2008). Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing the world. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Wagner, T. (2008). The global achievement gap: Why even our best schools don't teach the new survival skills our children need—and what we can do about it. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wagner, T. (2012). Creating innovators: The making of young people who will change the world. New York, NY: Scribner.

## **Appendix**

# Suggested Attributes for Developing the Whole Person

#### Self & self-views

- · Balanced
  - · Mind-body
  - · Thinking-feeling
  - Individual-social
  - · Material-spiritual
  - · Integrated
- Reflective
  - · Temperament & Personality
  - · Self-views
  - · Learning style
  - · Strengths
  - Interests
  - · Engagement and flow

#### Cognition & Thinking

- Knowledgeable
  - Artist
  - · Historian
  - Mathematician
  - Philosopher
  - Scientist
  - · Writer/Story teller
  - Integral
- · Thinkers
  - Gather data through the senses
  - · Think objectively
  - · Question and pose problems
  - Apply past knowledge to new situations
  - · Strive for accuracy
  - Think and communicate with clarity and precision
  - · Think flexibly
  - Think creatively; imagine and innovate
  - Think strategically
  - Identify the consequences of actions and options
  - Metacognition

- · Emotion & Affect
- · Emotionally developed
  - Aware of own emotions
  - · Aware of others emotions
  - Appropriately displays emotions
  - Manages and self-regulates emotions
  - · Can tolerate failure
  - High levels of emotional well-being
- · Develops optimism
  - Experiences pleasurable emotions
  - Apply positive thinking skills
  - · Modify affect in thinking
  - Explain causes
- Develops gratitude
- · Caring
  - · Identifies others' needs
  - · Helps others

#### Conation & Volition

- Planners
  - Develops vision and aspirations
  - Sets reachable goals and objectives
  - · Develops action plans
- Inquirers
  - Open to continuous learning
  - · Achievement motivated
- Risk-takers
  - Act assertively
  - Persevere
  - Resist undesirable pressure

# Physical & Kinesthetic

- Healthy lifestyle
- · Kinesthetic competence

## · Spirituality & Transcendence

- · Meaning and purpose
- · Deep, personal relationships
  - · Self
  - Others
  - · Nature
  - · Unknowns

### Social & Interpersonal

- · Open-minded
  - · Receptive to views of others
  - Take the perspective of others
- Communicators
  - Listen with understanding and empathy
  - · Monitor communication
- · Interpersonally skilled
  - Work with individual and group differences
  - · Become multicultural
  - Work with diversity in community
  - Cooperate, resolve conflicts, and make peace
  - Makes and maintains friendships

## Morality & Character

- · Ethical sensitivity
  - Examine bias
  - · Prevent bias
- · Ethical judgment
  - Understand ethical problems
  - Develop ethical reasoning skills
- · Ethical motivation
  - · Respect others
  - Develop conscience
  - Develop ethical identity and integrity
- · Ethical action
  - Act responsibly
  - · Meet obligations
  - Stewardship
  - Develop courage

#### Citizenship

- · Sociocultural Awareness
  - · Meeting basic needs
  - Peace and conflict resolution
  - · Sustainability
  - · Gender equity
  - · Racial and ethnic equity
  - · Religious freedom
- Value social structures
  - Identify and value traditions
  - Understand social structures
  - · Practice democracy
- Adult roles
  - · Family
  - Career
  - Finances
- Active involvement
  - Local
  - · State and national
  - Transnational
  - InternationalGlobal
  - Cosmic

Developed by: W. Huitt, June 2012, www. edpsycinteractive.org/brilstar/CurrMap/ltr/drop-down-menu-template.pdf

Dr William Huitt is Professor Emeritus at Valdosta State University, adjunct faculty at Capella and Walden universities, and Director of the Innovation Incubator Lab at On Track Life Solutions. He holds a PhD in Educational Psychology and an MEd in Business Education from the University of Florida, and a BS in Business Administration from the University of South Alabama. He has worked with schools in the Pacific, South America, and Europe, and throughout the United States, including the Navajo Reservation in Arizona.