

**FOSTERING GLOBAL CITIZENS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY**

by

Julie T. Nagashima

BA Liberal Arts, Soka University of America, 2005

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
School of Education in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

University of Pittsburgh

2007

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This thesis was presented

by

Julie T. Nagashima

It was defended on

December 14, 2007

and approved by

Dr. Seth Spaulding, Emeritus Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Dr. John P. Myers, Assistant Professor, Instruction and Learning

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Michael G. Gunzenhauser, Visiting Associate Professor,  
Administrative and Policy Studies

Copyright © by Julie T. Nagashima

2008

## **FOSTERING GLOBAL CITIZENS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY**

Julie T. Nagashima, M.A.

University of Pittsburgh, 2007

In this philosophical thesis, I propose global education as one approach for fostering global citizenship which, I believe, leads to a global consciousness. This increasingly interconnected and interdependent world calls for a global consciousness that not only nurtures a sense of caring about global as well as local and/or national issues, but also encourages contributive action. Once I introduce the rationale and goals for promoting a global consciousness, I then focus on education as one avenue for promoting the global citizenship that is essential for a global consciousness. However, global education faces its own challenges that impede its ability to foster global citizens. I specifically highlight six areas of concern that need to be addressed. To achieve a greater understanding of the complex relationship between citizenship and education, I explore the ideologies of traditional and more contemporary philosophers. Having established the linkage between citizenship, both as a nation-state and global concept, and education, I present a philosophy of education which is rooted in the teacher-student relationship. I advocate this bond as a primary step that leads to the promotion of global education in classrooms. By tying together all my main points in section five, I establish the foundation and steps that foster the emergence of a global consciousness.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE.....</b>	<b>VIII</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1.1 The rationales for promoting a global consciousness.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1.2 The goals for promoting a global consciousness: Global citizenship.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1.3 Section overview of thesis.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.0 GLOBAL EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1 WHAT IS GLOBAL EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1.1 Definitions.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.2.1 1960 – present .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3 CHALLENGES TO GLOBAL EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.3.1 Teacher training .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.3.2 Diversity appreciation .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.3.3 Financial stability and civic participation .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.3.4 Flexibility and awareness.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.3.5 Testing.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.3.6 Disconnection .....</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>3.0</b>	<b>GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>IDEOLOGIES OF CITIZENSHIP AND EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.1.1</b>	<b>Plato and citizenship.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.1.2</b>	<b>Rousseau and citizenship .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.1.3</b>	<b>Dewey and citizenship .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.1.4</b>	<b>Makiguchi and citizenship .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>CONCEPTS OF CITIZENSHIP .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.2.1</b>	<b>Nation-state citizenship .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.2.2</b>	<b>Global citizenship .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.2.3</b>	<b>Global citizenship: A new perspective .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION: TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP AS A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>TEACHER QUALITY AND CHARACTER IN THE CLASSROOM: METHODOLOGY AND AGENCY.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.2.1</b>	<b>Teaching approaches: Traditional and transformative.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.2.2</b>	<b>Teacher agency: Undivided self and unfinishedness.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP IN THE CLASSROOM: MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE STUDENT .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>4.3.1</b>	<b>Nurturing a sense of belonging.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>4.3.2</b>	<b>Respect from teachers .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>4.3.3</b>	<b>Fostering a caring environment .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>46</b>

<b>5.1</b>	<b>IMPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>5.1.1</b>	<b>Starting from the local .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>		<b>54</b>

## PREFACE

With my deepest appreciation and gratitude, I thank Daisaku Ikeda, my mentor in life and founder of my alma mater, Soka University of America (SUA), for giving me the opportunity to study at SUA. His faith and confidence that I will live a contributive life inspired me to believe in my own potential as well as the potential in every other person. Without the educational philosophy of value creation that is Soka, I would not today be seeking to become an educator.

I thank my family, friends, and comrades in life who have consistently supported me and who have encouraged me to continuously challenge myself and strive for advancement. Their high ideals, expectations, and belief in me sustained me in my efforts to complete my MA.

Finally, I thank my committee members, Dr. Michael Gunzenhauser, Dr. John Myers, and Dr. Seth Spaulding, for their patience, time, and care during the writing of my thesis. I especially thank Dr. Michael Gunzenhauser, my thesis advisor and mentor, for his constant presence, encouragement, wisdom, and guidance throughout the process of completing my masters. I hope to become an educator who, like Dr. Gunzenhauser, will support and encourage all students.



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### 1.1.1 The rationales for promoting a global consciousness

*We stand at a critical moment in Earth's history, a time when humanity must choose its future. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent and fragile, the future at once holds great peril and great promise. To move forward we must recognize that in the midst of a magnificent diversity of cultures and life forms we are one human family and one Earth community with a common destiny. We must join together to bring forth a sustainable global society founded on respect for nature, universal human rights, economic justice, and a culture of peace. Towards this end, it is imperative that we, the peoples of Earth, declare our responsibility to one another, to the greater community of life, and to future generations.*

*-Earth Charter Preamble (2000)*

The twenty-first century, is one of globalization. This means that disparate parts of the world, whether through technological advances or issues of mutual concern (e.g., economic, political, social), need one another in order to survive and thrive. For example, technological advances, which facilitate the dissemination of information, more easily link people and nations (Stromquist, 2001). Due to this interconnectedness, individuals need to redefine how they see themselves, their country, their world, and their place in it (Burbules & Torres, 2000). The challenging question to ask is how this notion of redefinition can become a reality. To achieve this involves a process of many steps: individuals becoming cognizant of other people and their

well-being, individuals recognizing the growing need to understand and respect diversity, and individuals seeing the domino-effect that permeates the world, realizing that one person's actions or choices do directly or indirectly affect others (Noddings, 2005). Thus, my thesis, which focuses on the necessity for promoting a global consciousness, proposes education as one means of fostering this global consciousness.

The phenomenon of globalization has a wide range of effects, including economic ones. For example, according to the 2007 annual report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), globalization has increased economic growth during the past 30 years. However, economic inequality has simultaneously widened at a rapid pace. Twenty percent of the world's wealthiest population in 1960 had 30 times more income than the poorest 20%; in 1997, that number rose, giving the wealthiest 74 times more income than the poorest (UNDP, 1999). Likewise, with the unequal distribution of resources, consumption has benefited the wealthy while the vast majority experiences deprivation. Although 20% of the world's population in high-income countries is responsible for 86% of total private consumption, 20% of the poorest population consumes a mere 1.3% (UNDP, 1998).

Globalization is not only an economic problem, but it is also an issue that affects both the physical and social environment. Specifically, globalization leads to a neglect of underdeveloped and underprivileged nations, exacerbating their already dismal status. For example, consumption has deeply hurt the global environment due to increased waste and emissions. The United States, despite having only 5% of the total world population, causes over 30% of global emissions (Singer, as cited in Noddings, 2005). As the UNDP (1998) asserts, "Environmental damage from the world's consumption falls most severely on the poor" (p.4). Noddings (2005) similarly states that "the poor suffer disproportionately from decisions involving place: they live in the valleys

that are flooded, in the neighborhoods where incinerators and chemical plants are built, in the regions chosen for nuclear facilities and waste disposal” (p.60). An abuse of consumption and the environment can increase poverty and inequality. If nations do not unite to curb these current trends, the UNDP (1998) predicts that human development will worsen. To address these concerns, I endorse Noddings’ suggestion that nations consider promoting a global consciousness.

Issues arising from diverse cultural identities within countries increasingly suggest this need for global consciousness. Although the United States consists of multiple ethnic and racial groups, its values seem to be rooted in its majority population. The majority of Americans tend to favor the melting pot theory as opposed to embracing diversity (Banks, 2001). Historically, the melting pot concept of assimilation has become embedded in the educational systems of the United States, often triggering many issues for those youths trying to create their own identities. Because the U.S. Census (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1998) predicts that 47% of the total U.S. population in 2050 will consist of ethnic minorities, the United States needs to accept and celebrate diversity, Noddings (2005) argues:

We have not yet come to grips with what is perhaps the most important reason for recognizing and appreciating diversity. This reason is that differences exist and are considered important, ignoring them is equivalent to not listening – hence is not caring....because diversity exists, pluralism – sharing power with all those affected by policies and decisions – is necessary for human survival. (p.14)

The U.S. is not alone in undergoing internal changes and challenges. According to the UNDP (2004), “Almost no country is entirely homogenous...containing ethnic, religious or linguistic groups that have common bonds to their own heritage, culture, values and way of life”

(p.2). Each nation struggles with its own diversity problems. Countless individuals are victims of religious persecutions and ethnic cleansings, while others struggle “through everyday exclusion and economic, social and political discrimination” (UNDP, 2004, p.1). We, the people on this planet, are reaching a turning point which requires all of us to work together for the survival and future of the world in which we live.

### **1.1.2 The goals for promoting a global consciousness: Global citizenship**

People are beginning to realize that they can no longer see themselves as separate entities, but instead must expand their borders to encompass humanity as a whole. To enable individuals to broaden their self-definitions so they perceive themselves both as citizens of their country as well as global citizens requires many societal changes. I perceive education as one important avenue of change. The learning environment has the potential to cultivate understanding, challenge the status quo, and encourage new ways of thinking. I believe education can reaffirm the students’ roots with their culture and history, and it can also awaken in those students a desire to connect with other cultures. The more people understand themselves and their relationship with their families, communities, and nation, the better they will comprehend their place in the large global world. This new awareness requires that young adults move from a passive acceptance of what does exist to an active desire to create positive change by envisioning what can exist. To promote global consciousness in today’s youth, then, nations should consider revising their educational systems. Education can and should play a leading role in preparing global citizens for the twenty-first century.

### **1.1.3 Section overview of thesis**

In this philosophical thesis, I acknowledge the world as being interconnected. Because of this, I argue for the promotion of a global citizenship of individuals who have a sense of belonging not only to their communities but also to their world. I define this sense of belonging as a caring for others and as a willingness to transform such caring into contributive action. While many avenues present possibilities for fostering global citizenship, I endorse a global education approach that is rooted in a teacher-student relationship.

In Section II, I introduce global education by exploring its concepts and definitions specific to the United States. I then present the historical development of global education in the U.S. from the 1960s to the present. I conclude this section by addressing current issues that challenge the implementation of global education: inadequate teacher training, a lack of diversity appreciation, financial instability and minimal civic participation, inflexibility and unawareness, overemphasis on testing, and disconnection.

In Section III, I begin exploring the notion of citizenship. I first establish the historical relationships between citizenship and education through an examination of different philosophies of education as presented by Plato (1997), Rousseau (1997), and Dewey (1997). Each has his own unique perspectives on the relationship between the state and the individual citizen. I then build on the concepts of Plato, Rousseau, and Dewey to introduce Makiguchi (1989), the founder of Soka Education – Value-Creating Education. After explaining Makiguchi’s Soka Education, I examine the concept of citizenship in terms of nation-state citizenship and global citizenship. I conclude this section by moving from a broad nation-state and global perspective to a more focused, specific view of global citizenship – one that entails a sense of belonging to the community, nation, and world.

Accordingly, in Section IV, I introduce the teacher-student relationship as the basis for a philosophy of education. I advocate this bond as the foundation upon which the six challenges in Section III can be addressed. Therefore, I see the teacher-student relationship as having the potential to promote global education in the classrooms. This philosophy serves as a catalyst for an educational revolution that hopes to reach out and encourage educators to take the first step in challenging themselves to change. I also present in this section the following: 1) Freire (2000) and Palmer's (1998) conceptual teaching approaches; 2) Freire and Palmer's notions of teacher agency; and 3) the philosophical approaches to meeting the needs of the student. Through this personal and educational revolution, students for the first time receive an opportunity to respond by taking contributive action.

In Section V, I tie together all my main points. I then establish a philosophical foundation to foster global citizens and the emergence of a global consciousness.

## **2.0 GLOBAL EDUCATION**

In this section, I introduce global education as an approach to promote global citizenship. After first presenting the basic concept of global education and how different scholars view it, I explain its historical background, beginning with its rocky start and exploring its gradual progress. Although there are many reasons for why global education is a valuable key to fostering global citizenship, at the same time, there are also clear reasons why it will be a challenge to implement its curriculum into the current educational systems. Therefore, I conclude this section by directly addressing the challenges that global education has on education.

### **2.1 WHAT IS GLOBAL EDUCATION**

During the 1960s, the media stimulated interest in global education by bringing it to the attention of the international community (Gaudelli, 2003). Specifically, images of the planet sent from space at the end of the decade in 1969 gave the United States and other nations a new perspective of the world. These images awakened in people the importance of coexisting beyond categorization and continental boundaries (Gaudelli, 2003).

This awareness has grown from the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century into the new millennium. Now, when any event, whether positive or negative, occurs in one area, it can have an impact on

other places. This connection gives greater validation for people to seek a global education which prepares younger generations to work together for a peaceful future.

In this section, I examine the implications of global education in the United States by presenting some of the corresponding definitions offered by scholars and by exploring historical events of global education since the 1960s.

### **2.1.1 Definitions**

Although numerous scholars offer various definitions of global education, they all agree that it shares broad ideals similar to global awareness, human rights, and peace education. Earlier scholars such as Anderson (1968) define global education as the development and awareness for students to realize that human beings are all from one species coexisting on the same planet – Earth (in Gaudelli, 2003). Hanvey (1976), another one of the first scholars to define global education, proposes five dimensions for global awareness: “perspective consciousness (ability to hold multiple perspectives), state-of-the planet awareness (ability to understand global issues), cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics (ability to understand interconnectedness), and awareness of human choices” (in Kirkwood, 2001, p.11). Furthermore, Diaz, Massialas, and Xanthopoulos (1999) perceive global education as the study of “cultural diversity, human rights, varied curricular perspectives, and prejudice reduction” in different countries of the world, while the American Forum for Global Education (2003) seeks to raise awareness and understandings of global issues that demonstrate the interconnectedness of one’s daily life and the world.

It is important to be cognizant of the distinction between international education and global education. According to Kirkwood (2001), international education, while a long time part



of the academic setting, “refers to the traditional approach of language studies and area studies in higher education” (p.11). Merryfield (1994) acknowledges international education by asserting that today’s global education builds on and expands its premises by incorporating “traditions in international relations, world history, and area studies” (p.4). Further, international education “recognizes that globalization necessitates changes in our teaching about the world and its peoples...[such as] more attention to understanding human values, global systems, global issues, involvement of different kinds of world actors, and global history” (pp. 4-5).

Although global education is often referred to by different terminology (e.g., global education, world-centered education, and global perspectives in education), it still maintains a core identity as “an education that brings the world into the classroom, where teachers teach from a world-centric rather than an ethno-specific or nation-state perspective” (Kirkwood, 2001, p.11). Thus, global education stems from an awareness that a problem challenging one area of the globe also challenges the entire globe. As Tye (1999) introduces in his study on global education in several countries, “The most common issues identified (in order of frequency) were: ecology, development, intercultural relations, peace, economics, and technologies” (Hicks, 2003, p.269).

Furthermore, Pike and Selby (2001) view global education as coming from two theories – world-mindedness and child-centeredness. They describe global education as focusing on the goal of the planet as a whole while simultaneously valuing the individual. Lastly, Gaudelli (2003) defines global education as a “curriculum that seeks to prepare students....where the study of human values, institutions, and behaviors are contextually examined through pedagogical style that promotes critical engagement of complex, diverse information toward socially meaningful action” (p.11). Therefore, Gaudelli (2003), as well as all the other scholars

cited in this section, illustrate that global education has a vast array of definitions, many of which overlap.

## **2.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

Although global education emerged after the 1960s, the United States initially paid little attention to it (Gaudelli, 2003). On one level, Americans saw it as a challenge to their traditional education system which had dominated schools for more than 30 years. On a deeper level, Americans identify their nation as the most privileged in the world; they are inclined to be ethnocentric and apathetic towards other groups or countries (McIntosh, 2005). However, to address more specific reasons of why the U.S. lacked global education in the period from 1960 to 1990, a more in-depth study of each decade is needed.

### **2.2.1 1960 – present**

While the 1960s witnessed an emergence of people seeking global education, the 1970s saw a decline in this interest (Gaudelli, 2003). Since most of the advocates for global education at the time were institutions feeling the need to solve global problems through education, educators who used global education in their curricula were usually affiliated with non-governmental organizations. By the late seventies, many of these educators embraced global education as a centralized theory, but they faced numerous obstacles in their efforts to explore it. First, global education was a theory rather than a practical curriculum to which teachers could abide (Gaudelli, 2003). This caused ambiguity to many educators who lacked the training or

preparation necessary to teach global education. During the same time, Ford (1979) did a study to examine how well teachers taught global education; he characterized over 75% of teachers as ethnocentric and unprepared (Diaz et al., 1999). Some other problems with global education research resulted from a lack of resources, such as textbooks, and a lack of a unified definition which created even greater ambiguity when attempting to apply theory into practice.

Global education faced even more difficulties in the 1980s than in the sixties and seventies. Some individuals in the United States criticized global education for emphasizing a range of cultures rather than strictly teaching about the United States. They feared that this new educational system would threaten American identity by distracting students and destroying their sense of citizenship and belongingness (Gaudelli, 2003).

Because of this fear of global education, the United States withdrew from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1984 and remained apart from it for nearly twenty years. Schaefer (2001) argues that this was due to UNESCO's growing membership of developing countries and its increasing support of anti-Western political agendas that leaned toward the left and refused to change corrupt practices. While the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations all considered rejoining UNESCO, they decided against it based on UNESCO's lack of effort to reform. Not until Koichiro Matsuura was appointed as director-general in 1999 and attempted to reform UNESCO did the United States decide to rejoin in 2003.

However, despite its opposition to UNESCO, the United States, by the 1990s, gradually began to understand that the world is becoming a more global one. According to Heyneman (2003), the United States, to remain an active player in this global community, needs to stay current with global issues. He, therefore, offers four factors explaining why the United States

needs an international organization like UNESCO: 1) to oversee other educational trends in other countries outside of its sphere; 2) to gain different perspectives on such issues as school-policies; 3) to help preserve culture in other countries; and 4) to recognize the need to be globally aware due to the increasing security issues around the world. Fujikane (2003) reinforces Heyneman's view by stating that "acknowledgement of interconnectedness in the world is urging the necessity of global education within formal schooling" (p.145).

## **2.3 CHALLENGES TO GLOBAL EDUCATION**

Recently, the United States has moved toward a greater understanding and acknowledgement of a global community (Gaudelli, 2003). In order for the United States to become a viable member of this community, it first needs to implement change within its existing education system. In this section, I suggest six issues that such change must address.

### **2.3.1 Teacher training**

For the educational system of the United States to have meaning in this evolving global community, change is essential for implementing global education. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) provides five reasons that explain this need for change:

- 1) People are constantly being affected by transnational, cross-cultural, and multicultural influences,
- 2) There are a variety of actors (states, multinational corporations, private voluntary associations, and individuals) on the world stage,
- 3) The fate of humanity cannot be separated from the state of the world environment,
- 4) There are linkages

between social, political, and ecological realities and alternative futures, and lastly 5) Citizen participation is critical in both local and world affairs. (NCSS, 1982, pp.37-38, in Diaz et al., 1999, p.19)

To implement this kind of global education requires competent and knowledgeable educators. However, just a few decades ago, only 5% of the nation's primary and secondary teachers had proper training to teach global education (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education – Council on Learning, 1981, in Diaz et al., 1999). This raises concerns not only about the curricula, but also about the quality of schools and educators.

### **2.3.2 Diversity appreciation**

A second issue stems from the lack of diversity and civic education. Specifically, Ladson-Billings (2005) asserts that the current educational system disproportionately supports the white, middle-class population, perpetuating ignorance among minority populations and adding to the growth of poverty:

Too little in our current civic education addresses the diversity that is a part of most urban schools, and increasingly a part of suburban and rural schools. Most curriculum developers seem to believe that our students are all white, all middle-class, and all native English speakers. (p.76)

Perhaps the mass immigration to the United States that occurred at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century caused this phenomenon. This immigration led to a civic educational philosophy that, according to Banks (2001), aimed “to eradicate the community cultures and languages of students from diverse ethnic, cultural, racial, and language groups” (p.2). Civic education tried to assimilate everyone into one united nation-state that encouraged

citizens to adapt to an Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture which was viewed as the model for good citizens (Banks, 2001).

Past problems have created present challenges that raise greater concerns for fostering global citizenship. Freire (2000) asserts:

The educational reforms of the past decades have not expanded the horizons of kids' imagination, nor deepened their understanding of the world, nor widened the boundaries of their knowledge. They have instead consistently constrained the definition of education to a narrow set of technical skills. (pp. 69-70)

### **2.3.3 Financial stability and civic participation**

Thirdly, Ladson-Billings (2005) stresses the struggles in the current economic system in which students live. In order to maintain a middle-class household, the present system requires at least two incomes for most families. As a result, this situation has caused people to work harder and have less time and opportunities for civic participation. More people are becoming increasingly concerned about their own happiness and interests and less sensitive to the well-being of others (Ladson-Billings, 2005). Subsequently, another challenge includes the limited understanding of citizenship that is presented to the students. Schools teach students that good citizenship means "voting, obeying the law, paying taxes, saluting the flag, and saying the Pledge of Allegiance" (Ladson-Billings, 2005, p.76).

### **2.3.4 Flexibility and awareness**

A fourth issue arises from an educational system that does not encourage students to have a flexibility in their thinking that allows them to become more aware of the global world in which they live (McIntosh, 2005). As a result, the educational system is producing students who lack an understanding of what global citizenship encompasses. McIntosh claims that the current administration poses the greatest obstacle to the fostering of global citizenship in the United States because it “shows no capacity for, understanding of, global citizenship that is, of belonging within an entity larger than the nation itself” (pp.27-28). She further criticizes this administration for imposing a domineering approach that implies to other nations that the interest of the U.S. is most important and should also be most considered by others. As a result, the nation-state is the farthest boundary that citizens feel a part of, causing anyone or any place outside this boundary to be considered as others who are in a different class consisting of “competitors, threats, or unknowns” (p.26).

### **2.3.5 Testing**

The link between the scores on standardized tests and the quality of education creates a fifth problem. The federal, state, and local governments create agendas and policies for education that undeniably urge schools to prioritize their time for standardized testing. As Carlsson-Paige and Lantieri (2005) assert, “Teachers spend more and more time teaching to tests; as the curriculum narrows, students have less and less of a role to play in their own learning” (p.110). The class hours devoted to preparing for a standardized test jeopardize the opportunity for students to make connections with what they learn. To address this issue of disconnection

between students and the world, Carlson-Paige and Lantieri (2005) suggest that schools should instead foster meaningful discussions for their students and broaden their perspectives by “examining how power shapes worldviews, and to get to know ourselves and each other” (p.110).

### **2.3.6 Disconnection**

If students cannot feel a connection to their immediate environment, they will face difficulties in developing a concern for it or for their global world (Ladson-Billings, 2005). At the same time, if students do not have concerns for the well-being of others, they will be unable to form a connection or sense of belonging with the global community. The issue is an ongoing, cyclical one.

Although schools may try to teach civic education and communities may try to foster citizenship, many of these current programs exist without properly developing a viable connection with individuals and their community (Ladson-Billings, 2005). For example, even though young people may physically participate in a program, they might not have the proper understanding of why and how their participation contributes to the community. Hence, educators need to connect the act of learning with students and their interests and/or personal lives. Only then can educators stimulate the students’ sense of activism or willingness to challenge issues in society.

Consequently, the promotion of global education is important for the fostering of global citizenship. Current educational systems need to address the challenges such as the ones raised above: enhancing teacher training, creating a classroom environment that supports diverse views, improving economic conditions, encouraging flexibility and openness within the schools, and



giving more value to learning than testing. Until they do so, education systems will continue to hinder the students' academic and experiential learning. The creation of an action plan, therefore, is necessary. Such a plan also needs to include educators in its formation and implementation.

### **3.0 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP**

In order to understand the philosophical foundation that I propose in this thesis, it is necessary to explore the notion of education and its relation to citizenship. I first examine the educational significance of the relationship between the state and the individual from the philosophical perspectives presented by Plato (1997), Rousseau (1997), Dewey (1997; 1938), and Makiguchi (1989). After recognizing the role of education in fostering citizenship, I then look briefly at the notion of citizenship in terms of the nation-state and the globe. I conclude this section by promoting a form of global citizenship as a necessity for a global consciousness. This consciousness fosters a sense of belonging to the globe, an entity larger than one's family, community, or nation.

#### **3.1 IDEOLOGIES OF CITIZENSHIP AND EDUCATION**

While Plato (1997), Rousseau (1997), Dewey (1997; 1938), and Makiguchi (1989) have envisioned education as a way to foster citizenship and develop a stable and prosperous society, each scholar offers his unique perspective of education and its relationship to the state and the individual. Plato, for example, first views society and then examines the individual's role in it. He perceives education as a means to an end, an approach that molds the person into the kind of citizen who will enhance society. Alternatively, Rousseau looks at the individual and only then

defines the person's role in the larger world. Rousseau's educational theory embraces teaching the person as an entity, separate from society. Dewey embraces both the philosophies of Plato and Rousseau, agreeing with Plato's belief in an ideal society and Rousseau's affirmation in the gifts of the individual. Makiguchi, while strongly influenced by Dewey, brings his own vision by developing a value-creating pedagogy. This sub-section presents each scholar in chronological order, illustrating the evolutionary process in the development of citizenship and education.

### **3.1.1 Plato and citizenship**

Plato (1997), a Classical Greek philosopher (427-347 B.C.) who introduces an educational philosophy fundamental to Western notions of citizenship, focuses his interest on the needs of the state and how the individual can participate in fulfilling these needs to create an ideal society. In Plato's mind, education should serve as a necessary factor to foster a wealthy state of capable citizens. As a result, Plato designs a model to "produce competent adults to meet the needs of the state" (Noddings, 2007, p. 6). A happy state produces a happy individual content in his role. In short, Plato's theory places the state first; how it functions determines the conditions of the individual.

Like Socrates, who greatly influenced him, Plato (1997) believes that every person has abilities. Therefore, he advocates an education system that caters to each individual's capabilities rather than imposing one central curriculum on all students. Socrates likewise states that "no two persons are born exactly alike, but each differs from each in natural endowments, one being suited for one occupation and another for another" (in Cahn, 1997, p.41). Despite acknowledging the infinite range of abilities which individuals possess, Plato proposes a categorization of people: 1) workers or artisans; 2) guardians or soldiers; and 3) rulers. In his class-based view of

the state, Plato urges the individual to work diligently to develop his or her skills and talents as a member of his or her class. For example, a soldier must learn to physically protect the country, while a ruler must be well educated to efficiently lead people. Thus, Plato built three educational tracks in his society.

By proposing this system, Plato (1997) creates a contradiction in his philosophy. While Plato believes that the individual holds different abilities which should not conform to one educational system, he also seems comfortable with imposing a socially stratified society on the individual's potential and capacity. Such a three-tiered society threatens to limit the individual's growth and ability by insisting upon conformity. The individual, as defined by Plato, sees only three choices, thereby lacking the capacity to choose other options. He was not interested in maximizing each child's uniqueness. In contrast, a viable education system can recognize that individuals are born into a specific class but can move beyond that class.

Instead of creating an ideal society in which all individuals are happy, Plato (1997), despite his lofty goals, causes problems. These concerns may stem from an educational philosophy rooted in the exclusion and subjugation of certain individuals based on class or gender. By focusing more on the individual rather than the general public, Plato may not have had to categorize people into sub-groups; he may, then, have succeeded in creating his ideal society built with citizens happy in their respective areas.

### **3.1.2 Rousseau and citizenship**

In contrast to Plato (1997) who views a perfect society from the perspective of the state, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1997), a Swiss-French philosopher (1712-1778), sees the individual as crucial

in establishing an ideal society. Rousseau believes society is corrupt. People are born pure and innocent, but the society in which they live ultimately corrupts them.

Furthermore, Rousseau (1997) asserts that education should focus on the individual and his or her needs, not on the individual as a means to fulfill the needs of the state. He rejects Plato's (1997) theory of an education for the state aimed at two opposite goals (a perfect society and the growth of man) that ultimately reaches neither. According to Rousseau, Plato's theory builds men who are instead "double-minded, seemingly concerned for others, but really only concerned for themselves" (Rousseau in Cahn, 1997, p.164). Rousseau states:

If we have to combat either nature or society, we must choose between making a man or making a citizen. We cannot make both. There is an inevitable conflict of aims, from which come two opposing forms of education: the one communal and public (state), the other individualistic and domestic. (p.164)

Thus, Rousseau (1997) pioneers the idea of promoting domestic education – education of nature – where educators would teach students in an environment outside and away from the community. Rousseau believes this method will foster self-actualized individuals who become happy and competent in their lives. In Rousseau's thinking, the individual creates the roots which lead to the growth of an ideal society. His ideal state exists when we:

Make a society of these ten, and let each man apply himself for his own benefit and that of the other nine to the kind of work that suits him best. Each one will profit by the talents of the others as if he personally had them all, and at the same time grow more perfect in his own line of work by constant practice. (p.179)

In contrast to Plato (1997), who envisions a society of order, Rousseau imagines a society of equality:

Man is the same in all stations. The rich man's stomach is no bigger than the poor man's, and his digestion no better. The master's arms are no longer and no stronger than the slave's. A "great" man is no greater than a man of the people. (p.179)

However, Rousseau's (1997) impractical suggestions for pedagogy limit his philosophy of education. Rousseau proposes isolation to nurture pure, self-actualized citizens; the mentor must also be exceptional. Even if the isolation succeeds, the other concern lies in promoting an education for the individual through isolation. This approach, while successful for a few students, faces difficulty when implemented for all students. Rousseau's philosophy challenges educators to create an educational system which values the individual in a community but does not isolate them.

### **3.1.3 Dewey and citizenship**

Similar to Rousseau's (1997) belief in the value of the individual, John Dewey (1997), an American philosopher (1859-1952), asserts, in *The Child and the Curriculum*, that "the child is the starting-point, the centre, and the end" (Cahn, 1997, p.278). However, in contrast to Rousseau, Dewey argues that a child's experience in the society is crucial. While he also agrees with Plato's ideal state where the individual participates in the needs of society, Dewey does not advocate an education that serves either the state or the individual as a means to an end:

He does not believe that education should serve anything or anybody...On the one hand, if education is determined solely by the needs of the state, its substance may not cohere with the needs and interests of individuals. On the other hand, if education is guided merely by the individual's particular interests and desires, it may become a tool for self-

promotion and self-aggrandizement at the expense of societal improvement. (Hansen, 2007, p.26)

According to Noddings (2007), “Dewey insisted that state and individual are, ideally, in a relation of mutual support” (p.38). While Plato (1997) and Rousseau (1997) stand on opposite ends with their beliefs and principles, Dewey appears in the middle. He takes a realist perspective, balancing ideas and incorporating approaches that are both productive and effective.

Dewey, by recognizing the importance of self-actualization before the individual can meet the needs of the state, “regards education as the deepening and enriching of the quality of life, by which he means its felt meanings and significance” (Hansen, 2007, p.26). He emphasizes this over the mere acquisition of subject matter. Accordingly, Dewey (1997), in *The Child and the Curriculum*, states:

Subject-matter never can be got into the child from without. Learning is active. It involves reaching out of the mind. It involves organic assimilation starting from within. Literally, we must take our stand with the child and our departure from him. It is he and not the subject-matter which determines both quality and quantity of learning. (Cahn, 1997, p. 278)

Dewey thus envisions a unified curriculum where the meaning of academic learning and the meaning of experiential learning complement one another.

Because he perceives “that the purpose of education for each individual is not self-reproduction but self-transformation” (Hansen, 2007, p.26), Dewey focuses on the growth of each individual learner. Instead of seeing the individual as stagnant, Dewey maintains that “the self is permanently engaged in the process of ‘losing’ and ‘finding’ itself” (Hansen, 2007, p.26). This process of self-discovery “is never terminal or fixed, but always in continuous

transformation. (Thus) humanity has an unfathomable capacity to enrich its experience and to expand its realization of meaning” (Hansen, p.27). Although Tsunesaburo Makiguchi, a contemporary of Dewey, leans toward the educational theory of Dewey, he brings a new perspective to Dewey’s concept of meaning, as described by Hansen: his pedagogy of value-creation.

### **3.1.4 Makiguchi and citizenship**

Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (1989), a Japanese educator and philosopher (1871-1944), strongly agrees with Dewey’s child-centered education, but he also asserts that “a society must be equally concerned about the individual needs and well-being of its children” (p.19). Makiguchi roots his philosophy in the belief that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts: “A nation or society is, after all, its people, it is a society of individuals. Where there is individual growth and fulfillment, there will be prosperity, enrichment, and health within the society as a whole” (p.19).

To achieve a strong, thriving society, therefore, requires an educational system that recognizes the individuals as key players in creating their society, not as pawns of that society. Makiguchi (1989) states the following:

The purpose of education as formulated by the society must be in agreement with the needs and goals of the individual. Education must be conducted in such a way that society does not use the educated as means to its own ends and vice versa. The reason for being of the one must be recognized and accepted by the other. (p.19)

Makiguchi additionally stresses that the purpose of education “must be the lifelong happiness of learners” (Ikeda, 2001, p.100). Some people may identify that happiness as materialistic, such as food, money, house, transportation, and jobs. Others may say that their



happiness lies in non-materialistic and non-quantifiable factors, such as emotions or feelings that arise from within or are received by others. “He (Makiguchi) further believed that true happiness is to be found in a life of value creation. Put simply, value creation is the capacity to find meaning, to enhance one’s own existence and contribute to the well-being of others” (Ikeda, 2001, p.100). Therefore, Makiguchi (1989) asserts that the purpose of education should be to reach all learners, no matter what their circumstance, and to give those learners the opportunity to create value in their lives; this will ultimately create value in society.

By seeing “happiness not as a fixed mark to be achieved but as a sense of becoming” (Makiguchi, 1989, p.23), Makiguchi also perceives “both living and learning as processes” (p.23). As a result, he offers “the pragmatic orientation of education ‘for living, of living, and by living’” (p.23). I interpret these three stages of education as not being mutually exclusive but as having three distinct rationales. I see education for living, the first and most basic stage, as embodying the elements needed for survival. The second stage finds meaning in the act of learning, while the third stage searches for the deeper significance of learning. I further associate each of Makiguchi’s stages of education with creating its own type of learner.

Education for living merely demands that learners grasp the essentials, such as math and elementary reading, in order to function as viable members of society. These learners recognize that education can serve as a means to a very specific end. They use their education to obtain a job and successfully find their way through the maze of daily living. Most persons who have the opportunity to receive any education experience this stage of learning.

I link Makiguchi’s (1989) education of living stage with those individuals, not only scholars, who find a passion in the learning process, who embrace education as its own entity. These individuals are the working professionals who, even after a long day at the office, find

time to attend lectures and to read books that are outside their area of expertise. They are the senior citizens who enroll in adult education classes. These individuals see the education of living as giving their lives a sense of purpose for themselves, not for advancement in the socioeconomic hierarchy. Their education of living gives them a reason to get up in the morning; it adds layers and depth to their lives.

Because in this thesis I present education as a way to create value, I most embrace Makiguchi's (1989) education by living. I believe this stage exemplifies those individuals who are able to create value out of their education and then use their educational tools for a purpose other than their own. Some may volunteer in the Peace Corps, while others may teach in the inner city. The aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina found physicians and social workers volunteering their services to the victims. Whether the individuals and their actions receive national or international attention matters less than whether the individuals, through their actions, make their communities a better place in which to live.

The choice to create value ultimately belongs to the individual. It may matter less why individuals choose to become physicians than what they do once they earn their degrees. If they never see beyond the prestige and material benefits that come with their societal position, then they fail to achieve an education by living. However, if they and a multitude of people throughout the world seek to create value, they then expand the possibility for making a peaceful society. For Makiguchi (1989), the key always lies within the individuals and their willingness to bring about change.

What links Plato (1997), Rousseau (1997), Dewey (1997, 1938), and Makiguchi (1989) is the recognition that education is integral to society's ability not only to survive but also to thrive. As suggested, however, the philosophy most essential to this thesis is that of Makiguchi who

insists that “human life is a process of creating value, and education should guide us toward that end. Thus educational practices should serve to promote value creation” (p.54). Noddings (2007), a contemporary philosopher of education, reinforces Makiguchi’s belief in the individual and his recognition of the link between the well-being of the individual and the health of the state: “A good society treasures its dissidents and mavericks because it needs the creative thinking that produces new hypotheses...The individual similarly needs a democratic state in which to flourish” (p.38). Noddings, Dewey, and Makiguchi, all understand that by nurturing and valuing the individual, that person will in turn contribute to the welfare of the state.

## **3.2 CONCEPTS OF CITIZENSHIP**

### **3.2.1 Nation-state citizenship**

Plato (1997), Rousseau (1997), Dewey (1997), and Makiguchi (1989) all respond to the attributes as well as the drawbacks of the nation-states in which they lived. They all grapple with how to give individuals the experiences and education they need to become viable, contributing citizens of their societies. Whether they perceive the role of citizenship as being one that serves the state or transforms the state, they agree that there is a link between the individuals and the state in which they exist.

As these earlier scholars demonstrate, one approach to understanding the concept of citizenship is through philosophy. While such an approach does shed light on what it means to be a citizen of a state, other less theoretical approaches also have validity. These less theoretical approaches see citizenship (both nation-state and global) as a more measurable concept that can

be dissected and analyzed. I begin by examining citizenship, and then expand it to a focus on global citizenship.

According to Banks (2001) and Benhabib (2002), citizenship usually consists of a membership which shares certain linguistic, cultural, ethnic, and religious commonalities. Specifically, Benhabib (2002) suggests that the practice of citizenship entails three components: collective identity, privileges of political memberships, and social rights and claims. The collective identity provides membership or a sense of belonging to a particular group, while privileges of membership allow members to make decisions and participate in political affairs. Finally, social rights and benefits encompass the rights of members to have possessions and receive equal benefits. All three components of citizenship are not required for participating in or holding rights in any one of the three areas. Benhabib (2002) proposes that these three components are currently being pulled apart, causing a “disaggregation effect” in the European States, as well as some similar trends in other regions of the world.

### **3.2.2 Global citizenship**

There are several positions to consider when examining global citizenship. For example, Dower (2002) introduces major issues on global citizenship, including whether global citizenship is an ethical or institutional concept, whether it entails world governance, whether it is for all people or some and, finally, whether global citizenship creates a dichotomy from national citizenship. Indeed, Dower, by presenting both sides of the many emerging issues, ignites a debate on global citizenship. Dower first questions whether global citizenship should be studied as an ethical concept, or whether it should be perceived as the traditional concept of citizenship that entails membership to a certain state.

Dower (2002) then looks at the possibility of world citizenship forming a world government. If a world government evolves, Dower fears that such a government could impose its visions or majority perspectives on all, including the minority. Whether or not Dower's concern about a world government becomes a reality, the existence of a fixed universal concept of global citizenship still remains an issue. Furthermore, from the perspective of the nation-state, if everyone were to be a world citizen, everyone would have an obligation or duty to participate in global events or institutions. Yet, another concern when examining world citizenship is whether it can challenge the notion of nation-state. Thus, before promoting the idea of world citizenship, Dower argues for a further definition and examination of the concept of world citizenship.

Dower (2002) next raises the issue of whether global citizenship entails participation from all people. This responsibility to participate in global concerns challenges those human beings who, because they live in poverty, must make their survival a top priority. In this case, only those individuals who do not face these obstacles have the choice to embrace global participation. Dower, therefore, raises common themes that are important ones to consider when grappling with the notion of global citizenship. However, in this thesis, I examine the notion of global citizenship, not by rejecting nation-state citizenship for global citizenship, but instead embracing it and, furthermore, promoting global citizenship for global consciousness.

### **3.2.3 Global citizenship: A new perspective**

Although I acknowledge that the common notions of global citizenship include political and economic dimensions, in this thesis I stress a different perspective. Based upon diverse scholars

and their ideas, I focus in this section on a global citizenship that is rooted in a sense of belonging.

First, I begin by revisiting Makiguchi, the Japanese educator who lived ahead of his time; he lived in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century when Japan was under imperialism and militaristic rule. In the midst of strong opposition from the government, he remained critical of “narrow-minded nationalism” but, at the same time, he was not quite convinced with the notion of “vacuous utopian globalism” (Ikeda, 2001, p.5). Instead, he envisioned moral values of global citizenship that:

Posited a three-layered scheme of identity or citizenship; education should instill a sense of belonging and commitment to the community, to the nation, and to the world.

Ultimately he saw the welfare of the world as intimately linked with and necessary to individual well-being. (Ikeda, 2001, p.5)

Furthermore, McIntosh (2005) emphasizes the importance of expanding our own capacities to develop a sense of belonging to the world, not only to our community or nation. She states, “The ethos of global citizenship, I believe, must start with providing, and caring about providing, these basic human necessities, and the protections for the sustaining ecosystems that humans depend on” (p.26).

Caring is a theme that also appears in the ideas of Carlsson-Paige and Lantieri (2005). They assert that the seeds of global citizenship exist within the individual. To nurture those seeds requires a social environment in which students have the opportunity to learn caring. When such a moral education occurs, Carlsson-Paige and Lantieri hope that people will consciously aim towards building a peaceful future rooted in global cooperation.

While also embracing the concept of global citizenship, Noddings (2005) is neither naïve nor ignorant to its complexities. She understands that seeing global citizenship through a moral lens can be problematic. How one culture defines morality may not be synonymous with how another culture perceives it. Thus, Noddings probes the grayness of morality, wondering whether morality can ever be as simple as black or white:

If global citizens appreciate cultural diversity, they will speak of ways of life, not one way, and they will ask how a valued diversity can be maintained. But what sorts of diversity should we appreciate? If a culture wants to maintain the inequality of women or the slavery of children, should we accept these practices as tolerable facets of cultural diversity – as simply “their way”? When cultural diversity pushes us toward moral relativism, we must back away. (p.3)

Noddings (2005) raises concerns that do not have simple answers. It is not safe to assume that all individuals have similar desires or values. At the same time, though, Noddings is not satisfied with a global community that does not allow all of its citizens to live with dignity: “And so we have to think carefully about the merits of diversity and those of unity or universality and how to achieve an optimal balance between the two. We should be interested in social as well as economic justice” (p.3).

Noddings (2005), along with McIntosh (2005) and Carlsson-Paige and Lantieri (2005), applies the concept of caring to global citizenship. According to Noddings, global citizens should have an awareness of and a concern for 1) the economic and social injustice that is prevalent in today’s world, 2) the environmental degradation that harms the physical environment in which we live, and 3) the balance of promoting cultural diversity and unity. This recognition and caring

within global citizens lead to their actively addressing these three issues, as well as a fourth critical issue: implementing peace education as a means for promoting global citizenship.

Noddings (2005) and Ikeda (2006) seem to offer complementary perspectives of global citizenship. Ikeda sees the global citizen as having three essential attributes. From his perspective, the global citizen should first recognize that all life is interconnected. Ikeda then perceives the global citizen as an individual who embodies the courage to respect and appreciate diversity. The third quality of Ikeda's global citizen is the compassion to empathize with all people, whether they live in nearby communities or in distant areas. Once individuals make these three essential attributes an integral part of who they are as global citizens, Ikeda (2005), incorporating the philosophy of Makiguchi's (1938) value creation, believes they can then foster the well-being of all individuals.

Here, I would like to comment on the terminology of global citizenship. Ikeda's notion of global citizenship is translated into multiple English terminologies depending on the translator and situation. Therefore, in some instances, Ikeda's notion of global citizens is translated into terms such as: planetary citizens, world citizens, and cosmopolitan citizens. Miller (2005) argues that the term global citizen is "insufficient" to grasp Ikeda's meaning of global citizenship because the term global citizen consists of multiple meanings depending on who defines it. For example, global citizenship can "have negative connotations, especially from those who see globalism as economic globalism...the expansion of American capitalism or of a world government authoritatively imposed" (Miller, 2005, p.55). As a result, Miller suggests using the term cosmopolitan citizenship instead. Therefore, to capture the essence of this new perspective of global citizenship, it is important to have an open-minded perspective.



At the heart of Ikeda's (2006) belief lies respect, both for life and cultural diversity. Ikeda further emphasizes the importance of appreciation. He reminds all individuals to be conscious of who they are and of the role others have played in their lives; Ikeda encourages all people to remember others and the potential that exists within each of them. Not only does Ikeda value well-being, respect, and appreciation, but he also advocates an openness that allows the individual to welcome and embrace change. He associates these four qualities with what he refers to as democracy - not a stagnant political ideology but, as Dewey suggests, an evolving way of life. Ikeda writes:

Democracy is a way of life whose purpose is to enable people to achieve spiritual autonomy, live in mutual respect and enjoy happiness. It can also be understood as an expression of human wisdom deployed toward the goal of harmonious coexistence. It is in this sense that it can be understood as a universal principle... Democracy must not be fixed. Furthermore, every generation must accomplish democracy over again for itself. (p.180)

Based upon the philosophies presented by the aforementioned scholars, I believe humankind has the potential to foster a consciousness for the well-being of others by developing a sense of belongingness to the globe. As citizens of a nation-state, people have a mutual understanding that they exist within a family, community, and nation. Therefore, I believe how individuals act today will indirectly affect people in distant areas as well as future generations. As a result of my study of citizenship, I not only acknowledge the importance of nation-state citizenship but I also embrace and encourage caring on a larger scope. My thesis specifically identifies this concept of belongingness as global citizenship.

## **4.0 TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP**

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION: TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP AS A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION**

The previous section introduced global education as one educational approach to fostering global citizenship. An exploration of this discipline shows the significant roles teachers can play in their classrooms; their participation and contribution are beneficial to fostering positive learning environments for students to more efficiently connect and learn. I advocate a stronger teacher-student relationship so that educators can better provide an environment conducive for teaching global education. Makiguchi (1938) would define this environment as an example of value-creation. When classroom education connects with the lives and interests of the students, it embraces Makiguchi's ideals of Soka Education that recognizes individuals and their essential role in society. According to Diaz et al.'s (1999) study, "Students who are exposed to controversial issues in an open and positive classroom atmosphere develop a greater sense of political efficacy and positive global attitudes" (pp. 31-32). Teachers play a crucial role in how they influence their students in the classroom. However, many people may ponder whether "U.S educators muster the character needed to widen the sense of loyalty and care in themselves and in students beyond the units of family, team, class, school, town, city, state, and nation" (McIntosh, 2005, p.26). In the promotion of global education programs, the quality of a teacher

emerges as an essential variable. Teachers have the ability to lead and make decisions, as well as to inspire and motivate students. Therefore, to foster global awareness in teachers, it is not only necessary to consider teacher training, but it is also beneficial to look more closely at teachers and their impact on students.

In this section, I propose the teacher-student relationship as a basis for a philosophy of education. I first examine the conceptual teaching approaches – traditional and transformative teaching styles. Here I focus on the instructional styles advocated by Freire (2000) and Palmer (1998) and how these approaches affect students. Then I briefly explore a theory of teacher agency by introducing Freire’s concept of *unfinishedness* and Palmer’s concept of the *undivided self* and the influence of the teachers’ whole selves. Finally, I conclude this section by presenting concepts that focus on how teachers can nurture and fulfill the needs of the students. Based upon my analysis, I propose the importance of uniting teaching approaches, teacher agency, and student needs. This connection, grounded in a theory of teacher-student relationship, develops a philosophy of education that empowers the individual student. It echoes Makiguchi’s belief that a teacher-student relationship is based on interaction or encounter: “The teacher...perceives himself...as a guide or a facilitator who assists the learner in gaining maximum benefit from his interaction with his environment” (Bethel, 1972, p.18). I support a global education system that promotes teacher agency and fosters teacher-student relationship as one vital way to implement global citizenship.

## **4.2 TEACHER QUALITY AND CHARACTER IN THE CLASSROOM: METHODOLOGY AND AGENCY**

According to the tenets of progressive education, it is beneficial for students to learn in an environment that encourages them to explore and connect their own life experiences with the school curriculum. An examination of the teachers' approaches, specifically those involving traditional and transformative learning environments, can result in the fostering of this positive environment for students. Freire (2000) and Palmer (1998) study the possibilities for improving and motivating student learning within a progressive framework.

### **4.2.1 Teaching approaches: Traditional and transformative**

Any educational field has both traditional and transformative teaching methods. Freire (2000) defines traditional teaching methods as the "banking system" where teachers systematically transfer knowledge to their students, and students then regurgitate that information back to their teachers. He calls this type of teaching the oppressed way of teaching where students have no voice. Freire sees the transformative teaching method as an alternative to the traditional approach. Transformative teaching is a flexible approach that allows for change and possibilities. Freire states, "To teach is not to *transfer knowledge* but to create possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge" (p.30). He believes that the teachers' role is not only to share their knowledge but also to create the space for learners to realize their vast unlimited potential so that they can imaginatively build their own future without being oppressed. Teachers can motivate and inspire their students to thrive and find meaning in their lives. In the same context, Freire adds:

What I can and ought to do...is to challenge the students to perceive their experience of learning the experience of being a subject capable of knowing. My role as a “progressive” teacher is...helping the students to recognize themselves as the architects of their own cognitive process. (p.112)

Freire (2000) encourages teachers to go beyond the traditional way of teaching, which is the “obvious advantages of the human person” (p.32). He advocates an approach of transformative teaching in the classroom by promoting the possibilities that human beings possess – the potential to resist as well as overcome given conditions. Because many educators believe that the educational system is fixed, they feel powerless to challenge its rigidity. However, people, unlike machines, do not routinely and systematically follow given instructions. Freire asserts that human beings have the ability to create positive as well as negative possibilities:

I like being human because I am involved with others in making history out of possibility, not simply resigned to fatalistic stagnation....I like being human because in my unfinishedness I know that I am conditioned. Yet conscious of such conditioning, I know that I can go beyond it, which is the essential difference between conditioned and determined existence. (p.54)

Along the lines of Freire’s (2000) transformative approach, Palmer (1998) also believes in the importance of individuals to transform their own place and environment rather than accept the given condition: “Institutions reform slowly, and as long as we wait depending on ‘them’ to do the job for us – forgetting that institutions are also ‘us’ – we merely postpone reform and continue the slow slide into cynicism that characterizes too many teaching careers” (p.20).

Although Palmer (1998) seems to agree with Freire's (2000) transformative method, he neither rejects the traditional nor the subject-centered teaching style. Instead, Palmer argues that "good teachers cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (p.10). He stresses the heart as the most important quality that gives good teachers, whether employing the traditional lecture style or transformative discussion style, the ability to connect the subject, students, and themselves. In my understanding of Palmer, the heart defines the core of the teacher-student relationship. His theory of weaving a connection among teachers, students, and curriculum essentially entails developing a viable teacher-student relationship. This relationship, rooted in a transformative approach, places heart over methodology. To describe this relationship, Palmer introduces a metaphor:

Mentors and apprentices are partners in an ancient human dance, and one of teaching's great rewards is the daily chance it gives us to get back on the dance floor. It is the dance of the spiraling generations, in which the old empower the young with their experience and the young empower the old with new life, reweaving the fabric of the human community as they touch and turn. (p.25)

Both Freire's (2000) transformative approach and Palmer's (1998) teaching-with-the-heart philosophy emphasize the students as essential players in the learning process. Based on these beliefs, I will develop a notion of teacher-student relationship.

#### **4.2.2 Teacher agency: Undivided self and unfinishedness**

Teaching approaches are not the only factors that are important to establishing positive teacher-student relationships. Teacher agency, specifically one that focuses on the teachers' identity in the classroom and the impact of the teachers' identity on the students, also emerges as a

significant tool. I define this teacher agency as being an innate quality that allows teachers to see themselves as life-long learners who continue to grow in their understanding of themselves and others. It is this sense of self which fosters within teachers a feeling of confidence and competence and an insistence on human dignity.

Freire (2000) and Palmer (1998) introduce essential qualities in teachers – the identity and integrity that allow teachers to share their whole selves with their students. When educators separate their professional/public identity from their personal identity, they find it difficult to bring their whole selves into the classroom. This can create an atmosphere of fear. Teachers who will not or cannot show their own vulnerabilities to their students tend to resort to complete objectivity. McIntosh (2005), another philosopher, states, “Teachers suffer from the same confinements that their students do. Many long to repair the damage...by the requirement that they leave their whole selves at home...and teach from a very narrow segment of their perceptions and capacities” (p.30).

The teachers who embrace Freire’s (2000) banking approach might leave their “selves” outside the classroom. Yet, Freire also believes that in the transformative groups, by acknowledging their incompleteness as human beings, students are more likely to express themselves as unfinished learners who can respect all individuals regardless of where they stand. Not being complete is what gives humanity to human beings.

Freire (2000) further suggests the idea of unfinishedness. He stresses the importance of accepting the fact that all people are learners in life who are equal and worthy of respect; nobody is better than anybody else. As Freire asserts, “Education does not make us educable. It is our awareness of being unfinished that make us educable. And the same awareness in which we are inserted makes us eternal seekers” (p.58).

Freire (2000) might define those teachers who confidently say that they have nothing more to improve in their teaching practice as non-teachers because they are not learning. The perseverance to learn more determines the individuals' growth. It is almost impossible to find a single person in this world who knows everything or who is perfect and complete. Like Freire, Dewey and many philosophers have emphasized that human beings are life-long learners, not finished products. For teachers to believe that they do not have to learn any more borders on arrogance.

According to Palmer (1998), those teachers who do not allow their whole selves to be present may find it difficult to weave a connection between themselves and their students and subject matter. Palmer stresses the importance of teachers who can bring their identity and integrity to the learning environment. He defines identity and integrity, as who we are: a self that encompasses and accepts both our strengths and weaknesses as a whole. Each of us holds an identity and integrity, but many of us are unconscious of them or are disinclined to accept that we may have a self that is weak or embarrassing. For example, we tend to protect our vulnerable selves by taking the offensive. In the cases of education, this can translate to teachers criticizing or hurting students.

Because of this, teachers might consider teaching from an *undivided self*, "where every major thread of one's life experience is honored, creating a weave of such coherence and strength that it can hold students and subject as well as self" (Palmer, 1998, p.15). The challenge in being an undivided self, according to Palmer, lies in the ability to balance personal and public life while simultaneously being true to ourselves and others. Balancing does not mean denying one over the other but rather bringing forth both in an equal and balanced way. To achieve this undivided self, Palmer calls for teachers to carry out an inner transformation by deepening their



own perception of themselves. Once teachers know and accept who they are, they can present an undivided self to their students.

Therefore, both Freire (2000) and Palmer (1998) emphasize the value in understanding that we as human beings are not complete. The acknowledgment that we are unfinished, that we are better able to build a foundation of inner security and create openness towards ourselves and others, is teacher agency. These qualities of teacher agency emerge as essential aspects of teachers and their educational practice. Friere points out, “On the contrary, it (sense of security) rests on the conviction that there are some things I know and some things I do not know. [...] I feel myself secure because there is no reason to be ashamed that there may be something I do not know” (p.121). Those who do not fear being unfinished are those who understand that teaching and learning are not separate from one another. Effective teachers welcome change and possibility as ways to keep education alive and relevant for their students. Like Freire, they know they “live in history at a time of possibility and not of determinism” (p.71).

#### **4.3 TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP IN THE CLASSROOM: MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE STUDENT**

In this part, I focus on the ways to foster individuals who will have the confidence, competence, and compassion necessary for the promotion of global citizenship; this approach echoes Makiguchi’s (1938) pedagogy of value creation. Once I present the elements essential for this process, I then explain how the teacher-student relationship plays an integral role in opening the door to global education.

### **4.3.1 Nurturing a sense of belonging**

Teachers face the challenges of recognizing their students as unique individuals who struggle to learn the academic material, develop socially, and discover their own identities. Teachers also confront the importance of understanding that their students change; second graders face different issues than their adolescent selves, while high school students may not have the real world fears of university students. Yet, no matter what stage teachers meet their students, they have the responsibility to support and nurture them. According to Grossberg (2005), this is especially important in an increasingly competitive and consumer-oriented society where children are desperate for a sense of belonging. He argues that children, who are being marginalized and blamed for many of the problems that occur in society, “want to be granted a space in which their feelings, thoughts, fears, and hopes can find expression as part of the common vocabulary of the society” (p.55). Teachers can make this space a reality. As McIntosh (2005) explains, a “global sense for belonging and making spaces for all to belong can be developed close to home by teachers bringing the wholeness of their emotions and capacities into classrooms” (p.39). Teachers “unafraid to help students also to develop the plural capacities and the wide-ranging awareness” (p.39) are those who succeed in bringing global education into the classrooms.

### **4.3.2 Respect from teachers**

Efficient teachers not only try to share their knowledge, but they also attempt to create the space for learners to realize their vast unlimited potential so they can imaginatively and independently build their futures. Treating their students with respect can accomplish this. Respect for students

is a quality that comes from the realization that every person is unfinished. Without understanding unfinishedness, teachers cannot entirely accept students. Freire (1998) writes, “This critical evaluation of one’s practice (self-reflection) reveals the necessity for a series of attitudes and virtues without which no true evaluation or true respect for the student can exist” (p.63). Such conduct leads to true respect for the individual student.

This respect that students sense from their teachers empowers them to feel important and confident about themselves; it motivates them to do well in their daily lives. Freire (2000) emphasizes the importance of respect as a vital contributing factor to student growth. In remembering his own classroom experience, he states, “I noticed he (teacher) was looking over my text with great attention, nodding his head in an attitude of respect and consideration. His respectful and appreciative attitude...inspired in me that I too had value and could work and produce results” (p.47). Because teachers’ roles are crucial to the students’ learning process, teachers must receive their students in a nonselective manner (Noddings, 2007). When students learn from such teachers, they are more likely to believe they can contribute to and make a difference not only in their community but also in the global world.

### **4.3.3 Fostering a caring environment**

Respect from teachers not only matters to young adolescents, but also is essential in building a positive teacher-student relationship. When students can see or feel that their teachers respect them, they can also believe that their teachers care for them (Noddings, 2007). Noddings (1987) presents two different types of caring. The first, the care relationship, exists between *one-caring* and *cared-for*. The second type of caring is defined only by the one-caring; this limits caring by excluding the input of the cared-for [student] and considering only the opinion of the one-caring

[teacher]. What a one-caring believes is in the best interest of the cared-for is the caring in this situation. The ideal caring environment to foster is the former type of caring, the first type, creating a mutually satisfying bond between one-caring and cared-for. When teachers acknowledge the feelings of their students, they empower them to feel important and confident about themselves. This motivates them to do well in their daily life.

In addition, Noddings (2007) introduces four major components of moral education from a care perspective. These exemplify the significant responsibility and accountability that teachers have for their students. Modeling, the first component, encourages teachers to teach caring from their own behaviors and examples. Dialogue, the second component, provides a space for both teacher and student to reflect and learn. Through dialogue, students sense how teachers care for them. Romano (2000) adds how dialogue supports the teacher-student relationship. “Through genuine dialogue of mutual respect and reciprocity, the distance between students and teachers is reduced, setting the stage for shared understandings, beliefs, and meanings. With such relations, each of us becomes obligated to respect and recognize one another” (p. 115). Essentially, teachers are the mediators who can create opportunities for dialogue in the classrooms. As Benhabib (2002) states, valuing the individual requires dialogue and universal respect. The third component of moral education, practice or personal experience, gives students the opportunity to learn how to care, while the last component, confirmation, recognizes and affirms the care.

In these four models as introduced by Noddings (2007), teachers play an important role. Regardless of how much they try to care, they must always be sensitive to the feelings of their students, the cared-for. If the cared-for do not believe they are cared for, then the teachers’ caring offers no value for the cared-for. In contrast, if they do believe they are cared for, this caring

relationship can develop into motivation and possibilities for learning and further caring (Gaudelli, 2003; Noddings, 2007).

By establishing a caring theory in the school community, Gaudelli (2003) believes that educators can further create an environment that will transcend boundaries for global education. Noddings (2005) and Ladson-Billings (2005) emphasize the importance of teachers nurturing a caring environment for their students in the local community. Furthermore, Gaudelli and McIntosh (2005) expand the role of teachers seeing the relationship they create with their students as the core to global education. When educators foster within individuals a strong sense of belonging to their local environment, those individuals might then begin to have a sense of belonging to the global environment and a concern for the well-being of others.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

Although the world is steadfastly becoming interconnected due to the market economy and information technology, both adults and children often remain disconnected from each other in their local and global communities. Thus, this thesis promotes the necessity for global citizenship. It argues for a global education that, based upon a teacher-student relationship, fosters a sense of belonging.

The foundation of my philosophy of education, as well as the essence of this paper, lies in the teacher-student relationship. Specifically, this paper suggests that teachers have the opportunity to 1) create learning environments that nurture students' self-awareness; 2) instill within their students a sense of respect and caring for themselves and others; and 3) encourage their students to be active participants both in their learning process and their lives.

I advocate a teacher-student relationship that is a multi-faceted one which recognizes the roles of both the teacher and the student. This philosophy, though, does not imply that a teacher-student relationship automatically leads to the promotion of global citizenship; teachers can foster relationships with their students yet neglect to promote a global sense of belonging. However, what I do emphasize is that this teacher-student relationship plays a fundamental and essential role for any educator who values the promotion of global education. This progressive philosophy sees the impetus for change as lying within the domain of the teachers. It encourages teachers to do the following:

- Develop an instructional approach or style that best suits their students and their needs,
- Acknowledge their inherent weaknesses and limitations in order to grow as educators and people, and
- Relate to their students and help them discover their own potential.

While one teacher cannot change the destiny of the world, I believe each teacher has the potential to make a difference in the lives of students by giving them the academic and social tools they need to implement change. Like McIntosh (2005), I see within teachers the openness to change and the courage to take action:

Though it may be hard to change schools and educational ideals, I have found through my experience that it is not so hard for teachers themselves to change if they feel they are recovering something they lost: their human breadth and their longing to help shape a world that is not torn apart. (p.30)

Freire (2000) also reinforces my basic premise that while one teacher cannot alter the entire world, teachers can still have a positive impact by being flexible, open-minded, and caring about their one-to-one connection with their students. To better the present situation, he states, requires “consistency with which she/he [teacher] lives out his or her committed presence in the world, knowing that this presence in the school... is nevertheless only one of many moments” (p.110).

My philosophy of education, then, does not question the importance of the teacher-student relationship. I understand that “students’ lives are integrally linked with the teacher. The stance of culturally relevant teachers is that what happens to students ultimately happens to me”

(Ladson-Billings, 2005, p.122). I also believe that teachers can meet the needs of their students and prepare them to become global citizens by fostering within them the following:

- A sense of belonging to themselves, their community, and the global world,
- A feeling of respect that yields a sense of value and empowerment, and
- A belief that others care about them and their well-being.

The question I do raise in this thesis, however, is whether teachers are willing to challenge themselves to become cognizant of the commonalities they share with others, both within the classroom as well as their local and global communities. It is my belief that should teachers incorporate these insights into their daily interaction with their students, they will educate their students to become globally conscious individuals.

Furthermore, when teachers constantly engage in a dialogue with themselves, they begin to question why they teach and why education exists. The more teachers allow themselves to grow, the more they see education as a way to foster within their students an understanding and acceptance of differences and a desire to make the world a more harmonious one. These are the teachers who embrace Makiguchi and his philosophy of value creation. These are the teachers who create an environment that meets the needs of their students. Students of such teachers can then more confidently and competently respond as follows:

- Learn the academic materials,
- Apply and connect what they learn to their lives, and
- Recognize and respond to the needs of others.

This teacher-student relationship provides the foundation from which a global education can be built, suggesting that this foundation can surmount the challenges to global education. My philosophy proposes that this connection builds a learning environment conducive for global



education. Once this philosophical foundation of teacher-student relationship is established, it allows and encourages teachers to see their students not only as parts of the whole but as unique individuals who have the potential for growth and change.

## **5.1 IMPLICATIONS**

### **5.1.1 Starting from the local**

I suggest an approach for educators that can foster within students a sense of belonging and of caring for global issues. Such an approach advocates starting the learning process from a locally-based education system that encourages students how to develop a sense of belonging in the community and an affinity for their place (Noddings, 2005). Achieving these goals is an ongoing process that is rooted in the value-creating pedagogy of Makiguchi (1989). By creating value with the resources available in their local community, teachers can enlighten their students to the interconnectedness of self and environment and can empower them to take action. I again emphasize the significant role that teachers play in the development of students: their growth as learners and their evolving recognition of a sense of belonging not only to their immediate community but also to the national and global communities.

Regardless of whether educators are trying to teach civic or global education, the current education systems have many challenges to address – including cultural, economical, and political – before individuals can connect with their society. Thus, education needs to start from the local community. According to Ladson-Billings (2005), the local setting should be the first environment in which individuals learn to connect, experience, and understand the relationship

between the community and themselves. She continues, “Until students begin to see democracy work in their own local communities, their ability to work for it as a part of common good and a worthwhile global strategy is unlikely to materialize” (p.79).

Furthermore, Noddings’ (2005) idea of education, focused in the local, encompasses the idea of individuals valuing the local environment and their place in it. Specifically, Noddings emphasizes peoples’ attachment to place, studying why people leave their place and what issues occur when they do. Through a locally-based education system, students learn about their community as well as their role in that particular place. The ideal goal is to foster in students a sense of concern for others through first teaching them an understanding about their own place.

The interconnectedness of today’s society today creates a need for cross-cultural understanding that develops the skills necessary for preparing the next generation. Accordingly, Romano (2000) emphasizes the importance of “the obligation of teachers to help students connect with one another and themselves, not the other way around, that is, not the obligation of students to connect with their teachers and one another” (p. 117). Going back to the classroom environment is important; the classroom offers abundant time and opportunity for fostering connections and building interests in the students.

Teachers can create a bridge between what they teach within their immediate environment with the global issues that confront all societies. In order to do this, Gaudelli (2003) encourages building and linking caring school communities; as an example, he suggests minimizing classroom sizes, promoting student mentorships, encouraging teachers to home visit students and build relationships with them outside of the school environment, and providing students with counseling opportunities.

Based upon my philosophy, teachers can challenge fatalism and strive for optimism. While teachers face a formidable task in implementing change, they can succeed by reflecting upon who they are today and what they can become tomorrow. Teachers can create value in their current circumstance to mold their curriculum and methods to meet the needs of their students and, more importantly, the era in which they both live.

This thesis does more than give teachers a philosophical guideline for incorporating a global curriculum within the educational system. It also endorses global education as an action plan that involves the act of internationalizing curriculum. Such a curriculum can teach students about the history, culture, and current issues that exist in specific regions of the world. However, this thesis is not an instructional guideline that presents educators with steps to foster global citizenship. As I have emphasized earlier, every place has its own cultural uniqueness, quality, and needs. It is up to the local educators and community to acknowledge its own strengths and weaknesses to create a valuable curriculum for the students. Thus, the challenge is a twofold one: teachers providing an education that encourages their students to learn and connect with their global community; students embracing this challenge by recognizing their place in the world and discovering ways to contribute to their world.

Teachers alone cannot achieve global education; students also play a role in this process. They can do this by replacing a passive attitude towards learning with a more dynamic one that involves active participation in the learning process. By questioning what has been and currently is, students can then envision what might be. They can take the education they receive within the classroom to their world beyond the classroom. Grossberg (2005) sees these children as the light for a transformation that will create a better future: “Childhood and youth became the essence of

imagination, the affirmation that there are always alternatives and that resistance to any one future is always possible. Kids remind us that we can always change directions” (p. 308).

Because they have seen their teachers nurture and embrace individuality and uniqueness, these students can learn to value who they are and extend that sense of respect and caring to others. Most of all, these students who recognize their uniqueness can become global citizens who create value and implement change within their global society. This society, which exists in peace, consists of citizens who focus not only on the challenges within their own borders, but also on the larger issues that affect the physical environment, world economy, and international politics. My philosophy envisions teachers and students who, by working together, can develop sensitivity to different cultures and empathy for others around the world. As Romano (2000) asserts, “In an educative community, difference is not threatening to one’s sense of self. Compassionate imagination of the feeling heart provides an opening to understandings between the participants” (p.112).

My philosophy embraces individuals who define themselves beyond a single community, city, state, or even nation. These individuals emerge as global citizens who recognize the interconnectedness of the world. Rosalie Romano (2001) ends her book, *In Fostering an Educative Community*, with a passage that equally captures the essence of the teacher-student relationship, education, and citizenship in an ever-evolving global community:

In an educative community, we are like La Huesera, bringing all our children together to help sing them to their world, free to be themselves. We cannot force awakening, but rather coax it with our singing. And our songs must change as our children change, each deserving her or his own variation. And as our song emerges, another begins, until soon

our children recognize their own song and the songs of the others and know through this their kinship. (p.124)

## REFERENCES

- American Forum for Global Education. (2003). Retrieved April 20, 2006, from <http://www.globaled.org/about.php>.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(11), 1-11.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (2000). *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Cahn, S. M. (Ed.). (1997). *Classic and contemporary readings in the philosophy of education*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Carlsson-Paige, N., & Lantieri, L. (2005). A changing vision of education. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 107-121). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997). The child and the curriculum. In S. M. Cahn (Ed.), *Classic and contemporary readings in the philosophy of education* (pp. 276-288). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Diaz, C. F., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, J. A. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dower, N. (2002). Global citizenship: Yes or no? In N. Dower, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Global citizenship: A critical introduction* (pp. 30-40). New York: Routledge.
- Earth Charter Commission. Earth Council. (2000). *Earth charter*. Retrieved August 18, 2007, from <http://www.earthcharter.org>
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Fujikane, H. (2003). Approaches to global education in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan. *International Review of Education*, 49(1-2), 133-152.

- Gaudelli, W. (2003). *World class: Teaching and learning in global times*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grossberg, L. (2005). *Caught in the crossfire: Kids, politics, and America's future*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Hansen, D. T. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethical visions of education: Philosophies in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heyneman, S. P. (2003). What the United States Needs to Learn from UNESCO. *Prospects*, 33(1), 7-10.
- Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: A reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 265-275.
- Ikeda, D. (2001). *Soka education: A Buddhist vision for teachers, students and parents*. Santa Monica, CA: Middleway Press.
- Ikeda, D. (2006). *To the youthful pioneers of Soka: Lectures, essays & poems on value-creating education*. Soka University of America.
- Kirkwood, T. F. (2001). Our global age requires global education: Clarifying definitional ambiguities. *The Social Studies*, 92(1), 10-15.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Differing concepts of citizenship: Schools and communities as sites of civic development. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating for global awareness* (pp. 69-80). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Makiguchi, T. (1989). *Education for creative living: Ideas and proposals of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi* (A. Birnbaum, Trans. First ed.). Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 22-39). New York: Teachers College Press
- Merryfield, M. (1994). *Teacher education in global & international education*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Publications.
- National Commission on Social Studies(NCSS). (1982). Position statement on global education. *Social Studies*, 46(1), 36-38.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Noddings, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of education* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (2001). *In the classroom*. Toronto, Ontario: Pippin Publishing.
- Plato. (1997). *The Republic*. In S. M. Cahn (Ed.), *Classic and contemporary readings in the philosophy of education* (pp. 39-109). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Reardon, B. A. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Romano, R. M. (2000). *Forging an educative community: The wisdom of love, the power of understanding, and the terror of it all*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1997). *Emile*. In S. M. Cahn (Ed.), *Classic and contemporary readings in the philosophy of education* (pp. 163-196). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Schaefer, B. D. (2001). Not the time for the United States to rejoin UNESCO. *The Heritage Foundation*, 1-8. Retrieved April 15, 2006, from <http://www.heritage.org/Research/InternationalOrganizations/BG1405.cfm>
- Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2004). *Human development report 2004* o. Document Number)
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2006). Retrieved March 15th, 2006, from <http://www.education.unesco.org/asp>
- Urban, W. J., & Wagoner Jr., J. L. (2004). *American education: A history*, (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- US Census Bureau. (1998). Census 1998. September 10, 2007, from <http://www.census.gov/>