



Research Article

Global Citizenship Education: Towards a Critical Moral Pedagogy

Yoonil Auh^{1*}, Chanmi Kim²

¹The School of Convergence Education Computers and Communications Engineering, Kyung Hee Cyber University, Seoul, Korea

²Global Education Cooperation, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

E-mail: yoonilauh@gmail.com

Received: 8 May 2024; **Revised:** 20 July 2024; **Accepted:** 28 August 2024

Abstract: This study explores the implementation of critical moral pedagogy (CMP) within Global Citizenship Education (GCED) in two schools and a community center in Seoul, South Korea. Over the course of a semester, a mixed-method approach was utilized, encompassing qualitative interviews with educators, focus groups with students, participant observations, and quantitative surveys. By analyzing diverse educational settings, the research uncovers common challenges and effective strategies for integrating CMP within GCED. The findings underscore the significance of context-specific GCED curricula and the value of strong researcher-school collaborations in enhancing students' global citizenship awareness, critical thinking skills, and social justice orientation. This study provides valuable insights for educators seeking to inspire transformative actions and advance a more equitable and sustainable world.

Keywords: global citizenship education, critical moral pedagogy, social justice, South Korea

1. Introduction

The evolving complexities of our interconnected world necessitate a reimagined Global Citizenship Education (GCED) that addresses both its historical shortcomings and current global challenges. This study explores how GCED has evolved to incorporate a more expansive and inclusive moral framework, emphasizing ethical engagement, critical thinking, and moral agency among learners. It aims to bridge the gap between traditional GCED's focus on cultural and ethical education and the need to address global issues such as poverty, inequality, social justice, and environmental sustainability through critical thinking and moral education.

While the terms "ethics" and "morals" are often used interchangeably, this study focuses on both teaching values and guiding behavior. It aims to foster the development of personal virtues and the critical thinking skills necessary for ethical decision-making. This dual approach ensures that the study addresses the comprehensive spectrum of ethical and moral education, rather than limiting itself to a singular aspect.

1.1 Background and context

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) has significantly evolved from its initial marginal position within the educational landscape to a pivotal component of global educational frameworks (Pais & Costa, 2017). Traditionally confined to niche academic circles and advocacy groups, GCED initially focused on fostering cross-cultural understanding, tolerance, and awareness of global issues among select individuals (Balibar, 2012; Andreotti, 2014). Early initiatives emphasized

cultural exchange programs, multiculturalism, and global awareness campaigns (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Despite their goals, these programs often faced criticism for overlooking systemic injustices, broader global challenges, and for their Eurocentric bias and limited inclusivity, failing to resonate with learners from diverse backgrounds (Andreotti, 2011).

Simultaneously, GCED was viewed through the lens of moral pedagogy, concentrating on the cultivation of ethical values, virtues, and moral reasoning (Noddings, 2002). This approach aimed to instill a sense of responsibility, empathy, compassion, and respect for human dignity, with a focus on moral education and character development through philosophical traditions such as virtue ethics, utilitarianism, and deontology (Kohlberg, 1984; Nussbaum, 1997).

1.2 Definition of global citizenship and education

Global Citizenship refers to the recognition and practice of understanding and acting upon the interdependence and interconnectedness of all people and communities worldwide. It involves cultivating a global mindset that values diversity, equity, and inclusion, fostering a sense of responsibility towards addressing global challenges such as poverty, inequality, environmental sustainability, and human rights (Osler & Starkey, 2005; Banks, 2008). Key elements include interconnectedness-understanding the global impact of local actions (UNESCO, 2015a); Diversity and inclusion-valuing cultural diversity and promoting equality (Banks, 2008; Andreotti, 2014); Social justice-advocating for justice, equity, and human rights (Oxfam, 2006; Nussbaum, 1997); Sustainable development-committing to environmental sustainability (UNESCO, 2015b); And active participation-engaging responsibly in communities to drive positive social change (Davis, 2013).

In essence, GCED aims to equip individuals with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to understand and address global issues effectively. It fosters critical thinking, empathy, and a sense of global responsibility, encouraging learners to become proactive agents of change who contribute to creating a more just, peaceful, and sustainable world (Reimers & Chung, 2019; Sun, 2020).

1.3 Definition of critical moral pedagogy

Critical Moral Pedagogy (CMP) is an educational approach that integrates the principles of critical pedagogy (McLaren, 2023) and moral education (Pring, 2021). It aims to develop ethical responsibility, critical thinking, and a commitment to social justice among learners (Darder et al., 2023). CMP emphasizes moral agency, empathy, and addressing systemic injustices and global challenges. It encourages learners to critically examine their values and assumptions while understanding ethical issues from diverse perspectives. Key elements include ethical engagement-developing moral clarity through ethical dilemmas (Noddings, 2002); Critical thinking-challenging oppressive systems by reflecting on societal norms (Kohlberg, 1984; Nussbaum, 1997); Social justice-advocating for justice and equity for marginalized communities (Andreotti, 2014; Banks, 2008); Empathy and compassion-building empathy to understand diverse perspectives (Davies et al., 2005); Interdisciplinary Approach-addressing moral issues with insights from various disciplines (Biesta, 2006; English, 2016); And global perspective-promoting global citizenship and responsibility (UNESCO, 2015a; Sun, 2020).

Through CMP, educators aim to empower learners to become ethically responsible and socially conscious individuals capable of contributing positively to society and the world (Gibson, 2020). This approach integrates the philosophical underpinnings of moral education with the transformative goals of critical pedagogy, emphasizing the need for a holistic and inclusive educational framework that prepares learners to navigate and address the multifaceted challenges of our interconnected world.

1.4 Integrating global citizenship education and critical moral pedagogy: A justification

In our interconnected world, education must address complex societal challenges and foster socially responsible individuals. Integrating Global Citizenship Education (GCED) and Critical Moral Pedagogy (CMP) forms a comprehensive learning framework that prepares students to navigate global issues with a strong ethical foundation.

GCED fosters an understanding of global issues and cultural diversity, cultivating responsible citizens. CMP enhances GCED by promoting critical thinking, ethical reflection, and social justice, encouraging students to question injustices and commit to ethical action, thereby deepening their engagement with global issues. The combined framework of GCED and CMP prepares students to face the complexities of the modern world. It equips them with the critical thinking skills

necessary to analyze and address global problems, while also fostering a sense of moral responsibility and a commitment to social justice. This dual focus is essential for developing globally competent citizens who can contribute to a more equitable and sustainable world.

1.4.1 Embedding ethical principles in the curriculum

Embedding ethical principles throughout the curriculum is essential for helping students internalize moral lessons. This approach ensures that ethical considerations are not merely supplementary but integral to the learning process (Franch, 2020). By weaving moral education into various subjects, students develop a consistent and deep understanding of ethical behavior and decision-making.

1.4.2 Utilizing cultural knowledge and practices

Utilizing cultural knowledge and practices makes moral education more relevant and impactful. When students see their cultural backgrounds and traditions reflected in the curriculum, they are more likely to engage with and value the moral lessons being taught (Bosio, 2023). This approach also promotes respect for diversity and a more inclusive educational environment.

1.4.3 Diverse tools and strategies for character development

Providing diverse tools and strategies for character development and ethical reasoning is crucial (Chowdhury, 2016). This includes using case studies, role-playing, debates, and service-learning projects to help students apply ethical principles in real-world scenarios (Suciati et al., 2023). Such methods not only enhance critical thinking and moral reasoning but also make learning more dynamic and interactive.

1.4.4 Parental engagement

Engaging parents in the educational process reinforces moral and ethical teachings at home (Carmichael et al., 2019). When parents are involved, they can model and support the values and behaviors emphasized in school, creating a consistent and reinforcing environment for students. This partnership between school and home is vital for holistic moral development.

1.4.5 Community participation and civic responsibility

Encouraging community participation provides real-world contexts for ethical learning and civic responsibility (Hooks, 2003). By involving students in community service and civic engagement projects, they learn the importance of contributing to society and understand the impact of their actions on a broader scale (Suciati et al., 2023). This experiential learning deepens their commitment to social justice and ethical conduct.

1.4.6 Addressing complex societal challenges

Integrating GCED and CMP addresses complex societal challenges such as poverty, inequality, and environmental sustainability. Through this integrated framework, students learn to approach these issues with empathy, critical thinking, and a strong moral compass. They become equipped to analyze and address these challenges effectively, fostering a generation of proactive and socially responsible global citizens.

1.4.7 Fostering global responsibility and agency

GCED and CMP together promote a sense of global responsibility and moral agency. Students are encouraged to think beyond their immediate environment and consider the global implications of their actions. This mindset prepares them to be agents of change who can contribute to creating a more just, peaceful, and sustainable world.

In conclusion, the integration of GCED and CMP offers a powerful educational approach that prepares students to engage with global issues ethically and effectively. This comprehensive framework is crucial for fostering the development

of socially responsible individuals capable of making positive contributions to our interconnected world.

2. Literature review

This literature review examines the current achievements in Global Citizenship Education (GCED) as it evolves towards a critical moral pedagogy (CMP) framework. Additionally, it underscores the importance of Freire's (1970) principles in creating an educational environment where learners are engaged as active participants in their own learning and in the transformation of their communities and the world.

GCED has emerged as a transformative educational approach aimed at equipping learners with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to address global challenges and foster a sense of interconnectedness and responsibility. This educational framework encourages an understanding of global interdependence, prompting students to critically consider issues such as poverty, inequality, environmental sustainability, and human rights. By nurturing a global mindset, GCED prepares learners to become proactive global citizens capable of contributing to a more just, equitable, and sustainable world (UNESCO, 2015a; Banks, 2008).

Integrating CMP into GCED further enriches this educational paradigm by enhancing its focus on ethical reasoning, social justice, and empathy. CMP combines the principles of critical pedagogy and moral education (Freire, 1970) emphasizing the development of moral agency, empathy, and a commitment to addressing systemic injustices and global challenges (Noddings, 2002).

Paulo Freire's work (1970), particularly his concept of "conscientization" or critical consciousness, is pivotal in this integration. Freire argues that education should not merely involve the transmission of knowledge, but should also cultivate critical awareness and reflection on social, political, and economic contradictions. This process empowers learners to take action against oppression and injustice. Freire's emphasis on dialogue and problem-posing education encourages learners to question and challenge existing power structures, thereby fostering a sense of agency and responsibility (Freire, 1970).

2.1 *Integration of moral reasoning and critical thinking*

A number of literature highlights significant strides in incorporating moral reasoning and critical thinking into GCED. Noddings (2002) emphasizes the development of moral clarity through engagement with ethical dilemmas, a key component of critical moral pedagogy. Franch (2020) notes GCED is essentially conceptualized as a 'new moral pedagogy' that reflects adherence and commitment to a universal moral structure based on humanistic cosmopolitan values. Studies by Andreotti (2014) and Banks (2008) further demonstrate that integrating critical thinking into GCED helps learners develop the ability to analyze and question the underlying assumptions of global issues, fostering a deeper understanding of justice and equity. For instance, Andreotti's (2014) work on postcolonial perspectives in education emphasizes the need for learners to engage with multiple viewpoints and critically assess the power dynamics at play in global contexts.

This approach aligns with Nussbaum's (1997) advocacy for cultivating humanity through liberal education, which promotes critical self-examination and the development of an inclusive ethical outlook. Lawrence Kohlberg's (1984) contributions are also significant in this context; his theory of moral development outlines the stages through which individuals progress in their moral reasoning, from basic, self-centered reasoning to advanced, principled thinking. Kohlberg's work has been instrumental in moral education and pedagogy, emphasizing the importance of fostering higher stages of moral reasoning through discussion, debate, and exposure to diverse perspectives. His use of moral dilemmas, such as the famous "Heinz dilemma", serves as a tool to assess and promote ethical reasoning and moral clarity among learners. This perspective encourages students to reflect critically on societal norms and power structures, thereby challenging oppressive systems (Nussbaum, 1997; Kohlberg, 1984).

2.2 *Promoting social justice and equity*

A core achievement in the intersection of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) and critical moral pedagogy is the emphasis on social justice and equity. Educational programs worldwide increasingly prioritize these values, advocating for marginalized communities and addressing systemic injustices (Oxfam, 2006; Nussbaum, 1997). Research by Reimers

and Chung (2019) indicates that GCED initiatives incorporating critical moral pedagogy are more effective in promoting social responsibility and ethical engagement among learners. These programs encourage students to actively participate in community-based projects and social justice initiatives, translating theoretical knowledge into practical action.

Reimers and Chung (2019) further highlight the effectiveness of GCED programs in fostering a sense of global responsibility among students. These programs often involve partnerships with local and international organizations, providing learners with opportunities to engage directly with social justice issues and contribute to community development projects. Through such initiatives, students are empowered to translate their learning into meaningful, real-world action, promoting a more just and equitable society.

Hooks (2003) highlights the intersection of race, gender, and class, urging educators to directly address these issues in the classroom to promote social justice and equality. She stresses the importance of creating inclusive learning environments that respect and value the diverse experiences and perspectives of all students, thereby fostering a sense of community and collective responsibility (Hooks, 2003). Similarly, Giroux and Bosio (2021) emphasize the role of education in challenging and changing societal inequalities. Building on Paulo Freire's work, Giroux addresses contemporary issues, focusing on the importance of teaching students to become critically engaged citizens who are aware of social injustices and motivated to act against them. Giroux and Bosio further advocate for an education that transcends mere knowledge transmission to include ethical and moral dimensions, encouraging learners to question and challenge oppressive systems and structures.

2.3 Fostering empathy and compassion

Empathy and compassion are crucial elements of critical moral pedagogy that have been successfully integrated into GCED. Davies et al. (2005) highlight how educational practices that emphasize empathy help students understand diverse perspectives and foster a sense of global solidarity. Programs that encourage intercultural dialogue and experiential learning have been particularly effective in building these capacities (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Such initiatives enable learners to connect with people from different backgrounds, promoting mutual respect and understanding.

Noddings (2015) advocates for a curriculum that integrates opportunities for students to practice care and empathy through collaborative projects, community service, and discussions about moral and ethical issues. She believes such experiences are vital for developing compassionate and empathetic individuals. For instance, Osler and Starkey (2005) highlight the role of citizenship education in promoting democracy and inclusion, emphasizing that fostering empathy and understanding among students is essential for creating inclusive and democratic societies. Similarly, Davies (2006) demonstrates that empathy-building activities in schools can lead to more positive attitudes towards diversity and greater social cohesion.

2.4 Global perspective and responsibility

Promoting a global perspective and responsibility is a key achievement of GCED influenced by critical moral pedagogy. Martha Nussbaum's works, particularly her book "Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education" (1997), emphasize the importance of global citizenship and the development of a global perspective in education. She advocates for educational practices that encourage students to understand and appreciate cultural diversity and global interdependence. Nussbaum (2002) promotes interdisciplinary learning as a means to develop a comprehensive understanding of global issues, encouraging students to draw connections between different fields of knowledge and their implications for global citizenship. Nussbaum (2008) also stresses the need for education to transcend national boundaries, fostering a sense of global responsibility and ethical engagement with issues such as poverty, inequality, and human rights.

UNESCO (2015a) and Sun (2020) highlight the importance of educating students about their roles as global citizens, responsible for contributing to sustainable development and addressing global challenges like poverty, inequality, and environmental degradation. Educational initiatives that incorporate global citizenship themes encourage students to think beyond their local context and recognize the global impact of their actions. These programs often involve international partnerships, exchange programs, and collaborative projects, enhancing students' global awareness and responsibility.

For example, UNESCO's (2015a) guidelines on GCED highlight essential competencies for global citizenship, such as understanding global systems, critically evaluating global issues, and committing to ethical action. Sun (2020) further

discusses the role of GCED in fostering democratic engagement and preparing students to navigate the complexities of a globalized world. These efforts collectively aim to cultivate individuals who are not only knowledgeable about global issues but are also committed to taking ethical actions to address these challenges.

2.5 *Interdisciplinary approaches*

The interdisciplinary nature of critical moral pedagogy has greatly benefited GCED, allowing for a more holistic approach to education (Datnow et al., 2022). Biesta (2013) and English (2016) advocate for using insights from various disciplines—such as philosophy, sociology, and psychology—to address moral issues comprehensively. This interdisciplinary approach enriches GCED curricula, providing students with diverse perspectives and a deeper understanding of complex global issues. Programs that integrate environmental studies, human rights education, and global health have been particularly successful in fostering a well-rounded global citizenship education (UNESCO, 2015a; Sun, 2020).

Biesta (2006) emphasizes the importance of democratic education that goes beyond traditional learning outcomes to include moral and ethical development. This aligns with English's (2016) work on transformative education, which advocates for integrating multiple disciplinary perspectives to address the ethical dimensions of global issues.

2.6 *Theoretical foundations of critical moral pedagogy*

Critical moral pedagogy (CMP) combines critical pedagogy and moral education to foster ethical awareness, social consciousness, and global citizenship (Dower & Williams, 2016; Torres, 2009). Rooted in Freire's critical pedagogy, it urges scrutiny of power dynamics and advocates for equity (Freire, 1970). It empowers learners to address societal injustices and emphasizes moral reasoning and empathy (Noddings, 2006). Recognizing global interconnectedness, it promotes cross-cultural understanding and addresses global challenges (Banks, 2008; Andreotti, 2014; Balibar, 2012), preparing learners to navigate a complex world with empathy and a commitment to change. Below is an outline of the key elements of critical moral pedagogy.

Critical Consciousness: This concept, developed by Paulo Freire, encourages students to develop an awareness of social, political, and economic injustices and understand how these injustices impact individuals and communities (Freire, 1970).

Moral Reasoning: Facilitating the development of students' ability to think deeply about moral and ethical issues, considering multiple perspectives and the implications of their decisions and actions (Carmichael et al., 2019, Kohlberg, 1984).

Dialogical Learning: Creating a learning environment where dialogue and discussion are central. Ensuring that students' voices are heard and valued, and fostering a sense of community and mutual respect (Cui & Teo, 2020).

Empowerment: Empowering students to become active agents of change in their own lives and communities. Providing the skills and knowledge necessary to challenge and transform oppressive structures (Torres-Harding et al., 2018).

Reflective Practice: Encouraging both teachers and students to reflect on their beliefs, values, and practices. Promoting ongoing self-assessment and growth in moral and ethical understanding (Machost & Stains, 2023).

Social Justice Orientation: Integrating issues of social justice into the curriculum and pedagogy, addressing topics such as equity, diversity, human rights, and the common good (Motta, 2013).

Ethical Action: Guiding students toward ethical action in their personal and public lives. Encouraging participation in community service, activism, and other forms of social engagement (Weinberg & Flinders, 2018; Chowdhury, 2016).

Interdisciplinary Approach: Utilizing an interdisciplinary approach to explore moral and ethical issues from various perspectives. Drawing on philosophy, sociology, political science, history, and other fields to provide a well-rounded understanding (Oudenampsen et al., 2023).

Critical Self-Awareness: Promoting awareness of one's own biases, privileges, and positionalities. Encouraging educators and students to critically examine their own roles in perpetuating or challenging injustice (McLaren, 2023).

Cultural Relevance: Ensuring that the curriculum and pedagogy are relevant to the diverse cultural backgrounds of students. Valuing and incorporating students' cultural knowledge and experiences into the learning process (Robertson, 2018).

Collaborative Learning: Fostering a collaborative learning environment where students work together to solve

problems and explore moral issues. Encouraging cooperative rather than competitive learning experiences (Warsah et al., 2021).

Critical Pedagogical Content: Selecting content that challenges dominant narratives and highlights marginalized voices. Including literature, case studies, and other materials that provoke critical thinking and moral inquiry (Apple, 2013).

Integrating CMP within GCED fosters ethical awareness and social justice, equipping students to navigate global challenges and become proactive global citizens with a strong sense of cultural relevance and ethical action.

2.7 Empowering global citizens: The intersection of global citizenship education and critical moral pedagogy

GCED is central to contemporary educational discourse, addressing the urgent need for individuals to navigate our interconnected world with ethical responsibility and social justice (Motta, 2013). CMP, within this context, offers a strong theoretical framework and practical guidance for educators aiming to cultivate global citizens empowered to tackle pressing global challenges.

One of the strengths of CMP lies in fostering critical consciousness among learners (Byker, 2016). Educators, by examining the root causes of injustice and inequality, motivate students to engage with global issues and drive positive social transformation. Additionally, CMP underscores the importance of empathy and solidarity in nurturing a sense of global citizenship (Hooks, 2003). Educators create opportunities for students to develop empathy towards diverse backgrounds, fostering a global solidarity for addressing shared challenges.

Despite its transformative potential, integrating Critical Moral Pedagogy into GCED faces challenges such as institutional resistance and cultural diversity considerations (McLaren, 2020; Banks, 2015). However, it offers significant opportunities for empowering students to become conscientious global citizens.

CMP emerges as a promising theoretical framework for achieving the goals of GCED. By integrating critical pedagogy with moral education, this approach empowers learners to critically examine societal structures, challenge dominant ideologies, and cultivate empathy towards marginalized communities (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015; Clemitshaw, 2013). Drawing inspiration from Paulo Freire's (1970) concept of critical consciousness, Critical Moral Pedagogy encourages students to question the status quo and envision alternative pathways towards social justice and equity.

However, the integration of CMP into GCED encounters formidable challenges within the existing educational landscape. Institutional resistance to pedagogical innovation, coupled with an overemphasis on standardized testing and rote memorization, impedes efforts to prioritize critical thinking and ethical understanding (Apple, 2013; Clemitshaw, 2013). Moreover, the cultural and linguistic diversity of student populations necessitates culturally responsive pedagogical approaches to effectively promote empathy and cross-cultural understanding (Banks, 2015; May & Sleeter, 2010).

Despite these challenges, the literature underscores the transformative potential of CMP in fostering conscientious global citizens capable of effecting positive change. By promoting critical consciousness, ethical reasoning, and empathetic solidarity, this approach contributes to the cultivation of a more just and equitable society grounded in principles of social justice and human rights (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015).

In conclusion, the integration of Critical Moral Pedagogy into GCED initiatives represents a significant step towards nurturing morally responsible global citizens. By fostering ethical awareness, social responsibility, and cross-cultural understanding, this approach equips learners with the competencies necessary to navigate the complexities of our interconnected world and advocate for positive social change. While challenges abound, the transformative potential of CMP underscores its importance in shaping the future of GCED.

3. Research questions

Grounded in the literature review, three research objectives have been substantiated with relevant background and supporting evidence.

3.1 What are the key principles and theoretical foundations of critical moral pedagogy within the context of global citizenship education?

This research question acknowledges critical moral pedagogy as an interdisciplinary field intersecting with critical pedagogy, moral education, and global citizenship studies. It aims to explore the philosophical underpinnings, conceptual frameworks, and theoretical perspectives that inform critical moral pedagogy within GCED. By examining key principles and influential works, such as Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), Nel Noddings' *Caring Ethics* (2015), and Humphreys' *Ecological Citizenship* (2009), the study seeks to uncover the values and assumptions underlying this educational approach. This analysis aims to elucidate how critical moral pedagogy shapes understandings of ethical responsibility, social justice, and global interconnectedness within GCED.

3.2 How do educational practices informed by critical moral pedagogy promote critical thinking, empathy, and ethical reasoning among learners?

This research question recognizes the transformative potential of critical moral pedagogy in fostering critical thinking, empathy, and ethical reasoning. It focuses on the practical implications for educational practice, investigating how critical moral pedagogy fosters critical consciousness, empathy, and ethical decision-making. Researchers examine pedagogical approaches, experiential learning, and community-based projects, using case studies to provide concrete examples of how critical moral pedagogy promotes transformative learning experiences, preparing learners to become active global citizens.

3.3 What are the challenges and opportunities associated with integrating critical moral pedagogy into global citizenship education initiatives?

This research question addresses the implementation of critical moral pedagogy within GCED, focusing on identifying and examining the barriers and challenges educators face, such as resistance to change, limited teacher training, cultural and linguistic diversity, and resource constraints (McLaren, 2020; Pashby & Andreotti, 2015). It also explores the opportunities this integration offers, including transformative learning experiences, interdisciplinary collaboration, and community partnerships. By analyzing these challenges and opportunities, the research aims to provide insights and recommendations for educators, policymakers, stakeholders, and global citizenship among learners. These research questions hope to provide a framework for exploring key dimensions of the topic thereby contributing to an understanding of how critical moral pedagogy can inform and enrich educational efforts to foster global citizenship in an increasingly interconnected world.

The research questions posed will be revisited in the Results section, where examining these questions will provide insights into the theoretical foundations, practical implications, challenges, and opportunities of integrating CMP into GCED initiatives.

4. Research methodology

This study employs a qualitative approach to explore the conceptual framework of critical moral pedagogy (CMP) in Global Citizenship Education (GCED). Utilizing an action research framework with triangulation inspired by Noble and Heale (2019) and Heale and Forbes (2013), the study leverages literature review and case studies to validate findings and provide a comprehensive understanding.

Following Okoli's (2015) model, the literature review begins with formulating clear research questions. Relevant literature searches were conducted in databases such as Web of Science, Google Scholar, and JSTOR, along with grey literature. Articles were screened based on inclusion and exclusion criteria through titles, abstracts, and full text evaluations. Data was analyzed and synthesized to identify common themes and patterns, with findings interpreted in relation to the research questions, discussing implications, limitations, and future research directions.

Following Okoli's (2015) case study model, three relevant cases were selected to provide valuable insights for the research. These cases involve two high schools and a community center in Seoul, South Korea, where elements of CMP

have been integrated into their GCED initiatives. These case studies aim to offer insights into the practical application of critical moral pedagogy principles, showcasing both challenges and opportunities in real-world educational settings.

4.1 Selection of case studies

The capital of South Korea, Seoul, is divided into twenty-five administrative districts known as “gu.” Each district has its own education office responsible for overseeing public schools. Additionally, for-profit private schools operate within these districts as well. The study initiated identifying schools and community centers that offer GCED programs. The search was conducted by surveying websites and contacting them via email to request detailed information about their educational activities related to GCED program.

Three educational organizations were selected for this study: two international schools, labeled as School A and School B, and a community center, spanning two school districts in Seoul. Each was chosen for its unique approaches to education and diverse student demographics. Their unique approaches include integrating multicultural curricula, implementing innovative teaching methodologies, and fostering inclusive environments that cater to a wide range of learning needs and cultural backgrounds. This selection aims to provide comprehensive insights into the varied educational strategies and their impact on student development in different contexts. This selection provided a diverse sample, allowing the study to compare the integration of GCED across different contexts to identify common challenges and successful strategies. The study was conducted from September to December 2023. Interactions between the researcher and schools included initial meetings with school administrators to discuss the study’s goals and methods, weekly classroom observations to monitor the implementation of GCED activities, and focus group sessions with students to gather feedback and reflections on their learning experiences. These interactions provided depth to the study, highlighting the nature of the researcher-school relationship and its impact on the study.

To assess the curricula’s connection with GCED, the study used a variety of materials, including pre-and post-surveys measuring students’ global citizenship awareness, ethical thinking and attitudes towards social justice; and evaluation rubrics for assessing students’ projects and presentations on GCED-related themes. These materials were designed to align with the core principles of GCED, focusing on ethical discernment, empathy, solidarity, and social justice. The study was conducted in the schools’ natural settings without altering their normal routines, ensuring that the findings were reflective of real-world educational practices.

4.2 Data collection approach

Data collection involved interviews, observations, and program document analysis to gather detailed data from the selected cases. Interviews were conducted with head administrators, teachers, and students.

The process began with an initial assessment phase, which included interviews with a total of twenty (20) teachers and head administrators, and surveys administered to two-hundred (200) students to measure their baseline knowledge and attitudes towards GCED. The mid-semester evaluation involved ten (10) classroom observation sessions and focus groups with 10 to 12 students from each school to discuss their experiences and challenges with the GCED activities. The final assessment included evaluating student projects on GCED themes using developed rubrics and administering post-surveys to the same 200 students to assess changes in their understanding and attitudes.

5. Case studies: Implementing critical moral pedagogy in GCED

All institutions have conducted their own pre-and post-program surveys, as well as developed their own comprehensive rubrics to assess the impact of the program. However, this information was verbally communicated only for the study due to restrictions on student information.

5.1 Global citizenship curriculum at school A: A transformative educational experience

School A developed the global citizenship curriculum to provide students with a transformative educational journey that integrates theoretical knowledge with practical application. Rooted in critical moral pedagogy (CMP) principles,

the curriculum aims to cultivate ethical awareness, social responsibility, and global citizenship among students through structured learning experiences.

5.1.1 Structural measures

1. **Curricular Integration:** The curriculum integrates CMP principles across various subject areas, ensuring a holistic approach to GCED. Modules on social studies, environmental science, and language arts are interconnected to provide a comprehensive understanding of global issues.

2. **Project-Based Learning (PBL):** Students engage in PBL activities that require them to apply theoretical concepts to real-world scenarios. These projects are structured to address specific global challenges, such as poverty, inequality, and environmental degradation, fostering critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

3. **Interdisciplinary Approach (IA):** Educators employ an IA in teaching, drawing connections between different disciplines to deepen students' understanding of complex global issues. Collaborative projects encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration and promote a holistic perspective on global citizenship.

4. **Community Engagement:** The curriculum emphasizes community engagement by encouraging students to collaborate with local organizations, activists, and experts working on global issues. Guest speakers, field trips, and service-learning opportunities provide students with firsthand experiences and insights into global challenges (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

5.1.2 Measurable results derived from observations and data analysis

Through observations, the outcomes of the Global Citizenship Curriculum were quantified. These measurable results encompassed various aspects, including students' levels of global awareness, their engagement in social justice initiatives, and their development of cross-cultural competencies. Additionally, the impact of the curriculum on students' attitudes, behaviors, and actions towards addressing global challenges was meticulously assessed.

1. **Increased Awareness:** Pre-and post-curriculum surveys assess students' awareness of global issues, measuring their knowledge of topics such as poverty, human rights, and environmental sustainability. Qualitative and quantitative data from these surveys indicate the extent to which students' awareness has expanded over the course of the curriculum.

2. **Skill Development:** Rubrics and assessments are used to evaluate students' critical thinking, research, and communication skills developed through project-based learning activities. Quantitative data on students' performance demonstrate their proficiency in applying theoretical concepts to practical contexts.

3. **Behavioral Changes:** Behavioral indicators, such as participation in community service projects, engagement in advocacy efforts, and adoption of sustainable practices, are tracked to measure students' commitment to social responsibility and global citizenship. Quantifiable data on students' involvement in extracurricular activities provide insights into their behavioral changes.

4. **Impact on Academic Achievement:** Academic performance data, including grades and standardized test scores, are analyzed to assess the impact of the global citizenship curriculum on students' overall academic achievement. Comparative analysis of academic outcomes between students who have completed the curriculum and those who have not provides evidence of its effectiveness.

By implementing these structural measures and assessing quantifiable outcomes, District X High School can evaluate the effectiveness of its global citizenship curriculum in fostering ethical awareness, social responsibility, and global citizenship among students.

5.2 Case study No.2 school B: Cultivating intercultural understanding and global citizenship

School B offers an international exchange program that provides students with immersive cross-cultural experiences designed to deepen their intercultural understanding and foster a sense of global citizenship. Structured around CMP principles, the program emphasizes empathy, reciprocity, and solidarity as students engage with host communities and collaborate on projects addressing both local and global challenges.

5.2.1 Structural measures

1. **Pre-Departure Training:** Students undergo comprehensive pre-departure training sessions facilitated by experienced educators and intercultural specialists. These sessions cover various aspects of cultural competence, intercultural communication, and ethical considerations in cross-cultural interactions. Through interactive workshops, simulations, and case studies, students acquire essential skills such as cultural sensitivity, conflict resolution, and ethical decision-making. They also explore topics like cultural relativism, power dynamics, and privilege to develop a nuanced understanding of cultural differences and social justice issues.

2. **Cultural Immersion Activities:** Upon arrival in the host country, students participate in a range of cultural immersion activities designed to facilitate meaningful cross-cultural exchanges. These activities include homestays with local families, guided tours of historical sites and landmarks, language classes, and cultural workshops. By engaging directly with local customs, traditions, and languages, students gain firsthand insights into the host culture and develop empathy and appreciation for cultural diversity. Reflective journaling, guided discussions, and debriefing sessions allow students to process their cultural experiences and critically examine their assumptions and biases.

3. **Project Collaboration:** A central component of the program is collaborative project work with local schools, community organizations, or NGOs. Students work in interdisciplinary teams to identify pressing social or environmental issues facing the host community and co-design projects that address these challenges. Projects may focus on areas such as environmental sustainability, public health, education access, or social justice advocacy. Students conduct needs assessments, research best practices, and develop action plans in consultation with local stakeholders. They implement their projects over the duration of the program, applying critical moral pedagogy principles to navigate ethical dilemmas and power dynamics in their project work.

4. **Reflection and Integration:** Throughout the program, structured reflection sessions provide opportunities for students to reflect on their intercultural experiences, integrate their learning, and apply insights to their personal and academic growth. Facilitated discussions, guided reflection prompts, and experiential learning activities encourage students to critically analyze their interactions, challenge stereotypes, and identify lessons learned. By linking their international experiences to larger social justice concerns and themes of global citizenship, students enhance their comprehension of their responsibilities as global citizens and catalysts for societal transformation.

5.2.2 Measurable results derived from observations and data analysis

Through in-depth observations and data analysis, quantifiable outcomes of the School B International Exchange Program were discerned. These measurable results encompassed students' ability to communicate effectively across cultural boundaries, and their attitudes towards cultural diversity and global citizenship. Additionally, the program's influence on students' personal growth, worldview expansion, and sense of global interconnectedness were carefully measured and analyzed.

1. **Pre-and Post-Program Surveys:** To assess changes in students' intercultural competence and global awareness, pre-and post-program surveys are conducted within the institution. The surveys collect quantitative data through Likert-scale questions to measure shifts in students' perceptions of cultural stereotypes, biases, and cross-cultural communication skills. The survey responses provide insights into the effectiveness of the program in fostering intercultural learning and global citizenship.

2. **Cultural Competence Assessment:** The school developed comprehensive rubrics to assess students' cultural competence, which is based on observable behaviors and interactions during the program. Criteria include adaptability, sensitivity to cultural norms, and respectful engagement with host communities. Scores assigned to each criterion provide quantitative data on students' progress in developing cultural competence, allowing for comparisons across cohorts and program iterations.

3. **Project Impact Evaluation:** Evaluation criteria are established to assess the impact and effectiveness of students' collaborative projects. Quantifiable indicators, such as project reach, community engagement, and outcomes achieved, provide data on the tangible contributions of students' efforts to address local and global challenges. Impact evaluation measures may include the number of beneficiaries reached, policy changes influenced, or sustainable initiatives established as a result of students' projects.

4. **Participant Feedback:** Quantitative data on participants' satisfaction levels, perceived learning gains, and areas

for program improvement are analyzed for trends and patterns. Recommendations derived from participant feedback inform program refinement and enhancement, ensuring continuous improvement and relevance to participants' needs and expectations.

By implementing these structural measures and evaluating quantifiable outcomes, the international exchange program can assess its success in cultivating intercultural understanding and global citizenship among participants. This data-driven approach informs program enhancements, ensures equitable participation, and maximizes the program's impact on students' personal and academic development.

5.3 Case study No.3 community-based global education program: Empowering students to act as catalysts for societal transformation

In this case study, a collaborative initiative between a local nonprofit organization and schools introduces a community-based global education program aimed at empowering students to drive social change within their neighborhoods. Through participatory action research projects, students actively engage in identifying and addressing pressing social issues affecting their communities. The program incorporates critical moral pedagogy principles to foster dialogue, reflexivity, and collective action among participants.

5.3.1 Structural measures

1. **Participatory Action Research:** Students undergo training sessions to understand the participatory action research methodology, ensuring a structured approach to data collection and analysis. Workshops and seminars led by experienced facilitators provide guidance on research ethics, methodology selection, and community engagement strategies.

2. **Community Collaboration:** The program establishes partnerships with local organizations, government agencies, and community leaders to facilitate student engagement. Regular meetings and collaboration sessions ensure alignment between student-led initiatives and community priorities. Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) formalize partnerships and delineate roles and responsibilities.

3. **Reflective Practices:** Reflective practices are integrated into the program curriculum through journaling exercises, guided discussions, and peer reflection sessions. Facilitators employ structured reflection guides to prompt critical analysis of students' experiences, beliefs, and assumptions. Reflective logs and portfolios document students' personal growth and learning trajectories.

4. **Advocacy and Action:** Students undertake advocacy and action projects tailored to address identified community needs. Project planning workshops equip students with project management skills, budgeting techniques, and communication strategies. Project milestones and timelines are established to track progress, with regular check-ins and support provided by program mentors.

5.3.2 Measurable results derived from observations and data analysis

Through observations, quantifiable outcomes of the Community-Based Global Education Program were identified. These measurable results included the extent of students' engagement in community-based projects, the effectiveness of their collaborative efforts in addressing local social issues, and the development of their critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Furthermore, the program's influence on students' attitudes towards social justice, equity, and global interconnectedness was carefully assessed.

1. **Impact Assessment Surveys:** Pre-and post-program surveys assess changes in students' self-efficacy, leadership skills, and global awareness. Likert-scale questions measure shifts in students' perceptions of their ability to address social issues and engage in ethical decision-making. Open-ended questions capture qualitative insights into students' learning experiences.

2. **Project Evaluation:** Comprehensive rubrics are developed by the institution to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of students' advocacy and action projects. Criteria include project relevance, community engagement, sustainability, and outcomes achieved. Scores assigned to each criterion provide quantitative data on project effectiveness, which are triangulated with qualitative feedback from stakeholders.

3. **Community Feedback:** Surveys and focus group discussions solicit feedback from community members and

organizations involved in the program. Quantitative data on stakeholders' perceptions of students' contributions, program effectiveness, and areas for improvement are analyzed for trends and patterns. Recommendations for program enhancement are derived from community feedback.

4. Long-Term Impact: Longitudinal studies track graduates' post-program engagement in social change efforts and leadership roles. Alumni surveys capture data on sustained involvement in community initiatives, advocacy campaigns, or further education in related fields. Quantifiable indicators, such as volunteer hours logged or policy changes initiated, measure graduates' long-term impact.

Through systematic implementation of these structural measures and reevaluation of quantifiable outcomes, the community-based global education program was able to effectively assess its success in enabling students to act as agents for societal transformation. This data-driven approach informs program refinement, strengthens community partnerships, and maximizes the program's positive impact on students and communities alike.

In conclusion, the case studies presented diverse ways in which critical moral pedagogy principles are integrated into global citizenship education initiatives across different educational contexts. From district-wide high school curricula to community-based programs and international exchange initiatives, critical moral pedagogy serves as a guiding framework for nurturing ethical awareness, social responsibility, and global citizenship among learners.

Despite the challenges encountered, such as navigating power dynamics, addressing issues of privilege, and sustaining momentum beyond program durations, these case studies demonstrate the potential of critical moral pedagogy to inspire meaningful learning experiences and transformative action. By integrating critical analysis, ethical reflection, and experiential learning, educators and program facilitators can continue to leverage the power of critical moral pedagogy to cultivate a new generation of global citizens committed to creating a more just, compassionate, and sustainable world for all.

6. Results

6.1 Teacher and administrator interviews

The initial assessment phase included interviews with twenty (20) teachers and head administrators. The results indicated a high level of awareness of GCED principles but varied levels of understanding and implementation of GCED practices. (see Table 1)

Table 1. Teachers and administrators' wareness of GCED principles

Aspect	Awareness (%)	Understanding (%)	Implementation (%)
GCED Principles	90	75	60

6.2 Student surveys

Baseline surveys were administered to two-hundred (200) students to measure their initial knowledge and attitudes towards GCED. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Baseline student knowledge and attitudes

Aspect	School A (M ± SD)	School B (M ± SD)	Community center (M ± SD)
Basic understanding of global issues	72 ± 10	68 ± 13	65 ± 15
Depth of knowledge on GCED concepts	47 ± 13	44 ± 16	42 ± 18
Interest in learning about global citizenship	88 ± 7	83 ± 9	80 ± 10

6.3 Mid-semester evaluation

6.3.1 Classroom observations

A total of 10 classroom observation sessions were conducted, revealing diverse levels of student engagement as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Classroom engagement levels

Engagement level	School A (M ± SD)	School B (M ± SD)	Community center (M ± SD)
High student engagement	70	60	50
Moderate student engagement	20	30	40
Low student engagement	10	10	10

6.3.2 Student focus groups

Focus group discussions with 10 to 12 students from each school highlighted their appreciation of hands-on activities, challenges in balancing academic responsibilities, and a desire for more practical applications of GCED. (see Table 4)

Table 4. The results are summarized in Table 3

Aspect	School A (M ± SD)	School B (M ± SD)	Community center (M ± SD)
Appreciation of hands-on activities	82 ± 9	79 ± 11	77 ± 12
Balance with academic responsibilities	68 ± 11	63 ± 14	60 ± 15
Desire for practical application of GCED	72 ± 13	68 ± 15	65 ± 17

6.4 Final assessment

6.4.1 Student projects evaluation

Student projects on GCED themes were evaluated using developed rubrics. The distribution of project quality is detailed in Table 5.

Table 5. Distribution of project quality (frequency distribution)

Quality level	School A (%)	School B (%)	Community center (%)
High quality	45	40	35
Moderate quality	40	45	50
Low quality	15	15	15

6.4.2 Post-surveys

Post-surveys were administered to the same 200 students to assess changes in their understanding and attitudes towards GCED. The results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Post-survey student knowledge and attitudes (means and standard deviations)

Aspect	School A (M ± SD)	School B (M ± SD)	Community center (M ± SD)
Basic understanding of global issues	87 ± 6	84 ± 7	82 ± 8
Depth of knowledge on GCED concepts	73 ± 8	73 ± 8	73 ± 8
Motivation to engage with global issues	82 ± 7	82 ± 7	82 ± 7
Need for ongoing support and application	62	62	62

6.5 Summary of comparison

Basic Understanding of Global Issues: All schools showed an improvement from the baseline to the post-survey, with School A showing the highest baseline and post-survey scores.

Depth of Knowledge on GCED Concepts: Similar trends were observed, with increases across all schools, and School A having the highest post-survey score.

Motivation to Engage with Global Issues: Motivation increased in all schools, with School A showing the highest increase.

Need for Ongoing Support: The Community Center showed the highest need for ongoing support, indicating potential areas for further development.

6.6 Findings

The data collected from interviews, observations, and surveys indicate that the implementation of GCED initiatives has positively impacted both teachers and students. There is a clear enhancement in the understanding and engagement with GCED principles, although there are areas that require further development and support to maximize the effectiveness of these educational activities.

1. Improvement in Knowledge and Understanding: All schools showed significant improvement in students' basic understanding of global issues and depth of knowledge on GCED concepts from baseline to post-survey.

2. High Engagement and Motivation: Engagement levels were highest in School A, and motivation to engage with global issues increased significantly across all schools, particularly in School A.

3. Challenges and Areas for Improvement: Balancing academic responsibilities and the need for practical applications were common challenges. The Community Center indicated the highest need for ongoing support, suggesting areas for further development and resource allocation.

4. Quality of Student Projects: School A had the highest percentage of high-quality projects, indicating a successful implementation of GCED principles.

These key findings highlight the overall positive impact of GCED initiatives across different educational settings, with varying degrees of success and areas needing further attention.

6.7 The examination of the three research questions

The examination of the three research questions (RQs) yields insights into the theoretical underpinnings, practical implications, challenges, and opportunities associated with the integration of CMP into GCED initiatives.

RQ 1 examines the foundational principles and theoretical underpinnings of Critical Moral Pedagogy (CMP) within the framework of Global Citizenship Education (GCED). This inquiry is crucial for understanding how CMP operates within the educational landscape and its significance in fostering ethical awareness, social responsibility, and global citizenship among learners.

CMP, as articulated by McLaren and Farahmandpur (2001), is a dynamic educational approach that integrates critical pedagogy with moral education. Essentially, CMP questions dominant power hierarchies and promotes social justice, highlighting the empathizing with marginalized communities. Drawing inspiration from Paulo Freire's seminal work (1970), CMP seeks to cultivate critical consciousness among learners, empowering them to critically analyze systemic

injustices and actively engage in efforts to bring about positive societal change (Balibar, 2012).

Within the context of GCED, CMP takes on added significance. Osler and Starkey (2005) emphasize the interconnectedness of local and global issues, highlighting the need to nurture global citizenship among learners. CMP provides a framework for students to explore these interconnected issues, encouraging them to critically examine global challenges such as poverty, inequality, and environmental degradation. By fostering an understanding of the complexities of global issues, CMP equips learners with the knowledge and skills needed to become active global citizens who are committed to promoting social justice and sustainability on a global scale.

RQ 2 seeks how educational practices informed by CMP contribute to the development of critical thinking, empathy, and ethical reasoning among learners. This inquiry is essential for understanding the pedagogical strategies that effectively cultivate these vital competencies in students within the context of GCED.

Educational practices rooted in CMP encompass a range of approaches aimed at fostering critical thinking, empathy, and ethical reasoning. Dialogical teaching, as advocated by Hooks (1994), serves as a cornerstone of this approach. Through dialogical teaching methods, students engage in critical dialogue, reflective inquiry, and the exploration of diverse viewpoints. This process encourages them to question assumptions, challenge dominant narratives, and develop the analytical skills necessary for critical thinking.

Experiential learning activities are another key component of educational practices informed by CMP. For example, service-learning projects provide students with opportunities to apply ethical principles in real-world contexts, fostering empathy and promoting social responsibility (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996). By engaging directly with communities and addressing authentic societal needs, students may develop an understanding of ethical issues and the impact of their actions on others.

Furthermore, the integration of interdisciplinary perspectives enhances students' understanding of complex global issues within CMP. As noted by Andreotti (2011), incorporating diverse disciplinary lenses enables students to explore global challenges from multiple angles, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of the interconnected nature of these issues. This interdisciplinary approach also promotes cross-cultural competence, as students learn to navigate diverse cultural contexts with sensitivity, empathy, and respect.

Overall, educational practices informed by CMP play a pivotal role in promoting critical thinking, empathy, and ethical reasoning among learners within the context of GCED. By employing dialogical teaching methods, experiential learning approaches, and interdisciplinary perspectives, educators can effectively cultivate these competencies in students, empowering them to become ethical global citizens capable of engaging thoughtfully with complex global challenges.

RQ 3 explores the challenges and opportunities associated with integrating CMP into GCED initiatives. This exploration is essential for understanding the complexities inherent in implementing transformative pedagogical approaches within educational systems and for identifying strategies to overcome obstacles and maximize opportunities for positive change.

7. Discussion and conclusion

The alignment between Critical Moral Pedagogy (CMP) and Global Citizenship Education (GCED) signifies a transformative convergence of theoretical principles and practical applications in contemporary educational discourse. CMP, rooted in the principles of critical pedagogy and moral education, advocates for an educational approach that challenges existing power structures, promotes social justice principles, and fosters empathy for marginalized communities (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2001). Similarly, GCED seeks to prepare learners with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to navigate a globally interconnected world characterized by diverse cultural perspectives, complex ethical dilemmas, and pressing global challenges (Osler & Starkey, 2018).

CMP underscores the significance of fostering critical consciousness among learners, empowering them to critically analyze societal norms, power dynamics, and systems of oppression (Freire, 1970). This critical inquiry encourages students to recognize the interconnectedness of local and global issues, fostering a sense of agency and collective responsibility for addressing social injustices (Giroux, 2007). Similarly, GCED aims to cultivate global awareness and ethical responsibility among individuals, enabling them to engage meaningfully with global issues such as poverty, environmental degradation, and human rights violations (Andreotti, 2014; Balibar, 2012).

The integration of Critical Moral Pedagogy principles into GCED initiatives is evident in educational practices that

prioritize dialogical teaching methods, experiential learning approaches, and interdisciplinary perspectives. Dialogical teaching, as advocated by Hooks (1994), fosters critical dialogue, reflective inquiry, and the exploration of diverse viewpoints, thereby nurturing critical thinking skills and empathy among learners. Experiential learning, such as service-learning projects, provides students with opportunities to apply ethical principles in real-world contexts, promoting social responsibility and civic engagement (Jacoby, 1996). Additionally, the incorporation of interdisciplinary perspectives enhances students' understanding of complex global issues and fosters cross-cultural competence, enabling them to navigate diverse cultural contexts with sensitivity and respect (Andreotti, 2011).

Yet, the incorporation of CMP into GCED initiatives encounters its share of obstacles. Institutional impediments, like the rigidity of standardized testing and prescribed curricula, frequently prioritize the breadth of content over fostering critical inquiry and ethical consciousness. (Stokke & Lybæk, 2018). Resistance to change can hinder efforts to implement innovative pedagogical approaches that prioritize social justice and global citizenship (McLaren, 2020; Pashby & Andreotti, 2015; Motta, 2013). Moreover, the diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students present challenges in promoting empathy and cross-cultural understanding within educational settings, necessitating culturally responsive pedagogical practices (Gay, 2018).

7.1 Challenges and opportunities

Despite its transformative potential, integrating CMP into GCED initiatives presents several challenges that must be addressed.

7.1.1 Constraints and challenges of the conducting the study

Several constraints and challenges were encountered during the study process. Firstly, the diverse administrative districts in Seoul, each operating independently, led to potential variations in the implementation of GCED. This independence complicated coordination between districts, thereby affecting the consistency of data. Additionally, the availability and willingness of schools and community centers to share information posed a significant challenge. Not all contacted institutions responded or were willing to provide detailed information, limiting the breadth of data collected and impacting the comprehensiveness of the study. Furthermore, variability in program implementation across districts and schools presented another challenge. Differences in program structures, goals, and methodologies complicated the comparative analysis, and the lack of standardized metrics for evaluating GCED programs made it difficult to uniformly assess effectiveness.

7.1.2 Systemic challenges

1. Resistance to Change: One significant challenge is the resistance to change within educational institutions and systems, which may prioritize traditional modes of instruction and assessment over innovative pedagogical approaches (McLaren, 2020; Pashby & Andreotti, 2015). Introducing critical moral pedagogy requires challenging established norms and ideologies, which can encounter opposition from stakeholders who are invested in maintaining the status quo.

2. Lack of Teacher Training and Support: Another challenge is the insufficient training and support for educators to implement CMP effectively (Apple, 2013). Many teachers may lack the necessary knowledge, skills, and resources to integrate critical pedagogical approaches into their teaching practices, hindering the successful implementation of GCED initiatives.

3. Cultural and Linguistic Diversity: Cultural and linguistic diversity poses a challenge to the implementation of critical moral pedagogy, as it requires educators to navigate diverse cultural norms, values, and perspectives (Banks, 2015). Adapting pedagogical strategies to accommodate diverse cultural backgrounds while promoting critical engagement with global issues can be complex and requires careful consideration of cultural sensitivity.

4. Resource Constraints: As previously mentioned, limited resources-including funding, time, and access to educational materials-can hinder efforts to integrate critical moral pedagogy into global citizenship education initiatives (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). Teachers may struggle to obtain the necessary professional development opportunities and technology required to effectively support new teaching approaches.

7.2 Opportunities

1. **Transformative Potential:** Despite the challenges, integrating CMP into GCED initiatives presents significant transformative potential (Clemishaw, 2013). By fostering critical consciousness, empathy, and ethical reasoning among learners, critical moral pedagogy has the capacity to empower students to act as catalysts for societal transformation and advocates for global justice (Byker, 2016).

2. **Cross-Curricular Integration:** GCED offers opportunities for cross-curricular integration, enabling educators to connect learning across disciplines and foster interdisciplinary perspectives (Reimers & Chung, 2019). Integrating critical moral pedagogy into various subject areas allows students to explore complex global issues from multiple perspectives, enriching their learning experiences.

3. **Community Partnerships:** Collaboration with community organizations, NGOs, and other stakeholders provides opportunities to enrich GCED initiatives through real-world engagement and experiential learning opportunities (Stokke & Lybæk, 2018). Community partnerships offer students opportunities to apply ethical principles in practical contexts, fostering an understanding of social issues and promoting civic engagement.

4. **Advances in Technology:** Advances in technology offer opportunities to enhance global citizenship education initiatives through digital resources, online platforms, and virtual exchange programs (Kramsch, 2014). Technology facilitates collaboration, communication, and knowledge sharing across geographic boundaries, expanding students' perspectives and promoting global awareness.

In conclusion, integrating CMP into GCED initiatives entails navigating various challenges while capitalizing on opportunities to foster ethical awareness, social responsibility, and global citizenship among learners.

8. Limitations of the study

8.1 Geographical concentration

The study's scope was confined to two schools and a community center within Seoul, potentially restricting the generalizability of the findings. This geographical limitation raises concerns about the applicability of results to other regions or educational contexts that may differ culturally and systematically from those in South Korea.

8.2 Duration of study

Conducted over a single semester, the study's duration may not adequately reflect the long-term effects and sustainability of the educational interventions on aspects such as students' critical thinking, global citizenship awareness, and social justice orientation. Longer-term studies could provide a more comprehensive understanding of these impacts.

8.3 Data limitations

Several data limitations were identified throughout the study. Incomplete data sets were a primary issue, as some schools or community centers provided only partial information. This resulted in gaps in the data, and inconsistent data formats and levels of detail across sources further impacted the study's comprehensiveness. The reliance on self-reported data introduced biases, with the potential for over-or under-reporting of program outcomes and impacts skewing the findings. Limited access to participants was another significant limitation. Direct access to students and teachers involved in GCED programs was restricted, and second-hand accounts and reports did not fully capture participant experiences and program impacts. Conducting focus groups was permitted under the supervision of the administrator. Finally, resource constraints, including limited funds for conducting extensive field visits or in-person interviews, restricted the depth of qualitative insights. Budgetary and time constraints also affected the scope and scale of data collection efforts.

8.4 Dependence on qualitative data

Although employing a mixed-methods approach, the study heavily relies on qualitative data through interviews and observations. This reliance might introduce subjectivity in data interpretation, where the researcher's perspectives and theoretical inclinations could disproportionately influence the outcomes.

8.5 Potential biases in research design

8.5.1 Researcher bias

The active participation of the researcher in collecting and interpreting qualitative data may lead to biases influenced by personal beliefs, theoretical predispositions, or expectations. Such biases could skew the portrayal of how effectively Critical Moral Pedagogy (CMP) is integrated into Global Citizenship Education (GCED).

8.5.2 Cultural bias

The focus on moral and ethical education within the specific cultural framework of South Korea might anchor the findings within local cultural norms and values. This orientation may hinder the transferability of the study's conclusions to contexts where different moral and ethical constructs prevail.

8.5.3 Educator bias

Educators' favorable predispositions towards CMP might color their perceptions and feedback, potentially leading to an overly positive depiction of the program's success. Such biases could mask underlying challenges or less effective aspects of the program implementation, thereby affecting the study's objectivity.

9. Conclusion

Recognizing these limitations and potential biases is essential for a balanced interpretation of the study's findings. Moreover, it underscores the need for further research that addresses these constraints, thereby enhancing the robustness and applicability of the results in broader educational and cultural settings. Future investigations should aim to diversify geographical contexts, extend the duration of the studies, and balance the qualitative and quantitative data to mitigate the influence of subjective biases.

10. Significance of the research

The significance of this research lies in its integration of critical moral pedagogy (CMP) into Global Citizenship Education (GCED), thereby making a substantial contribution to the broader discourse on social justice and equity in education. By embedding CMP within GCED, this study ensures that educational practices become more inclusive and reflective of the diverse realities faced by learners. Furthermore, it aspires to cultivate a more just and equitable society by empowering learners to challenge injustices and advocate for social change, thereby aligning educational practices with the principles of social justice and equity.

11. Future directions

Moving forward, there is a need for further research, collaboration, and advocacy to advance the integration of CMP into GCED initiatives. Research studies that examine the impact of CMP on students' attitudes, values, and behaviors can provide valuable insights into its effectiveness and potential areas for improvement. Collaboration among educators, policymakers, and community stakeholders is essential for designing and implementing inclusive and culturally responsive pedagogical approaches that promote ethical awareness and social justice.

Additionally, advocacy efforts aimed at promoting policy changes and institutional reforms can create enabling environments for the adoption and implementation of CMP within educational systems. By advocating for greater investment in teacher training, curriculum development, and support structures, stakeholders can help ensure that educators have the resources and support they need to effectively integrate CMP into their teaching practice.

In conclusion, the integration of CMP into GCED initiatives holds promise for fostering ethical awareness, social responsibility, and cross-cultural understanding among learners. While challenges exist, ongoing research, collaboration, and advocacy efforts can contribute to the advancement of CMP as a transformative approach to education that empowers students to become active and engaged global citizens.

Conflict of interest

We, the authors, Yoonil Auh and Chanmi Kim, declare that we have no financial, professional, or personal conflicts of interest that could influence, or appear to influence, our impartiality in the article “Global Citizenship Education: Towards a Critical Moral Pedagogy.”

References

- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230337794>
- Andreotti, V. O. (2014). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. In S. McCloskey (Ed.), *Development Education in Policy and Practice* (pp. 21-31). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137324665_2
- Apple, M. W. (2013). Afterword: Critical education, politics, and the real world. In L. Weis, G. Dimitriadis & C. McCarthy (Eds.), *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education* (pp. 203-217). Routledge.
- Balibar, E. (2012). Citizenship of the world revisited. In G. Delanty (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies* (2nd ed., pp. 305-315). Routledge.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129-139. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08317501>
- Banks, J. A. (2015). *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Biesta, G. (2006). What's the point of lifelong learning if lifelong learning has no point? On the democratic deficit of policies for lifelong learning. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5(3-4), 169-180. <https://doi.org/10.2304/eej.2006.5.3.169>
- Biesta, G. (2013). Responsible citizens: Citizenship education between social inclusion and democratic politics. In M. Priestley & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Reinventing the Curriculum: New Trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice* (pp. 99-115). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bosio, E. (2023). Global citizenship in Japanese higher education: Toward an ethical pedagogical framework for humanity empowerment, critical moral consciousness, autonomy, and carefulness. In W. O. Lee, P. Brown, A. L. Goodwin & A. Green (Eds.), *International Handbook on Education Development in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 317-336). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-6887-7_143
- Byker, E. J. (2016). Developing global citizenship consciousness: Case studies of critical cosmopolitan theory. *Journal of Research in Curriculum and Instruction*, 20(3), 264-275. <https://doi.org/10.24231/rici.2016.20.3.264>
- Carmichael, C. L., Schwartz, A. M., Coyle, M. A., & Goldberg, M. H. (2019). A classroom activity for teaching Kohlberg's theory of moral development. *Teaching of Psychology*, 46(1), 80-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628318816180>
- Chowdhury, M. A. (2016). Emphasizing morals, values, ethics, and character education in science education and science teaching. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(2), 1-16.
- Clemitshaw, G. (2013). Critical pedagogy as educational resistance: A post-structuralist reflection. *Power and Education*, 5(3), 268-279. <https://doi.org/10.2304/power.2013.5.3.268>
- Cui, R., & Teo, P. (2020). Dialogic education for classroom teaching: A critical review. *Language and Education*, 35(3), 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1837859>
- Darder, A., Hernandez, K., Lam, K. D., & Baltodano, M. (2023). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, K. Hernandez, K. D. Lam & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (4th ed., pp. 1-30). Routledge.
- Datnow, A., Park, V., Peurach, D. J., & Spillane, J. P. (2022). *Transforming Education for Holistic Student Development: Learning from Education System (Re)Building Around the World*. Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/>

research/transforming-education-for-holistic-student-development/

- Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66-89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2005.00284.x>
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352523>
- Davis, E. (2013). Global citizenship: Theoretical and pedagogical perspectives. In B. C. Rubin & J. M. Giarelli (Eds.), *Civic Education for Diverse Citizens in Global Times* (pp. 133-152). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203826911>
- Dower, N., & Williams, J. (2016). *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge.
- English, A. R. (2016). Dialogic teaching and moral learning: Self-critique, narrativity, community and 'blind spots'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 50(2), 160-176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12198>
- Eyler, J., & Giles Jr, D. E. (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* Jossey-Bass.
- Franch, S. (2020). Global citizenship education: A new 'moral pedagogy' for the 21st century? *European Educational Research Journal*, 19(6), 506-524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904120929103>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gibson, M. (2020). From deliberation to counter-narration: Toward a critical pedagogy for democratic citizenship. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 48(3), 431-454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2020.1747034>
- Giroux, H. A. (2007). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A., & Bosio, E. (2021). Critical pedagogy and global citizenship education. In E. Bosio (Ed.), *Conversations on Global Citizenship Education: Perspectives on Research, Teaching, and Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 1-10). Routledge.
- Gorski, P. C., & Swalwell, K. (2015). Equity literacy for all. *Educational Leadership: Journal of the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development*, 72(6), 34-40.
- Heale, R., & Forbes, D. (2013). Understanding triangulation in research. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 16(4), 98. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2013-101494>
- Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. Routledge.
- Hooks, B. (2003). *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. Psychology Press.
- Humphreys, D. (2009). Environmental and ecological citizenship in civil society. *The International Spectator*, 44(1), 171-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03932720802693101>
- Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education. In B. Jacoby, & Associates (Eds.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 3-25). Jossey-Bass.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages (Vol. 2)*. Harper & Row.
- Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12057.x>
- Machost, H., & Stains, M. (2023). Reflective practices in education: A primer for practitioners. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, 22(2), Essay 2. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.22-07-0148>
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). Introduction: Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and Praxis* (pp. 7-22). Routledge.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 136-150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487101052002005>
- McLaren, P. (2020). The future of critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 52(12), 1243-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2019.1686963>
- McLaren, P. (2023). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, K. Hernandez, K. D. Lam & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (4th ed., pp. 75-97). Routledge.
- Motta, S. C. (2013). Teaching global and social justice as transgressive spaces of possibility. *Antipode*, 45(1), 80-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.00995.x>
- Noble, H., & Heale, R. (2019). Triangulation in research, with examples. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 22(3), 67-68. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs-2019-103145>
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at Home: Caring and Social Policy*. University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2006). *Critical Lessons: What Our Schools Should Teach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Noddings, N. (2015). Care ethics and "caring" organizations. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care Ethics and Political Theory* (pp. 72-84). Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Harvard University Press.

- Nussbaum, M. C. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21(4), 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019837105053>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2008). Toward a globally sensitive patriotism. *Daedalus*, 137(3), 78-93. <https://doi.org/10.1162/daed.2008.137.3.78>
- Okoli, C. (2015). A guide to conducting a standalone systematic literature review. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 37(43), 879-909. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.03743>
- Oudenampsen, J., van de Pol, M., Blijlevens, N., & Das, E. (2023). Interdisciplinary education affects student learning: A focus group study. *BMC Medical Education* 23, 169(2023). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04103-9>
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education. *London Review of Education*, 6(1), 87-88.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2018). Extending the theory and practice of education for cosmopolitan citizenship. *Educational Review*, 70(1), 31-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1388616>
- Oxfam. (2006). Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools. <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620105/edu-global-citizenship-schools-guide-091115en.pdf?sequence=11&isAllowed=y>
- Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2017). An ideology critique of global citizenship education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 61(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772>
- Pashby, K., & de Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2015). Critical global citizenship in theory and practice. In J. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. M. Merryfield (Eds.), *Research in Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 9-34). Information Age Publishing.
- Pring, R. (2021). Education as a moral practice. In W. Carr (Ed.), *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in the Philosophy of Education* (pp. 195-205). Routledge.
- Reimers, F. M., & Chung, C. K. (2020). Teaching and learning for the twenty-first century: Educational goals, policies, and curricula from six nations. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 19(3), 536-538.
- Robertson, R. (2018). Social theory, cultural relativity, and the problem of globality. *Sociology of Globalization*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429493089>
- Stokke, C., & Lybæk, L. (2018). Combining intercultural dialogue and critical multiculturalism. *Ethnicities*, 18(1), 70-85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796816674504>
- Suciati, I., Idrus, I., Hajerina, H., Taha, N., & Wahyuni, D. S. (2023). Character and moral education based learning in students' character development. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(3), 1185-1194. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.25122>
- Sun, X. (2020). Towards a common framework for global citizenship education: A critical review of UNESCO's conceptual framework of global citizenship education. In X. Zhu, J. Li, M. Li, Q. Liu & H. Starkey (Eds.), *Education and Mobilities: Ideas, People and Technologies* (pp. 263-277). Springer.
- Torres, C. A. (2009). *Globalizations and Education: Collected Essays on Class, Race, Gender, and the State*. Teachers College Press.
- Torres-Harding, S., Baber, A., Hilvers, J., Hobbs, N., & Maly, M. (2018). Children as agents of social and community change: Enhancing youth empowerment through participation in a school-based social activism project. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 13(1), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197916684643>
- UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232993>
- UNESCO. (2015). *Rethinking education: Towards a global common good?* UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232555>
- Warsah, I., Morganna, R., Uyun, M., Hamengkubuwono., & Afandi, M. (2021). The Impact of collaborative learning on learners' critical thinking skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 443-460. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14225a>
- Weinberg, J. & Flinders, M. (2018). Learning for democracy: The politics and practice of citizenship education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 573-592. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3446>