Exploring Pedagogical Practices to Cultivate Wisdom, Courage, and Compassion as Key Tenets of Global Citizenship: A Qualitative Study

Gitima Sharma
California State University, Fresno
U. S. A.

Christina Bosch
California State University, Fresno
U. S. A.

Gonzalo Obelleiro
DePaul University, Chicago
U. S. A.

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study was to explore college students' and educators' (N = 29) perceptions, experiences, and recommendations around cultivating wisdom, compassion, and courage as key tenets of global citizenship. Based on pragmatic research design and thematic analysis, we sought multicultural education approaches that could strengthen campus communities' capacity to advance peace, sustainability, dignity, and well-being of all forms of life – all across the world. We have discussed the findings in the context of specific pedagogical practices focusing upon: (a) emergent praxes and curriculum to foster wisdom, (b) courageous dialogues for mutual understanding, and (c) restoring compassion and humanity.

KEYWORDS: Citizenship education; multicultural competence; dialogue; empathy; cosmopolitan pedagogy

Our world is facing unprecedented crises that include, but are not limited to pandemic, war, mass shootings, racism, threats to democracy, and ultranationalism (Goulah, 2020; Ikeda, 2020; Supa et al., 2021). What is needed more than ever is a significant educative impact in strengthening people's inherent capacity to overcome the tendencies that cause violence and division, and instead cultivate the potential for promoting peaceful coexistence and well-being of all

forms of life – rooted in shared humanity, appreciation for diversity, and sense of global citizenship. Global citizenship is a millennia old idea with independent sources in multiple cultural traditions (Hansen, 2011; Strand, 2010a, 2010b) and a history of periodic reemergence (Anderson, 1998; Nussbaum, 2019). The past three decades mark a period of reemergence with flourishing of research on global citizenship (Hansen, 2010a; Strand, 2010a; Todd, 2010). In particular, since the United Nations launched the Global Education First Initiative, the idea of global citizenship has taken center stage in debates about education (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). The appeal and perceived relevance of the concept lies in that it offers a framework and an ethical orientation to respond creatively to the challenges of an increasingly interconnected world (Hansen 2008, 2009, 2010b; Strand, 2010a, 2010b).

Global citizenship has also emerged as an important perspective in multicultural education (Banks, 2004; Supa et al., 2021; Wall, 2019). Both concepts occupy a common semantic space. They are both committed to the values of diversity and unity. They both represent responses to the challenges associated with mass migration and the rapid development and spread of communications technologies. Both ideas also stand in contrast to exclusive nationalism, assimilationism, and differential exclusivism. There are, however, significant differences as well. As Tarozzi and Torres (2016) argue, the rise of global citizenship education discourses within multicultural education comes in response to a growing appreciation that multiculturalism for the 21st century needs to move beyond recognition of diversity and promoting cultural hybridization to cultivating a sense of global ethic and a commitment to social justice.

Global citizenship insists that as citizens of the world we should be aware and appreciate the aspects of human (and non-human) experience that we share across differences. At the same time, it demands that we recognize and value differences, appreciating and respecting that which makes each group and each individual unique. This intrinsic tension shapes a conceptual taxonomy. Universalistic approaches to global citizenship emphasize the shared aspects of human experience (Nussbaum, 2002a). The main aim of an education for global citizenship, then, is that of cultivating a critical distance from one's cultural and moral background assumptions and instead fostering understanding of a universal human nature (Papastephanou, 2002, 2005). The critical perspectives of global citizenship challenge the outlooks that give privileged students additional status to perpetuate asymmetrical global power relations and enhance their competitiveness in a globalized capitalist economy (Aktas et al., 2017; Rizvi, 2007; Shultz, 2007).

Recognizing growing global inequalities, several scholars and educators have advocated for revisiting the concept of global citizenship from diverse cultural and religious viewpoints that inspire people to achieve a positive collective future for humanity and build "socially cohesive and culturally robust communities" (Rizvi & Choo, 2020, p. 2). Scholars have also advocated for more research on understanding global citizenship in terms of inherent capacities that encourage resolution of the world's interlocking crises instead of replicating the existing global

power dynamics and inequities (e.g., Aktas et al., 2017; Andreotti, 2014; Caruana, 2014; Rizvi, 2007; Shultz, 2007). The purpose of the present study was to explore pedagogical practices and initiatives that could cultivate people's inherent capacities as citizens of the world who can build a sustainable society in which diverse forms of life can live with dignity and a sense of well-being (Ikeda, 2020), which is also the goal of multicultural education that aspires for equitable opportunities for all (Banks, 2010).

Conceptual Framing

The importance of fostering global citizenship in times of uncertain struggle for liberatory change was captured in the title of civil rights and feminist activist Fannie Lou Hamer's 1971 speech: "Nobody's Free until Everybody's Free." That half a century later, Hamer's insight remains as relevant — and challenging — as ever illuminates both the enduring nature of social crises and the need for interconnected struggles for liberation. An educator and peacebuilder, Daisaku Ikeda (2017, 2021), offers the term "human revolution" to describe the process of inner and social transformation necessary to engage in committed, compassionate actions that can contribute to a lasting, positive change. Such capacity for positive change based on inner transformation has come to play a central role in contemporary discourses on global citizenship.

This study is informed by Ikeda's (1996, 2021) conceptualization of global citizenship. A constituent element of his larger philosophy of *ningen kyōiku*, or "human education," Ikeda's conceptualization of global citizenship focuses upon strengthening human beings' inherent qualities, representing a third, middle way approach between the universalist concern with the problem of overcoming harmful, morally-arbitrary divisions and the critical focus on issues of power dynamics and difference (Goulah, 2020, 2021; Obelleiro, forthcoming). The following three tenets illustrate Ikeda's (2021) conceptual framework for global citizenship:

> (a) The wisdom to perceive the interconnectedness of all life; (b) The courage to not fear or deny difference but to respect and strive to understand people of different cultures and to grow from such encounters; and (c) The compassion to maintain an imaginative empathy that reaches beyond their immediate surroundings and extends to those suffering in distant places. (Pp. 6-7)

Ikeda (1996) derives the three principles of wisdom, courage, and compassion from Mahayana Buddhist ethical theory. The specific formulation Ikeda offers is original, but the three terms come from the Buddhist principle of the three virtues (*santoku*): wisdom (*chie*), courage (*yūki*), and compassion (*jihi*).

The term Ikeda uses for the "interconnectedness" (*soukansei*) of life alludes to the Buddhist concept of *dependent origination* (Sanskrit: *pratītya-samutpāda*;

Japanese: *engi* or *innen*). Dependent origination is a key term in Buddhist philosophy that communicates the wisdom to perceive interconnectedness and interdependence between all forms of living (Ikeda, 2005b). Ikeda (2012) elucidated, "just as we cannot experience happiness and security in isolation – enjoying them even as others suffer from their want – we likewise cannot live insulated against the miseries and threats that afflict others" (p. 5). While Ikeda's conception of interconnectedness overlaps with Western liberal notions of harmony, it differs from it in important way. Western liberal notions of harmony figure prominently in Western theories of global citizenship and constitute the basis for assimilationist conceptions of citizenship (Banks, 2008; Gutmann, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2004). Western liberal conceptions of global citizenship grounded in such notions of harmony emphasize the overcoming of differences and achieving moral growth in a narrow sense as a path that leads from the limiting function of particular perspectives towards the liberating function of universal human nature (Nussabum, 1997, Papastephanou, 2002). Such conceptions of harmony have been criticized as a mere rationalization of hegemonic power (Mouffe, 2005; Todd, 2010), in which the particular interests of the powerful are elevated to the status of universal values and the various modes of oppression that flow from hegemonic power are concealed. The rhetoric of universal values and harmony effectively operates to suppress struggle against oppression (Mouffe, 2005). By contrast, Ikeda's conception of interconnectedness crucially includes critical awareness of questions of power, oppression, and suffering – rooted in the inseparability of wisdom, spiritual transformation, and social and political action. For Ikeda (2005b) wisdom is not simply perceiving some kind of underlying harmony in nature but to strive for well-being of all forms of life, given the undeniable interconnectedness.

The second tenet foments the courage necessary not to be defeated by personal biases and instead engage in open dialogues based on a firm belief in the inherent dignity of others' lives (Goulah, 2020; Ikeda, 2021). For Ikeda (2005a), courageous dialogue is instrumental for the cultivation of genuine friendships, trust, and grassroots exchanges in the cultural and educational fields. These, in turn, are conducive to achieve lasting peace through a persistent effort to remove all obstacles that obscure people's common humanity (Goulah, 2018; Ikeda, 2005a).

Finally, the third tenet of global citizenship focuses on compassion and imaginative empathy that can extend to all humanity at large (Ikeda, 2021). According to Ikeda (2010), the quality of compassion entails the capacity to embrace others' sufferings as one's own and make consistent efforts to resolve humanity's concerns as citizens committed to the well-being of all. Even if compassion exists within the hearts of many people as an important sentiment, egoism and fear of difference often result in ethnocentrism and lack of action towards greater good. Courage plays a decisive role in translating the sentiment of compassion into concrete action for social justice and well-being for all.

These qualities of wisdom, courage, and compassion are distinct but also interrelated. At core, all of these qualities are rooted in respect for the dignity of life (Goulah, 2020) and emphasize humanitarian quest to further the cause for world

peace (Ikeda, 2021). These qualities are also mutually reinforcing. For instance, the compassionate desire to contribute to others' well-being gives rise to wisdom for using one's knowledge to benefit others (Ikeda, 2021). In addition, although courage to dialogue is critical, such dialogues must be rooted in wisdom to appreciate interconnectedness between all forms of life and overcoming "prejudicial thinking" (Ikeda, 2010, p. 169). It is worth noting that the idea of compassion as a cognitive and affective trait, and a moral concern for others, is a common feature of many theories of global citizenship (Goulah, 2021). By contrast, the emphasis on courage as central and constitutive of global citizenship seems a unique feature of Ikeda's conception (Goulah, 2021). For Ikeda, courage plays a special role in the developmental sequence of the three virtues because courage is the only one that can be willed. We cannot simply choose to feel compassion or have wisdom, but we can choose to act courageously, and when we do, as Ikeda (2010) claims, compassion and wisdom can contribute to others' well-being.

One significant limitation of this framework is that it focuses on global citizenship as an ethical orientation and its conception of education is viewed as a process of self-transformation, which puts excessive responsibility on the kind of person educators and students should be or become to enact global citizenship. At the same time, it offers little guidance in terms of what they should *do.* In other words, as a framework, it has more to say about ethics than about the pedagogical practices involved in global citizenship education. A growing body of recent scholarship has begun to address this issue (Inukai & Okamura, 2021).

Moreover, Ikeda's perspectives are influenced by the ideas of Japanese educators and Eastern philosophers Makiguchi Tsunesaburō (1871–1944) and Toda Jōsei (1900–1958), leading to concrete global-citizenship-centered-curriculum strategies (Goulah, 2020). In addition to shaping curriculum at Soka University (in Japan) and Soka University of America, both of which Ikeda founded, his ideas undergird curriculum and research centers at multiple universities around the world, such as DePaul University's Institute for Daisaku Ikeda Studies in Education and its degree programs in Value-Creating Education for Global Citizenship (2022). Such programs and initiatives feature pedagogical practices of dialogue, interconnectedness, and critical, creative, and socially-engaged praxis (Goulah, 2021; Ikeda, 2021). Multicultural education similarly aims to foster students who can function as citizen-participants within the complex, interlocking systems of an increasingly connected world, "with a richness of human understanding and aspiration that cannot be supplied by economic connection alone" (Nussbaum, 2002b p. 292). The significance of this study lies in empirically exploring praxis at the multicultural education level to foster students' and educators' positive inner transformation for engaging in compassionate and courageous actions that can address the interconnected concerns of humanity.

Research Design and Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore college students' and educators' perceptions, experiences, and recommendations around cultivating wisdom, compassion, and courage as key tenets of global citizenship, and further shed light on pedagogical practices that could strengthen a sense of global citizenship. To fulfill this purpose, we used a pragmatic research paradigm and conducted thematic analysis. The pragmatic approach facilitated the integration of Ikeda's conceptual framework to developing practical insights on strengthening global-citizenship-centered-multicultural education across various contemporary contexts (Morgan, 2014). Using thematic analysis allowed us to inductively identify themes, analyze the data, and report patterns to shed light into participants' perspectives (Braun & Clarke, 2012).

Context and Participants

After receiving approval from the University's Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, participants were sought through purposeful sampling to yield cases that were "information rich" (Patton, 2001) and represented diversity with regard to age, race, ethnicity, nationality, gender identity, religion, and role in higher education. Based on purposeful and snowball sampling techniques, we sent recruitment emails to college students and educators within the United States. We chose both students and educators to gain a comprehensive understanding of how global citizenship can be nurtured from both students' lived experiences and educators' conceptual and pedagogical understanding. A total of 29 participants (19 college students and 10 educators) from public and private higher education institutions in the U.S. voluntarily consented to participate in the study through a written consent form. The students' ages ranged from 21 to 33 years old; eight were undergraduate, nine were graduate students, and two did not disclose. The age range of the ten educators was between 33-60 years old. The participants' demographic information is provided in Table 1, below.

Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

	Students	Educators	Total
Gender			
Female	12	8	
Male	5	1	
Non-Binary	0	1	
Undisclosed	1	0	
Race/Ethnicity			
Latino/a/x	11	n/a	
African American	n/a	1	
Asian	3	6	
White	n/a	3	
Mixed	3	n/a	
Undisclosed	2	0	
Nationality			
U.S. Citizen	15	6	
Non-U.S. Citizen/Visa	3	2	
Permanent Resident	n/a	2	
Undisclosed	1	0	
Total	19	10	29

Data Collection and Analysis

We conducted all 29 interviews virtually using Zoom videoconferencing. We decided to conduct interviews via Zoom instead of in-person due to COVID-19 protocols. Each interview lasted for 60 to 90 minutes and interviewees were provided a gift card of $30 as a token of appreciation. We transcribed and organized the data using MAXQDA software. We followed Braun and Clarke's (2012) six-step reflexive thematic analytical approach. First, we familiarized ourselves with the data through active listening and reading the transcripts that were transcribed verbatim. Second, we initiated the process of coding and developing initial codes. During step three, we coded all relevant data and gathered information to create potential themes. These were reviewed and relationships between the codes, sub-themes and overarching themes were noted. Next, we described the overarching themes and labelled them with consideration to how the data relate to one another and our research purpose. Lastly, we generated a report on the themes.

To establish trustworthiness and credibility, we engaged in the processes of reflexivity, audit trail, member checking, and triangulation (Creswell, 2013). We used reflexive summaries to critically reflect upon our positions, perceptions, and roles as researchers regarding the concept of global citizenship. The first two

authors and a research assistant were involved in the process of data analysis. All three engaged in a self-reflection process to reflect upon their prior knowledge, experiences, and perceptions of global citizenship. The first author is an international faculty from India who was already familiar with Ikeda's (2021) conceptualization of courage, compassion, and wisdom as key tenets of global citizenship and was seeking to learn about pedagogical approaches that could promote students' identity as global citizens – especially while teaching courses on multicultural education and cross-cultural counseling. The second author was unfamiliar with Ikeda's (2021) conceptualization of global citizenship but passionate about supporting both students and educators to strengthen their capacity as citizens of the world who can advance global peace, social justice, and collective well-being amidst current crises of pandemic and war. The third author is an educator and scholar on global citizenship and supported the study with the review of literature and conceptual framing. This study was also supported by a research assistant who engaged in the process of triangulation and discussing initial findings of the data. The research assistant was a graduate student who specialized in the areas of multicultural education and qualitative research methods but was not familiar with the literature on global citizenship. Collectively, the analysts discussed their roles as researchers and strove to bracket their own ideas to objectively analyze every transcript while maintaining notes on the content and ideas that emerged from each participant's interview.

To maintain an audit trail, we kept records of all research activities, participant demographic information, interview protocols and transcripts, analysis procedures, our thematic analysis map, and a systematic emergence of initial codes and themes (Hays & Singh, 2012). We further engaged in member checking by sharing the transcripts, drafts on initial notes, and descriptions of each theme with the participants. We attempted to triangulate our findings by comparing our findings as co-researchers, examining the data across multiple student-participants, reflecting upon the data shared by educator-participants, and further comparing the data provided by students and educators as participants.

Findings

The data analysis resulted in four themes. This section highlights participants' narratives along with a detailed description of each of these themes. To protect participants' anonymity, we used pseudonyms.

Theme 1: Perceiving Interconnectedness

Participants emphasized that global citizenship is not about having a "world passport" but, rather, a sense of responsibility and awareness that one's own thoughts, feelings, and actions have an effect on others. For example, Kelvin

(educator) stated that global citizenship is about "the intent, life-state, and mindset" that does not allow people to see others as separate but is rooted in a deep awareness that "our lives are part of the macrocosm and though it may seem isolated we experience and affect everything." Similarly, Flora (student), shared that being a global citizen would mean "to be in unity with all things and see the same life that is in me in another human being." The same participant further stressed that their identity as a global citizen encouraged them to "acknowledge and appreciate that all living things are dependent on one another and no life is lesser or better than any other." Likewise, another participant, Rohan (educator) expressed:

> A lot of social issues that we face right now come from a hierarchical or structural or categorical understanding of life. We keep separating from each other. We are different, but that does not mean that we are separate. We are unique but still connected. There is interconnectedness across all life forms.

Some participants further perceived themselves as a "citizen of the planet first," instead of "the borders that people draw around themselves based on nationality and other identities." Ankita (student) stated that, "the belief that we are all born of the same source and are interconnected has given me strength and courage to overcome family trauma because as long as I change, everything around me, can change."

Within the context of pandemic, several (N = 6) participants shared that, even if the pandemic revealed global interconnectedness, the "politicizing of the pandemic" resulted in "so much negativity and hate, causing people to feel more separated than united." Most of the participants (N = 23), however, acknowledged that the pandemic strengthened their awareness about the relationship between all living beings and "sense of responsibility and accountability for what's going on around the world."

Theme 2: Renewed Compassion and Empathy

Participants talked about global citizenship with regard to compassion that extends to all humanity. An educator, Shruti, expressed that a global citizen is "someone who is thinking of the wellbeing of the whole planet rather than just of their own narrow circumstances and nation." Another participant, Ankita (student), expressed achieving global citizenship as a matter of "an internal quest" that inspired them to "stay humble," overcome the "feeling of superiority," and "keep finding the strength to have compassion and respect for all."

Several participants (N = 9), such as Tania (student), explained that "compassion for self and others is not separate." In relation to compassion for others leading to care for self, Shruti (educator) stated that the pandemic reaffirmed their belief that "if we are concerned about our own wellbeing, we should

be concerned about the whole world's wellbeing, because if the whole world is not well then we won't be." With regard to self-care leading to compassion for others, Tania (student) shared that their past trauma taught them the importance of self-care and stated that "for me, compassion is actually compassion for myself and the ability to say I need to heal because the more I heal, the more available and compassionate I become."

Participants' narratives showed that the pandemic renewed their empathy for people worldwide who were struggling with similar health concerns and hardships. Participants also highlighted the importance of treasuring those near them and building genuine friendships. They emphasized that, in addition to feeling compassion for those who live far away, it is also important to practice compassion for those nearby.

Theme 3: Mustering Courage to Take Action and Engage in Dialogues

Despite a growing sense of interconnectedness and compassion, many participants (N = 17) reported that the pandemic made it more challenging for them to engage in actions that benefit others. These participants shared that being in virtual environments amidst political polarization made them feel isolated. An educator, Betty, added, "it takes a lot of courage [to engage with] somebody who's different from me. So, I tend to just shut off and won't engage." Some participants, such as Maizah (student), reported feelings of helplessness and frustration because they felt that "people were trying to blame others and did not know how to come together to fight this disease (COVID-19)." Rolando (student) expressed,

> When this virus was labeled a Chinese virus, it implanted this idea in people's minds that all of this is a fault of Asian people… And that right there is the antithesis of interconnectedness because it goes to show that it draws boundaries and categorizes people… But, we're all the same.

Rolando continued, "Hate crimes show that a lot of people don't have that same mindset that we're all connected."

The participants also emphasized that to grow as global citizens they needed the courage to overcome their own biases, prejudices, and tendencies that prevented them from connecting with others. For instance, Isabella (student) shared that they used conflicts to reflect upon their own selves and question: "Do I believe in my own and others' humanity? And truly embrace different cultures instead of rejecting differences?" Another student, Ankita, shared their resolve:

> I challenge myself every day in the process of human revolution or self-mastery to win over my own assumptions and implicit biases and to engage in a kind of dialogue where I am not fearing even the death of my own opinion.

These examples illustrate how participants linked courage to dialogue and internal change. Participants further acknowledged the role of the pandemic and recent racial reckoning in deepening their resolve to engage in dialogues. They shared that such dialogues must be rooted in respect, compassion, and empathy.

Theme 4: Global Citizenship-centered Curriculum and Pedagogy

A majority of the students (N = 14) shared that, apart from ethnic studies, few if any courses focused on directly enhancing their capacity as citizens of the world who can advance a positive global change. An educator, Betty, talked in detail about the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals but struggled with illustrating how college education could help the campus community to take action towards ensuring that "future needs are not compromised due to current human actions." Participants advocated for "global-citizenship-centered-curriculum" in form of some required courses, workshops, professional development seminars, campus clubs, organizations, and collaborations that further global citizenship–supporting them to make global citizenship "part of their daily conversations and regular life."

Additionally, both educators and students suggested some concrete pedagogical practices and content on which "global-citizenship-centered" education could focus. For instance, participants emphasized local, global, social, and ecological issues; historic examples of victories for equity; and the intersectional lived experiences of privilege and oppression. Participants further suggested integrating "human rights education," "intercultural competence," and "advocacy skills" in different courses. Almost all participants (N = 24) shared the importance of cross-cultural dialogues that are rooted in respect for the dignity of each person's life, desire to connect based on common humanity, and resolve to explore solutions that could potentially benefit everyone. Isabella (student) asserted that we need to explore "creative ways on how to promote dialogues where different people meet and really listen to what humanity is yearning for and how we can unite to create spaces where everyone's voices are respected." Educators, such as Fen, explained that strengthening the campus community's skills in conducting dialogues also required teaching about active listening skills and being "willing to challenge personal biases and prejudices that build a wall between people."

Beyond specific pedagogical content and practices, participants emphasized the importance of expanding their own humanity and achieving personal growth. While describing the important role that educators can play in supporting students' growth as global citizens, Nitin (student) said, "It's not about the content, it's about the person, the human being." Vani (educator) shared the importance of modeling "what it means to advocate for others and for equity." Another educator, Ananya, reflected upon the importance of personal growth and shared, "As human beings, we have power, and sometimes we forget that we can

impact our environment… I use my Buddhist chanting of *nam-myoho-renge-kyo* to use my work to create a world that is sustainable and where humanism pervades." Educators also highlighted the importance of "restoring humanity," "humanizing hearts," "imparting hope and confidence," "respecting the dignity of each student's life," and "believing in everyone's unlimited potential and worth" as the way to nurture global citizens.

Several (N=7) educators, including Rohan, advocated for "calling out current existing practices that undermine global connectedness or dehumanize others and instead focus on anti-racist, anti-colonial frameworks that can flatten the hierarchy." Rohan also emphasized that we must "represent diverse voices and not just Western ideologies and concepts." Similarly, Vani suggested modeling for students "how to talk about hard, complicated, complex topics, especially regarding race or other markers of identity." Julia emphasized the importance of celebrating diversity among students and supporting them to share their own lived experiences.

Discussion

The present study used a pragmatic research design to discuss the findings of this study and previous research in the context of multicultural education practices that could foster global citizenship amidst the current interlocking crises, such as, but not limited to, the COVID-19 pandemic that backgrounded the study. This study has specifically provided an opportunity to improve praxis in higher education towards the development of people's inherent capacities as citizens of the world. Similar to Ikeda's (1996, 2021) conceptualization and previous literature (e.g., Goulah, 2012; Guajardo & Reiser, 2016; Sherman, 2019), the participants in this study described global citizenship as made of key mindsets and capacities that inspire people to strive for the wellbeing of all forms of life across the world. Participants emphasized that the inherent capacities of wisdom, courage, and compassion that this study focused on, are mutually supportive and, therefore, a comprehensive global-citizenship-centered-curriculum should provide opportunities to strengthen and practice each of these capacities.

Participants also shared that there is a lack of opportunities within educational settings to foster the inherent capacities that can help them advance a positive change as global citizens. Similar to some of the multicultural education programs, participants highlighted that the limited global citizenship education programs focused more on enhancing students' knowledge and economic competitiveness in a globally interconnected world rather than strengthening their capacity to strive as global citizens who can resolve the world's current concerns (Andreotti, 2014; Shultz, 2007; Sue et al., 2010). Interestingly, despite the distinctive positions of power inherent in the university between educators and students, data analyses did not provide any evidence that participant responses clustered around or varied in relationship to these gradations of difference. It is

therefore possible that an affinity for global citizenship may create contexts ripe for practicing wisdom, courage, and compassion within diverse educational groupings. Additionally, even if articulating and meeting culturally inclusive outcomes is increasingly a focus of higher education, scholars such as Nalani et al. (2021) and Noddings (2013) have pointed out the need for more research that can address inequitable social outcomes and lack of care for the world within educational institutions. Based on our pragmatic research framework, we have discussed the findings of this study to highlight how higher education institutions can promote global-citizenship-centered-multicultural education approaches that could strengthen campus communities' capacity to advance sustainability, dignity, and well-being of all forms of life – all across the world.

Emergent Praxes and Curriculum to Foster Wisdom

In accordance with Ikeda's (2021) conceptualization of wisdom, participant narratives highlighted that the concept of wisdom is grounded in empathetic resonance that acknowledges contributing to others' well-being as a critical cause for one's own personal well-being based on people's shared humanity. Given the results of this study, we suggest pedagogical approaches that could help students to gain both content knowledge and the wisdom to apply that knowledge for advancing world peace and well-being of all as global citizens. With regard to specific knowledge, this study highlighted the importance of discussing: (a) global issues that can support students to reflect upon interconnectedness, (b) historical and current events that can help in elevating historically underrepresented voices and inspire everyone to strive for equity, (c) intersectional identities and people's actual experiences in relation to privilege and oppression, (d) contemporary social issues, such as poverty, that students witness within their own and other countries, and environmental issues, such as disruption of ecosystem processes and species extinction. Similarly, multicultural education scholars Banks et al. (2005) advocated for supporting students to understand the complex relationships between unity and diversity, human rights, democracy, and the growing economic, political, cultural, environmental, and technological interdependence around the world.

Although some other studies have highlighted the importance of similar themes of human rights education (Kiwan, 2005; Mignolo, 2010; Todd, 2010), this study has emphasized that global-citizenship-centered-education must go beyond knowledge transmission to awakening students' inherent capacity to put such knowledge into practice for peaceful coexistence. For example, participants shared the importance of providing students opportunities to reflect upon the ways in which different dimensions of society are interconnected and express gratitude through striving to making a positive difference in the lives of others. In line with multicultural education approaches, educators could also use open dialogues, group projects, community building exercises, cross-cultural immersion

opportunities, study abroad, and service-learning to help unite students towards the common objective of using education for society's positive advancement.

Courageous Dialogues for Mutual Understanding

Participants shared that the pandemic deepened their awareness of the interconnectedness between all forms of life and a sense of responsibility towards advancing positive change. However, many participants shared a sense of helplessness and frustration about not being able to engage in courageous actions and dialogues due to the isolation and political polarization that occurred during the pandemic. The present study, therefore, reaffirms the importance of forging a sense of connectedness and global citizenship through strengthening people's capacity to engage in courageous dialogues that can foster mutual understanding and respect for differences. Participants specifically highlighted the need to strengthen people's ability to empathetically listen without judgement despite differences. Participants also highlighted the importance of using education as a tool to muster the courage to advocate for those who are oppressed to achieve social justice.

In resonating with the Freirean conceptualization of dialogue, these views also highlight dialogue as a pedagogical tool for university educators, whose purpose is not to present any particular message to learners (Freire, 1970), but rather to create the conditions that allow for awareness of the dualities inherent in human participation within the world. A unique contribution of this study lies in demonstrating the specific nature of such dialogues, such as fostering appreciation for differences, desire to learn from others' unique experiences and shared humanity, and resolve to achieve mutual understanding. Presumably, educational contexts oriented towards global citizenship ought to support individual and collective awareness of bias, prejudice, and tendencies to Other or separate. Global-citizenship-centered-education is expected to prioritize dialogical and experiential pedagogy, as well as commitments to democratic values and institutions (Hansen, 2011). The cultivation of the skills of critical self-reflection, in particular the ability to adopt an orientation of critical distance from one's own biases, has been considered central for engaging in humanizing dialogues that could foster a sense of global citizenship (Nussbaum, 1997, 2002a) and develop multiculturally competent learners (Waldron, 2000, 2003). Yet, both students and educators shared that, even if they felt interconnectedness and compassion, they lacked the courage to engage in mutually respectful dialogues.

Restoring Compassion and Humanity

Participants emphasized that global citizenship cannot flourish easily in educational situations rife with hierarchy and exclusion. Therefore, educational

institutions that aspire to nurture a sense of global citizenship must value practicing compassion, demonstrating empathy, and communicating respect for the unique potential of all students and colleagues, who represent diverse backgrounds. In line with Ikeda's (2021) conceptualization of compassionate empathy and previous research (Guajardo & Reiser, 2016), the present study demonstrated the importance of understanding students through fostering human-to-human bonds of care. Specifically, the students in this study stated that, more than classroom content, it was their professors' compassion and care for them that inspired them to strive for others' well-being as global citizens.

Similarly, an educator used the term "humanizing the heart." This aligned with other educators' aspiration to model the work of moral growth in the direction of respecting, valuing, and believing in the potential, purpose, and worth of every individual, including students. In line with these findings, Noddings (2002, 2005, 2010) advocated for creating a global ethic of care through educators themselves modeling caring behavior and validating students' positive development as they engage in their own caring-for-others practices, while Hansen (2011) proposed global citizenship as a "reflective openness to the new with a reflective loyalty to the known" (p.1).

Further, one of the most significant findings of this study is that the most important aspect of global-citizenship-centered-curriculum lies in what one participant called "restoring humanity" and that several participants referred to as the capacity to accord dignity to all forms of life. An atmosphere of respect and concern – or *restored humanity* – aligns with the intent of multicultural education and contrasts with institutional dehumanization in which individuals are treated as a means to achieve certain goals. For instance, multicultural education scholar, Sue et al. (2010) highlighted the importance of modeling humility to learn from students' diverse lived experiences, acknowledge one's own biases and limitations, and actively humanize the classroom to build trust.

Limitations and Future Directions

In this study, we sampled college students and educators in the U.S. This could limit transferability of the findings to other populations. In addition, some participants' (N = 7) familiarity with Ikeda's conception of global citizenship might have influenced their responses. This study was also based on a semi-structured interview format that could have set the parameters of the subsequent discussion on global citizenship. However, the findings are nevertheless significant as participants' responses were related to their personal narratives and life experiences.

Overall, in giving voice to college students' and educators' own experiences, perceptions, and recommendations, this study contributes to the scholarship on and pedagogy of global-citizenship-centered-multicultural education. Future research is needed to design, implement, and evaluate the

effectiveness of global-citizenship-centered-curriculum based on the pedagogical content and practices suggested by participants in this study. Additional studies are also needed to examine whether the findings from this study transfer across other populations and contexts. Future longitudinal and mixed-methods research is also recommended to further explore how one's identity as a global citizen evolves or transforms over time and influences other aspects of personal and professional growth.

Funding

This research was supported by a grant from the American Educational Research Association Division E Doctoral Student and Early Career Scholar Seed Grant Program.

Acknowledgement

We want to thank Ms. Katherine Bernal Arevalo for her support with data analysis and all participants for their time and insights.

References

Aktas, F., Pitts, K., Richards, J. C., & Silova, I. (2017). Institutionalizing global citizenship: A critical analysis of higher education programs and curricula. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *21*(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153166698

Anderson, A. (1998). Cosmopolitanism, universalism, and the divided legacies of modernity. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. University of Minnesota Press.

Andreotti, V. O. (2014). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. In McCloskey, S. (Eds.), *Development education in policy and practice*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137324665_2

Banks, J. A. (2010). Multicultural education: characteristics and goals. In Banks, J.A. & Banks, C.H.M. (Eds.), *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in global age. *Educational Researcher, 37(3)*, 129-139. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08317

Banks, J. A., McGee Banks, C. A., Cortes, C. E., Hahn, C. L., Merryfield, M. M., Moodley, K. A., Murphy-Shigematsu, S., Osler, A., Park, C. and Parker, W.C. (2005). *Democracy and Diversity: Principles and Concepts for Educating Citizens in a Global Age*, Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Introduction: Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3-16). Jossey-Bass.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *The handbook of research methods in psychology* (pp. 57–71). American Psychological Association.

Caruana, V. (2014). Re-thinking global citizenship in higher education: From cosmopolitanism and international mobility to cosmopolitanism, resilience and resilient thinking. *Higher Education Quarterly, 68*, 85-104. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12030

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

DePaul's College of Education (2022). *Value-Creating Education for Global Citizenship*. Retrieved from https://education.depaul.edu/academics/leadership-language-curriculum/graduate/value-creating-eduction-global-citizenship-med/Pages/degree-requirements.aspx

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (MB Ramos, Trans.). Continuum, 2007.

Goulah, J. (2021). Introduction: Daisaku Ikeda, and hope and joy in education. In J. Goulah & I. Nuñez (Eds.), *Hope and Joy in Education: Engaging Daisaku Ikeda Across Curriculum and Context* (pp. xiii-xxxiv). Teachers College Press.

Goulah, J. (2020). Daisaku Ikeda and the Soka movement for global citizenship. Special Issue: "Asian Cosmopolitanism: Living and Learning across Differences," *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *40*(1), 35-48.

Goulah, J. (2018). The presence and role of dialogue in Soka education. In P. Stearns (Ed.), *Peacebuilding through dialogue: Education, human transformation and conflict resolution* (pp. 55–70). George Mason University Press.

Goulah, J. (2012). Realizing Daisaku Ikeda's educational philosophy through language learning and study abroad: A critical instrumental case study. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 9*, 1–2, 60–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2012.648065

Guajardo, M. & Reiser, M. (2016). Humanism as the foundation for global citizenship education. *Journal of Research in Curriculum and Instruction, 20*. 241-252. https://doi.org/10.24231/rici.2016.20.3.241

Gutmann, A. (2004). Unity and diversity in democratic multicultural education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 71-96). Jossey-Bass.

Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. The Guilford Press.

Hansen, D. T. (2011). *The teacher and the world: A study of cosmopolitanism as education*. Routledge.

Hansen, D. T. (2010a). Cosmopolitanism and education: A View from the ground. *Teachers College Record*, *112*(1), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0161468110112001

Hansen, D. T. (2010b). Chasing butterflies without a net: Interpreting cosmopolitanism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *29* (2), 151-166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-009-9166-y

Hansen, D. T. (2009). Education viewed through a cosmopolitan prism. In R. Glass (Ed.), *Philosophy of Education 2008* (pp. 206-214). Philosophy of Education Society.

Hansen, D. T. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40*, 289–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270802036643

Ikeda, D. (2021). *The light of learning: Selected writings on education.* Middleway Press.

Ikeda, D. (2020). *Founder's Message to the Class of 2020.* Soka University of America. https://www.soka.edu/about/our-stories/founders-message-class-2020

Ikeda, D. (2017). *The wisdom for creating happiness and peace*. Middleway Press. [selection of excerpts] Retrieved from https://www.sokaglobal.org/resources/study-materials/buddhist-study/the-wisdom-for-creating-happiness-and-peace.html

Ikeda, D. (2012). *Human security and sustainability: Sharing reverence for the dignity of live*. Retrieved from https://www.daisakuikeda.org/assets/files/Peace_ Proposal_2012.pdf

Ikeda, D. (2010). *A new humanism: The university lectures of Daisaku Ikeda*. I. B. Tauris.

Ikeda, D. (2005a). *Toward a new era of dialogue: Humanism explored.* Retrieved from http://www.columbia.edu/cu/buddhism/document/pp2005.pdf

Ikeda, D. (2005b). Foreword. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness* (pp. ix-xi). Teachers College Press.

Ikeda, D. (1996). *Thoughts on education for global citizenship*. Lecture delivered at Teachers College, Columbia University, June 13, 1996. http://www.daisakuikeda.org/sub/resources/works/lect/lect-08.html

Inukai, N., & Okamura, M. (2021). Determining to be hopeful in hopeless times. In I. Nuñez & J. Goulah (Eds.), *Hope and joy in education: Engaging Daisaku Ikeda across curriculum and contexts* (pp. 10-20). Teachers College Press.

Kiwan, D. (2005). Human Rights and citizenship: An unjustifiable conflation? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *39*(1), 37–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-8249.2005.00418.x

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). Culture versus citizenship: The challenges of racialized citizenship in the United States. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 99-126). Jossey-Bass.

Mignolo, W. (2010). Cosmopolitanism and the de-colonial option. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *29*(2), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-009-9163-1

Morgan, D. L. (2014). *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*. SAGE.

Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. Routledge.

Nalani, A., Yoshikawa, H., & Carter, P. L. (2021). Social science–based pathways to reduce social inequality in youth outcomes and opportunities at scale. *Socius, 7*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23780231211020236

Noddings, N. (2013). *Education and democracy in the 21st century*. Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2010). Moral education and caring. *Theory and Research in Education*, *8*(2), 145–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878510368

Noddings, N. (2005). Identifying and responding to needs in education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 35*(2), 147–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640500146757

Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at home: Caring and social policy*. University of California Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2019). *The cosmopolitan tradition: A noble but flawed ideal*. Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2002a). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country? Debating the Limits of Patriotism,* (pp. 2-17). Beacon Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2002b). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country? Debating the Limits of Patriotism,* (pp. 2-17). Beacon Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Harvard University Press.

Obelleiro, G. (forthcoming). Cosmopolitanisms of the middle way.

Papastephanou, M. (2005). Globalisation, globalism and cosmopolitanism as an educational ideal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *37*(4), 534–551. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2005.00139.x

Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy and Education*, *36*(1), 69-86. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00260

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative research and evaluation and methods (3rd ed.)*. Sage.

Rizvi, F. (2007). Internationalization of curriculum: A critical perspective. In Hayden, M., Levy, J., Thompson, J. (Eds.), *Research in international education* (pp. 391-403). Sage.

Rizvi, F. & Choo, S. S. (2020). Education and cosmopolitanism in Asia: An introduction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 40* (1), 1 – 9. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1725282

Sherman, P. D. (2019). The cultivation and emergence of global citizenship identity. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning, 14(1)*, 7–25. https://doi.org/ 10.1386/ctl.14.1.7_1

Shultz L (2007) Educating for global citizenship: conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248–258. https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v53i3.55291

Strand, T. (2010a). Introduction: Cosmopolitanism in the Making. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *29* (2), 103-109. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s11217-009-9168-9

Strand, T. (2010b). The Making of a New Cosmopolitanism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *29* (2), 229-242. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-009-9161-3

Sue, D. W., Rivera, D. P., Capodilupo, C. M., Lin, A. I., & Torino, G. C. (2010). Racial dialogues and White trainee fears: Implications for education and training. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*, 206–214. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016112

Supa, M., Nečas, V., Rosenfeldová, J., & Nainova, V. (2021). Children as Cosmopolitan Citizens: Reproducing and Challenging Cultural Hegemony. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *23*(2), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v23i2.2269

Tarozzi, M. & Torres, C. (2016). Global Citizenship Education and the Crises of Multiculturalism. *Comparative Perspectives*. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474236003

Todd, S. (2010). Living in a dissonant world: Toward an agonistic cosmopolitics for education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *29*(2), 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-009-9171-1

Waldron, J. (2003). Teaching cosmopolitan right. In K. McDonough & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Education and citizenship in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities* (pp. 23–55). Oxford University Press.

Waldron, J. (2000). What is cosmopolitan? *The Journal of Political Philosophy, 8*(2), 227–243. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00100

Wall, J. (2019). Theorizing children's global citizenship: Reconstructionism and the politics of deep interdependence. *Global Studies of Childhood*, *9*(1), 5-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/2043610618815484

Author Contact

Gitima Sharma, gsharma@mail.fresnostate.edu

Christina Bosch, cbosch@mail.fresnostate.edu

Gonzalo Obelleiro, gobellei@depaul.edu