

Research Notes

Japanese Universities' Challenges in Implementing Global Citizenship Education: Conceptualisation of Citizenship and Neo-liberal Education Policy

Yu Ogawa

MA in Global and International Citizenship Education at the University of York

1. Introduction

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) is an umbrella term for 'peace education, intercultural learning, global education and citizenship education' (Winsteiner, Grobbaver, Diendorfer, & Reitmair-Juarez, 2015, p. 9) and its spread plays an important role in fostering the values of peace, diversity, sustainability and non-violent activism world-wide. GCED has become increasingly crucial considering current issues around government brutality and global activism (Black Lives Matter, 2020). Thankfully increasing globalisation has caused it to catch the attention of higher education institutions (Guajardo & Reiser, 2016), with Japanese universities having inserted 'global citizenship' in their educational policy and programmes. Despite this adoption though, universities face challenges fostering global citizenship: particularly around conceptualisation, articulation, and implementation alongside national education policy. As McKeague (2016) argued, global citizenship is not just 'a convenient umbrella

concept' but can be defined to articulate outcomes and pedagogical approaches (p. 51). However, many universities do not define GCED, pedagogies, and outcomes in their policy (Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2016). Only two Japanese universities have on-going GCED programmes, and a few others conduct GCED-related programmes without a definition of global citizens or global citizenship (Ogawa, 2018). Following the Global Education First Initiative (UNESCO, 2016) and Sustainable Development Goals' Target 4.7 (United Nations, n.d.) being officially launched by organisations of the United Nations, GCED should be spread and implemented more actively among higher education institutions in Japan. Previous literature has analysed the complexity of conceptualizing citizenship and global citizenship in general, but a thorough analysis of the challenges regarding the adoption of GCED in Japan does not seem to have been performed. Therefore, this paper aims to contribute to a more rounded understanding of the challenges that apply to Japanese higher education and GCED. Due to limited space, this paper does not include an analysis of Japanese universities' GCED programmes or effective pedagogies. It does, however, explore the following topics: conceptualisation of citizenship, different values in citizenship between the East and the West, national policy for global human resources in Japan, criticism against global citizenship in a neoliberal approach, and possibilities for the future of GCED. Understanding these challenges will help teachers and programme-makers devise suitable approaches in establishing or improving their GCED content.

1-1. Why does global citizenship education matter now?

GCED is in urgent need because many people's peaceful lives are threatened by existing power structures. For example, in 2020 alone,

we saw many incidences of police violence and a global activist campaign against racism (Black Lives Matter, 2020) as well as the protest marches against the Chinese government's oppression and for democracy in Hong Kong (Ramzy & Ives, 2020). According to Johan Galtung (1996), peace can be only maintained by 'absence of personal violence, and absence of structural violence' (p. 183), and, as such, citizens all over the world are still fighting for peace today. Wayne (2016) stated that it is 'critical' or 'dangerous citizenship' wherein people, as a group or individually, put themselves in inevitable danger to fight against 'an oppressive and socially unjust status quo, to existing hierarchical structures of power' that goes beyond 'voting and signing petitions' (p. 73). This paper does not argue that people should take major risks to oppose the government, but, rather that people should be educated as to why and how oppression happens and how to act effectively in an era with an imperative need for critical citizenship. The Black Lives Matter movement, especially, rapidly became spread worldwide since many citizens engaged with the campaign on both local and global levels. This persuades us that GCED is crucial to nurture responsible "critical" citizens for addressing global challenges and realising peace worldwide.

1-2. What is global citizenship education?

GCED enhances citizens' skills in three key areas: global knowledge, ethical responsibility and actions to make a difference. For many people, the concept of global citizenship is questionable because researchers argue and define it variously. There is no "right" answer for the definition of global citizenship. According to a study carried out by Goren and Yemini (2007), many scholars considered GCED as a synonym of "cosmopolitanism", "global mindedness" and "global

competence” (p. 181), and ended up being a target of criticism that the concepts are too vague to define. Defining GCED is challenging, but some researchers have successfully identified as a global-scaled version of citizenship education: a mixture of global education and citizenship education (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016; Wintersteiner et al., 2015). Global education enhances understanding of global issues and cultural differences through a wide range of global topics while citizenship education helps students to learn political agendas such as rights and responsibilities (Davies et al., 2005), social and economic justice (Cogan, 2000; Crick, 2004; Heater, 1999; Snauwaert, 2011). Therefore, this education covers such diverse topics as peace, cultural development, sustainability and the interconnectedness of the world (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). All of these topics matter to every single one of us and future generations to come. Frahani (2014) emphasised the importance of GCED in that it can build up learners’ and teachers’ confidence in taking effective action for the values of ‘justice, equality, truth seeking’ and peace (p. 935). As UNESCO’s (n.d.) definition of GCED clearly identifies, GCED fosters “cognitive”, “socio-emotional” and “behavioural” skills that summarise all the elements introduced above. Overall, GCED is education that helps learners to enhance their knowledge of global and political issues, to establish a social responsibility to make a better world, and to act for their community at local and/or global scales.

For further understanding, there are different approaches within GCED. Some researchers have distinguished two distinct types of GCED: the humanistic approach and the neoliberal approach. The humanistic approach nurtures awareness of interconnectedness with others, human ethics, social responsibility and active citizenship. The

other neo-liberal approach fosters the vocational skills that allow students to compete in the global market (Shultz, 2007; Dill, 2013; Pais& Costa, 2017).

Often discourse around GCED raises questions of whether universities nurture characteristics of global citizens or global workers (Hammond & Keating, 2017; Kato, 2014). Hammond and Keating's (2017) study differentiated between global citizens and global workers (Table 1). Interestingly, some characteristics of global workers overlap some skills with those of global citizens. They argued that a Japanese university's policy did not aim to produce global citizens but global workers under the neoliberal approach (Hammond & Keating, 2017).

Table 1: Hammond and Keating's (2017, p. 6) comparison of global citizens and global workers

Characteristics unique to global citizens	Characteristics of both global citizens <i>and</i> global workers	Characteristics unique to global workers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notions of global rights and responsibilities • Civic engagement on a global scale • Commitment to solving global problems • Empathy and common sense of humanity • Commitment to social justice and equity • Ability to challenge injustice and inequalities • Concern for the environment and commitment to sustainable development • Respect for people and things 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical thinking skills • Ability to argue effectively • A high degree of drive and resilience • Self-awareness • Co-operation and conflict resolution • Collaboration with cross-cultural teams • Awareness of global issues • Value and respect for diversity • Leadership • Economic engagement on a global scale • Social engagement on a global scale • Global and cross cultural perspectives • Adaptability and flexibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global competitiveness • Ability to form professional, global networks • The ability to negotiate and influence clients from various backgrounds • Global commercial awareness • Second language ability • Knowledge of foreign economies and own industry area overseas

2. Challenges to implementing GCED

The challenge that universities face is articulating and conceptualising global citizenship in educational policy or curricula

as the definition of global citizenship is various in different researches, as introduced earlier. Lilley, Barker, and Harris stated that many universities do not define GCED (2015), pedagogies and outcomes in their policy (Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2016). As they argued, my previous small-scaled case study based on Hammond and Keating's (2017) theory discovered that two universities owning an ongoing GCED programme defined global citizenship, but ended up putting an emphasis on "global mindset" and second language learning, especially English (Ogawa, 2018). Saito's (2015) research concluded that a greater emphasis is needed on foreign language education, including mindset teaching, to foster Japanese students' sense of international ethics. Regarding learning English or second language for Japanese students, it should not be ignored that learning a second language opens the mind to new ideas and philosophy. Even considering global citizenship as a concept, since the concept originated in the Western concept of citizenship (Anderotti, 2006), learning English may be an influential factor to understand global citizenship. However, having good command in a second language is not required to be an essential skill of global citizens (Table 1). Definition of global citizens is a key to implementing GCED that actually enhances students' global citizenship because GCED cannot automatically produce global citizens by just stating it depending on approaches to GCED. As McKeague (2016) argued, global citizenship should be defined in order to set educational outcomes and choose pedagogical approaches. In the next paragraph, some challenges to implement GCED are discussed by examining previous literatures: defining citizenship in Japanese, teaching both perspectives of citizenship from the West and the East and conceptualising the differences between global citizens and global human resources.

2-1. Challenges in conceptualisation

2-1-1. Complexity in citizenship as a term

Understanding the concept of citizenship is important to understand GCED, but various expressions of “citizens” in Japanese cause some difficulties because of the Japanese linguistic ambiguity concerning the term itself. There are three words for “citizens”: “Kokumin” or 国民, “Shimin” or 市民, and “Koumin” or 公民 (Davies, Mizuyama, Ikeno, Parmenter, & Mori, 2013, p. 165). In detail, not only the sound but the meaning of each Kanji of citizens is different: Koku or 国 as nation, Shi or 市 as city and Kou or 公 as public. Regarding the term Kokumin, before 1945, citizens meant “eligible voter” and “fellow” with the Emperor. Under the new education system after the war, the term has been reinterpreted into ‘a member of civil society’ and ‘a member of the state’ (Otsu, 2000, p. 68) who ‘has legal rights and duties’ (Davies et al., 2013, p. 165). Shimin, meanwhile, is ‘a person who in relative terms is independent of the nation and wants to participate actively in society’, whereas “Koumin” includes the meanings of both “Kokumin” and “Shimin” (Davies et al., 2013, p. 165). As Heather (2004) stated, traditionally, citizenship is regarded as the nation where the citizens live and as a relationship to the country along with legal status. It is natural to have a difficulty to distinguish between “citizen” and “national” because a “national” can be any and all citizens of a nation under a single government (Otsu, 2000, p. 68). However, the complexity is that there are not just three ways to express citizens in relation to the nation. “Shimin” is also commonly used in discourses of GCED in Japan such as グローバル市民 (Kato, 2014, p. 1; Nishimura, 2016, p. iv), 世界市民 (Inter Press Service & Soka Gakkai International, 2020, para. 1) and 地球市民 (Murata, 2016; AFS JAPAN, n.d., para. 1) — all of them meaning global citizens, but it is

often associated with “the place”, because it is used to describe “the place” where people belong to in a certain nation, for instance, Kobe Shimin or 神戸市民 meaning those who live in Kobe City. Therefore, “global citizens” seems to mean those who live in “a nation” and in “this world”. Moreover, citizenship is commonly explained as “identity” in the civic education of Japanese schools (Parmenter, 2006, p. 9). Therefore, it is confusing to understand that citizens are merely determined by where they live or their identity. This relates to people’s “self”, which will be discussed in the next paragraph. In short, the multiple expressions of the meaning of citizens in Japanese build complexity to understand citizenship.

2-1-2. Conceptual differences in citizenship between the West and the East

Concepts of citizenship are varied in different countries (Parmenter, Mizuyama, & Taniguchi, 2008, p. 206). There is no ‘universally true’ meaning of citizenship (Crick, 2004, p. 3), and Wing On Lee (2009) explained the different concepts between the Western and the Eastern. Citizenship in the West put emphasis on political aspects, such as rights and responsibilities between the nation and the citizens (p. 5). Yet, citizenship in the East, where the Confucian ideas have a huge influence, rather focuses on harmonious relations with others rather than individual freedom (McCullough, 2008, p. 22). This seeks ‘how one relates to self, others (such as family and friends), the state and Nature’ (Wing On Lee, 2009, p. 5). Also, dividing “citizenship” and “self” is challenging (Parmenter, 2006). “Self” in Asian discourse based on the Confucian value is related to ideas of citizenship, referring to “self-cultivation”. Indeed, especially in Japan, it is related to the advancement of “self-awareness” (Wing On Lee, 2009, pp. 6-13). After all, being a citizen in Asian countries is intended to be a good person

rather than being a right-bearing citizen (Seung-hwan Lee, 1996, p. 367).

It is not impossible for Japanese learners to understand the Western concept of citizenship and global citizenship (Ogawa, 2018), but importing the ideas of citizenship from the West does not help to nurture global citizenship. Many teachers still face difficulties due to deep-rooted conflicting values (Davies, Mizuyama, & Thompson, 2010, p. 171). For example, a vital part of citizenship is civic engagement, which can be nurtured by open discussion about issue-based topics such as politics and society (Fournier-Sylvester, 2013, p. 34). Higher education institutions in Japan carry liberal arts education involving open discussion for learning a second language and global citizenship. Open discussion requires “critical thinking and active learning”, and it conflicts with traditional Japanese values such as harmonious and hierarchical relations and obedience (Mou, 2019, p. 28). Because Japanese learners are taught to be good and respectful to others, including their elders, they respect other people’s opinions and struggle with voicing their opinions since their critical opinions against others may affect their harmonious relations. Etzrodt, Hrebentar, Lacktorin, and Nilson (2016) also warned that a Western learning style, such as free and critical discussion, does not fit in a non-Western learning environment. Therefore, the conflicting value in citizenship between the East and West brings a challenge for both teachers and students to teach and learn global citizenship.

2-2. Global citizenship or global human resources

2-2-1. National policy and *Global jinzai*

Japan’s educational system currently aims to take a more neoliberal approach to produce human resources instead of global citizens.

Firstly, in the report of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (2006), tertiary education policy aimed to nurture citizenship-related skills, named '21st century citizens' (The Central Council for Education, 2008), to survive in the growing globalisation (Hashimoto, 2013). The report was hugely influenced by the ideas of citizenship in the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (Kameyama, 2009). However, the discourse was shifted to development of '21st century skills' and *global jinzai*. *Global jinzai* is human resources in Japanese and defined as those who are going to apply these globalising economics and possess the three main components: (1) 'linguistic and communication skills', (2) dispositions such as 'self-direction, a positive attitude, a sense of responsibility and mission, and a spirit welcoming challenge, cooperativeness, and flexibility' and (3) 'an understanding of other cultures and a sense of identity as a Japanese citizen' (Take & Shoraku, 2018, p. 22; The Council on Promotion of Human Resource for Globalization Development, 2012). According to the Council on Promotion of Human Resource for Globalization Development (2012), global human resources should desirably have a high degree of specialisation, problem finding and solving skills, leadership in team and ethics. The government's focus is on the linguistic and communication skills that are related to global workers, according to Hammond and Keating's theory. A sense of responsibility and leadership in team and ethics are related to features of global citizens (Hammond & Keating, 2017), but others cannot simply be sorted. This neoliberal tendency to produce global human resources is widespread in Japan due to the national education policy.

National educational policy created a competitive project to produce more *global jinzai* for post-secondary institutions in Japan.

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) started a project called 'Top Global University Japan Project' in 2014 that has been increasing international competition and partnership among higher education institutions (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT]c, n.d.). This project 'selects Top Global Universities from among Japanese universities that are driving internationalization and offers prioritized support for university reforms' (MEXTc, n.d., para. 3). Universities are chosen and funded by the MEXT once they achieve given criteria that put a huge emphasis on foreign language and influence: the number of full-time foreign faculty, the number of students that obtained credits from other universities abroad, the number of students with foreign language skills over a certain level, and in introducing a worldwide external English examination, TOEFL, in their entrance examination (MEXTa, n.d., para. 7). For further competition, MEXT set two categories of universities: Top Type (Type A) which are universities which carry out 'world-leading education and research' and are offered 420 million yen; and Global Traction Type (Type B) universities leading 'internationalization of Japanese society' and being provided 172 million yen (MEXTb, n.d., para. 1; MEXTc, n.d., para. 3). In 2016, 13 universities were chosen for Type A and 24 universities were selected for Type B out of 775 universities in Japan (MEXTc, n.d., para. 5). As expected, there is no "citizen" or "citizenship" mentioned in the MEXT website. Their project showed what Marginson (2014) warned, that Japanese universities have significant interest in university rankings and they sought to respond to this national neoliberal trend. As such, the national initiative to foster the economy has been influencing Japanese universities.

This government's initiative has been accepted by many Japanese

universities. *Global jinzai* has been increasingly articulated in policies of Japanese higher education (Yonezawa, 2014). In Take and Shoraku's study (2018), they analysed admission, curriculum and degree-award policies of over 70 universities in Japan and discovered that the most frequently stated characteristics are foreign language and communication skills, positive attitudes, problem solving skills and logical thinking skills (p. 48), and these are overlapped with the skills that the government viewed as *global jinzai*. Also, many universities have focused 'the international competitiveness of their educational and research functions and develop educational systems that cultivate human resources, producing graduates capable of being active in globalized society' (Take & Shoraku, 2018, p. 38). Needless to say, sending students out into society to contribute to the national economy is a socially accepted role of universities in Japan. This vocationalism has been a significant characteristic of Japan's universities (Kano, 2014). Many Japanese universities are working for the national educational policy and there is much criticism against this neoliberal tendency.

2-2-2. Neoliberalism in education policy as a hindrance of GCED

This national education initiative valuing neoliberalism raises many critical concerns in regard to nurturing global citizenship. The national initiative regards students as future labour population or human capital and raises competition to get into economic society and the international market, but firstly students should not be treated as economic subjects but as citizens (Foucault, 1979). Education policies also should not simply ensure entering into the job market, but in promoting social good (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). This initiative brings a question of the social role of university. When knowledge

is recognised as capital, as Giroux (2002) criticised, education has little connection with global citizenship learnings, such as social responsibility and just and democratic values (p. 441). Hammond's (2016) study also argued that GCED programmes, including education abroad, can be designed to nurture the skills required 'to be successful in the global knowledge economy' and that it seems 'a novel approach to fostering global competitiveness for... Japan' (Hammond, 2016, p. 563). As global citizenship has a vague nature in meaning, global citizenship could be used for 'marketing purposes' though it should not (Giles, 2019, pp. 13-14). For example, Hammond and Keating (2017) subsequently analysed different forms of GCED implemented by a university in Japan. Their main finding was that the policy focused on the linguistic and critical thinking skills required to be a global worker, not a global citizen (Hammond & Keating, 2017). The Japanese university's GCED policy articulated more terms related to global employability than global citizenship, even though the policies did not focus on only producing global workers. Even when GCED was articulated, the purposes for citizenship education could be overlooked because of integrating employability development in educational strategies (Hammond & Keating, 2017, p. 15). Presence of the neoliberal approach raises the concern of GCED being just a catchphrase for educational institutions (Pais & Costa, 2017). GCED may result in just a promotion of civic mottos. GCED has to at least involve critical literacy to understand complex global and political power structures (Andreotti, 2006) and raise critical questions as to the national policy (Hammond, 2016). In short, GCED cannot be simply done by stating it in policy but by practising it. Therefore, McKeague's (2016) argument is very convincing that universities need to 'focus on defining the outcomes they wish to see developed in

their students' (p. 51) by conducting GCED.

3. Beyond these challenges: Producing both global citizens and global workers

Despite the conceptual complexity of citizenship and global citizenship, and the general neoliberal tendency in education, there are at least two approaches that universities can use to foster global citizenship while putting emphasis on career or employability. Indeed, undergraduate students cannot thrive in an increasingly competitive world having only the characteristics of a global citizen. Universities can focus on fostering characteristics of global citizens while training them to obtain employable skills.

Kagawa showed that increasing the value in gaining a better education and career prevents learners from obtaining civic qualities (2013). For example, gaining technical skills matters most to engineering students, and this influences them to consider themselves less as citizens able to make differences locally and globally in their future (Grudzinski-Hall et al., 2007, p. 5). Therefore, as a suggestion, Hammond and Keating's (2017) theory (Table 1) can be implemented as three phases so that universities can help students to expand their skills gradually from characteristics of global workers to ones of "both", and to ones of global citizens through their GCED programmes. For example, Lehigh University's global citizenship programme enables the engineering students to learn different cultures (as a characteristic of both global citizens and global workers), respect those who have different backgrounds and do public good for others (as characteristics of global citizens) - while training vocational skills (Grudzinski-Hall et al., 2007, p. 5). Another

suggestion is to teach GCED separately from the curriculum. Wood (2012) showed that universities can perform GCED outside of primary classes - The Square Mile initiative that encourages students' social engagement by involving not only teachers, but also residents, local non-profit organisations and authorities. This type of GCED does not articulate curricula outcomes but shares its humanistic aim and goals. It can teach students to impact their local community alongside those who they do not collaborate with in class. In this case, the University's role is:

As 'volunteer'... engaged its staff and students alongside residents and local authority staff in regular volunteering activity.... As 'organizer'... supported an emerging partnership between residents, the police and the voluntary sector, focused on strengthening and sustaining youth work provision in the area. The university contribution included providing consultation data, identifying potential funding sources and supporting the completion of a funding bid. As 'catalyst'... aimed to respond to the low levels of resident confidence in influencing decisions made about the local neighbourhood (Wood, 2012, pp. 25-26).

This type of GCED involves many stakeholders and requires much time for collaboration and preparation, but is a more active approach that balances opportunities for students to gain global citizenship skills outside the curricula while training vocational skills in class.

4. Conclusion

This paper explored complex conceptualisation of citizenship in Japanese, the gap with the Western concept of global citizens,

and neoliberal national policy in education as some challenges that universities have to implement GCED. GCED nurtures learners' global citizenship that consists of global knowledge, social responsibility and actions to make a better world. In Japan, one of the challenges that universities face is conceptualizing citizenship and global citizenship. Citizenship as a term in Japanese has various expressions that have slightly different meanings each. Moreover, the concept in citizenship is different regionally between the West and the East. Global citizenship as a concept originated from the Western concept of citizenship that covers individuals' rights and responsibility, while the Eastern concept of citizens refers "good people" and values harmonious relations to others over individual freedom. Global citizenship or global citizens as a concept is not familiar in Japanese language and traditional culture. Even more, the Japanese government enforces university initiatives that fosters global human resources, and some Japanese universities accept the governmental idea in their educational policy. This neoliberal education tendency has been a target of criticism from researchers of GCED since it does not help to produce global citizens. Not to make GCED as a marketing tool or just a motto, this paper suggests setting educational outcomes when conducting GCED. Hammond and Keating's (2017) theory also may help universities not only to articulate concrete educational outcomes of GCED but also to aim to achieve nurturing global citizenship while also focusing on characteristics of global workers. Just articulating "global citizenship" in educational policy does not mean that universities implement GCED. Written clear educational outcomes are required to carry out GCED. For future references, it would be helping to explore what pedagogies could be effective to each characteristic of global citizens at higher education

level.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Masashi Nakayama for his general supervision and Mr. Morrison Cole and Mr. Mike Davies for professional English proofreading for this paper.

References

- AFS JAPAN. (n.d.). *Chikyushimin wo sodateru* [Producing global citizens]. Retrieved, 28 June 2020, from <https://www.afs.or.jp/education/>
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education, *Policy and Practice – A Development Education Review*, 3 (1), 40-51.
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & practice: A development education review*, 3, 40-51.
- Black Lives Matter. (2020). *A Moment of Silence for George Floyd*. Retrieved July 6, 2020, from <https://blacklivesmatter.com/a-moment-of-silence-for-george-floyd/>
- Central Council for Education. (2008). *Gakushikatei kyōiku no kouchiku ni mukete* [To establish education at the Bachelor level: A report]. Retrieved May 30, 2018 from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/b_menu/shingi/toushin/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2008/12/26/1217067_001.pdf
- Cogan, J. J. (2000). Citizenship education for the 21st century: Setting the context. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship the 21st century: An international perspective on education*. (pp.1-21). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Cogan, J. J. (2000). Citizenship education for the 21st century: Setting the context. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship the 21st century: An international perspective on education*. (pp.1-21). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Crick, B. (2004). *Essays on citizenship*. London: Continuum.
- Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66 • 89.
- Davies, I., Mizuyama, M., Ikeno, N., Parmenter, L., & Mori, C. (2013). Political Literacy in Japan and England. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 12(3), 163-173.
- Dill, J. S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education: The moral pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Etzrodt, C., Hrebenar, R., Lacktorin, M., & Nilson, D. (2016). The application

- of a Western-style liberal arts education model in a non-Western environment. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 5(1), 65-84.
- Farahani, M. F. (2014). The Role of Global Citizenship Education in World Peace and Security. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, pp. 934-938.
- Farahani, M. F. (2014). The Role of Global Citizenship Education in World Peace and Security. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 934-938.
- Fournier-Sylvester, N. (2013). From the chat room to the voting booth: The potential of using online discussion forums to develop civic skills. *Citizenship Education Research Network Collection*, 34-45.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), pp. 167-191.
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined: A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 170-183.
- Grudzinski-Hall, M., Jellison, K. L., Stewart-Gambino, H. W., & Weisman, R. N. (2007). Engineering students in a global world: Lehigh University 's global citizenship program. *The online journal for global engineering education*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Guajardo, M., & Reiser, M. (2016). Humanism as the foundation for global citizenship education. *Journal of Research in Curriculum & Instruction*, 20(3), 241-252.
- Hammond, C. D. (2016). Internationalization, nationalism, and global competitiveness: A comparison of approaches to higher education in China and Japan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(4), 555-566.
- Hammond, C. D., & Keating, A. (2017). Global citizens or global workers? Comparing university programmes for global citizenship education in Japan and the UK, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 1-20. DOI:10.1080/03057925.2017.1369393
- Hashimoto, M. (2013). Nihon niokeru citizenship kyoiku no yukue [Whereabouts of Japan's citizenship education], *The Waseda Study of Politics and Public Law*, (101), 63-76.
- Heater, D. (1999). *What is citizenship?* Malden, Mass: Polity Press.
- Inter Press Service & Soka Gakkai International. (2020). Kyoikukarahaji marusekaishimin [Global citizens, starting from education]. *Fostering Global Citizenship*. Retrieved, June 28, 2020, from <https://www.fostering-globalcitizenship.net/index.php/asian-languages/japanese/161-global-citizenship-starts-education-2>
- Kagawa, S. (2013). Daigakukaihou no rinentositeno 'citizenship kyouiku': Igirisu no kyouiku no 3C karakangaeru ['Citizenship education' as a principle of university extension: Considering 3C of education in the UK].

- UEJ Journal*, 11, 16-21.
- Kameyama, T. (2009). Career kyoikukara citizenship kyoiku he?: Kyouikuseisakuron no genjo to kadai [From career education to citizenship education?: Reality and required improvements of educational policy]. *The Japanese journal of labour studies*, 583, 92-104.
- Kato, E. (2014, January). Global jinzai ka, global shimin ka: Tayouna wakamono no, tayouna kaigaitoko no susume [Global human resources or global citizens: Recommendation for various study abroad for the diverse youth]. *Ryugaku Koryu*, 34, 1-11.
- Lee, S. (1996). Liberal rights or/and Confucian virtues?, *Philosophy East and West*, 46(3), 367-379.
- Lee, W. O. (2009). *Conceptualising citizenship and citizenship education: A trajectory of exploring Asian perspectives*. Chair professors public lecture series. The Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Lilley, K., Barker, M., & Harris, N. (2015). Exploring the process of global citizen learning and the student mind-set. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19(3), 225-245. DOI: 10.1177/1028315314547822
- Marginson, S. (2014). Higher Education as a Public Good in a Marketized East Asian Environment. In A. Yonezawa, Y. Kitamura, A. Meerman & K. Kuroda (Eds.), *Emerging International Dimensions in East Asian Higher Education*. (pp. 15-33). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Mccullough, D. (2008). Moral and social education in Japanese schools: Conflicting conceptions of citizenship. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 21-34.
- McKeague, G. (2016). Global citizenship in a liberal arts curriculum: Meanings for faculty work. [Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University]. *ProQuest LLC*.
- Mou, L. (2019). Liberal arts education in East Asian context: Inclusion and Internationalization. In R. Schendel, H. Wit, & T. DeLaquil (Eds.), *Inclusive and innovative internationalization of higher education* (pp. 27-29). Massachusetts: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.
- Murata, Y. (2016). *Tabunka shakai ni kotaeru chikyusimin kyouiku: Nihon, Hokubei, ASEAN and EU no ke-su [Global citizenship education for responding to a multi-cultural society: Cases in Japan, North America, ASEAN and EU]*. Minerva Shobo
- Nishimura, A. (2016). *Global shiminnyumon [Introductory book of global citizens]*. Musashi University.
- Ogawa, Y. (2018). Do Japanese universities' GCE programmes produce global citizens? [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of York.
- Otsu, K. (2000). Japan. In R. Derricott (Ed.), National case studies of citizenship education. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship the*

- 21st century: An international perspective on education.* (pp.66-72). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2017). An ideology critique of global citizenship education, *Critical Studies in Education*, 1-16. DOI: 10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772
- Parmenter, L. (2006). Asian (?) citizenship and identity in Japanese education. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2(2), 8-20.
- Permenter, L., Mizuyama, M., & Taniguchi, K. (2008). Citizenship education in Japan. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn. (Eds.), *Education for citizenship and democracy.* (pp.205-214). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority [QCA]. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools: Final report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship.* London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Ramzy, A., & Ives, M. (2020). Hong Kong Protests, One Year Later. *The New York Times*. Retrieved July 6, 2020 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/09/world/asia/hong-kong-protests-one-year-later.html>
- Saito, N. (2015). Philosophy as translation and understanding other cultures: Becoming a global citizen through higher education. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook*, 9, 17-26.
- Shultz, L. (2007) Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53 (3), 248-258.
- Snauwaert, D. (2011). Social justice and the philosophical foundations of critical peace education: Exploring Nussbaum, Sen, and Freire, *Journal of Peace Education*, 8(3), 315-331. DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2011.621371
- Snauwaert, D. (2011). Social justice and the philosophical foundations of critical peace education: Exploring Nussbaum, Sen, and Freire, *Journal of Peace Education*, 8(3), 315-331. DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2011.621371
- Take, H., & Shoraku, A. (2018). Universities' expectations for study-abroad programs fostering internationalization: Educational policies. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(1), 37-52.
- Tarozzi, M., & Torres, C. A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism: Comparative perspectives.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- UNESCO. (2016). *About the global education first initiative.* Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/>
- UNESCO. (n.d.). *What is global citizenship education?* Retrieved July 6, 2020, from <https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced/definition>
- United Nations. (n.d.). 4 Quality Education. Retrieved June 20, 2020, from <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>
- Wayne, R. (2016). The courage of hopelessness: Creative disruption of

- everyday life in the classroom. In J. Wayne (Ed.), *Reassessing the social studies curriculum: Promoting critical civic engagement in a politically polarized, post-9/11 world*. (pp. 69-82). Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Wintersteiner, W., Grobbauer, H., Diendorfer, G., Reitmair-Juarez, S. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Citizenship education for globalizing societies*. Klagenfurt: Zentrum für Friedensforschung und Friedenspädagogik.
- Wood, J. (2012). The university as a public good: active citizenship and university community engagement. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 8(3), 15-31.