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Abstract

This study contributes to the broader scholarly discussion on global citizenship education by having examined and documented an inquiry into three particular secondary social studies teachers’ initial conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship, reporting on the evolution of their constructions through the negotiation of tensions, and theorizing that 1) Teachers change their conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world by shifting or recreating their identities and 2) Teachers’ identities are locations of agency for global citizenship and global citizenship education.

While thinking about, reflecting on, or constructing new understandings of the concept of citizen and teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW) was important to changing teachers’ conceptualizations, it was insufficient. Each teacher had a concept of what it means to be a citizen—an identity as a citizen—and this helped to define their understandings of teaching for citizenship. The findings indicate that teachers must fundamentally practice new forms of being and relating to others. As the teachers are citizens themselves, change in their conceptualizations had ramifications for them personally. The study concluded that teacher identities are locations for making choices about who we are, how we want to relate to others, and what kind of world we want to live in.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Citizenship education has traditionally focused on the attainment of the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to be an effective and loyal citizen within the nation-state (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Peters, Britton and Blee, 2008). Over the last fifty years, escalating globalization of political, economic, technological and ecological systems has brought the world into people’s daily lives (Stiglitz, 2007).

Such increased global interconnectedness challenges the nation-state’s claim as the only means and grantor of citizenship (Falk, 2002; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Merryfield with Duty, 2008; Osler, 2003). More than ever, individuals, governments, religious groups, corporations and activist organizations identify, express agency and operate beyond the bounds of the nation-state (Gaudelli, 2006; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton, 1999; Mittelman, 2005). As new forms of citizenship are emerging, new forms of education need to be developed (Davies et al., 2005). Although students will still need to be prepared for citizenship within their nation-states, the realities of interconnectedness suggest we rethink what young people need to know and be able to do in order to be effective, engaged citizens in today’s world (Merryfield with Duty, 2008).
Outcomes of Globalization and Implications for Educating Citizens

While the term globalization has become very popular in the last several decades, globalization itself has been with us for a long time (Njehu, 2005; Scheuerman, 2006). Despite its long-standing presence, however, it is an idea whose many definitions and meanings are still contested (Heilman, 2006; O’Byrne, 2005). Globalization in its most general sense may be conceived of as the broadening, densening, intensifying and accelerating of worldwide interconnectedness across political, economic, environmental and social terrain (Held et al., 1999). Clearly, the interconnectedness we experience today, is extraordinary (Scheuerman, 2006). While globalization produces many effects, four outcomes in particular should be understood as powerful ecologies in which educating young citizens must be considered.

Global Interconnectedness

Just as new technologies aided exploration, trade, and the spread of culture historically, globalization today means that our hometowns are integrated into the global political economy, and local shops, banks, industries, and stock markets are influenced by international standards, treaties and agreements on trade, finance, and production (Merryfield with Duty, 2008). A decision made by a transnational organization, a terrorist act, a financial crisis, an oil spill or an ethnic conflict—any of these things happening miles away may affect our local lives in the United States (Held et al., 1999). Interconnectedness also means that what happens in our neighborhoods affects others and the state of the planet (Stromquist, 2002).

Thus interconnectedness has immense implications for teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (Merryfield with Duty, 2008; Pike, 2008a). Students must examine and think
about the world as a system and so must possess substantive knowledge of many nations and
the planet (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). Students must study the dynamics of moving
populations (Gaudelli, 2003; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005), human rights and responsibilities
(Gaudelli, 2003; Kirkwood-Tucker, 2003; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005) the environment
(Gaudelli, 2003; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005) and more. Merryfield and Wilson (2005) assert
that interconnectedness implies that students must learn to engage and manage a number of
complex perspectives, many from the voices of those who are rarely heard. The authors stress
that an important effect of the study of multiple perspectives is that students will learn about
themselves and their own worldviews which are usually related to imperialism, ethnicity or
religion (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005).

Multicultural and Global Societies

The movement of people and cultures also has important ramifications for what
students need to know and be able to do (Gaudelli, 2003; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). As
national borders become less defined, individuals are developing complex, shifting, and layered
identities outside the confines of the nation-state and inside new political, economic,
technological and ecological systems (Banks, 2004). Now, more than ever, it is possible for
individuals to live in multiple worlds simultaneously (Chinchilla, 2005).

While some movements of people are related to economic opportunities, others are
due to war, political instability or famine (Held et al., 1999; Osler and Starkey, 2003). While
homogeneous nation-states were most always more myth than reality (Parmenter, 2006),
racially and ethnically diverse peoples are moving in numbers that amplify their visibility. Some
fear that globalization will lead to loss—cultural homogeneity. Others believe new mixtures of cultures will rise—but that sometimes this integration will provoke a stronger defense of tradition (Lechner, 2000). Rights are of concern to many people, yet most agree there is no one good way to assess or manage the rights of people moving between nations (Castles, 2004; http://www.realizingrights.org/). In all of its fluidity, the meaning and practice of citizenship must be reassessed.

As communities and regions become more multicultural and global, young people who have the knowledge and skills to work across different cultures and languages are needed; those with culturally complicated backgrounds are more likely to have the cosmopolitan mindsets and cross-cultural skills that make it easier to interact on the world stage (Merryfield with Duty, 2008). Citizenship education must help students combat cultural and religious stereotypes, challenge media’s exotic images and overcome prejudice and racism (Merryfield with Duty, 2008). Intercultural skills, substantive culture learning and cross-cultural experiences prepare young people to live, work and mediate cultural conflicts and misunderstandings in a culturally diverse world (Merryfield with Duty, 2008).

The Information Revolution

“Perhaps the most profound change of the last half-century has been the growth in the accessibility of information to ordinary people.” (Pike, 2008a, p. 12). Access to information and information technologies increases individuals’ understanding of the world in which they live and the ways in which they can live and work within the world. Information literacy creates opportunities for knowledge and wealth and encourages the growth of private-public spheres
where citizens can congregate and work to expose and solve global problems (Castells, 2008).

It’s important to note, however, that while information plays an ever-expanding role in shaping our picture of the world, some lack access to media and media may not always reflect global realities (Pike, 2008a). The voices of the status quo—be they political, economic, scientific, religious, medical, business or other—continue to shape mainstream academic knowledge taught across the world (Merryfield with Duty, 2008).

Changes in the generation and flow of knowledge and information have serious consequences for civil society and citizenship education. Students need to critically examine the knowledge that is typically created by stable, privileged western societies and purposely seek out other worldviews and multiple perspectives (ALA 1989; Dam and Volman, 2004; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). Individuals and societies committed to freedom must guarantee access to information for all and nurture citizens’ capacities to interrogate that information in order to promote and preserve personal liberties (ALA, 1989). Students need to be equipped to investigate knowledge, construct information and use it to influence public policy and address global issues (Hermes, 2006; Pithers, 2000). Students need to appreciate complexity, recognize ambiguity, and abandon the search for one correct answer (ALA, 1989; Vysoka, 2003). Multiple perspectives and critical thinking are central to the complex problem solving required in the real and globalized world (Dam and Volman, 2004).

Global Power and Inequity

Some view globalization as pure capitalism while others think globalization is a process that naturally or inevitably enables individuals, corporations and nations to integrate
themselves, their markets or their futures (Lechner, 2000). Perhaps more consensually, people agree that recent times are marked by the internationalization and transnationalization of politics and decision-making and the rise of regional and global supra-institutions and non-state actors (Held et al., 1999; Mittelman, 2005; Stiglitz, 2002). While many benefit from such new developments and arrangements, others feel oppressed by multinational companies and international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the World Bank (Shiva, 2005; Stiglitz, 2002). Clearly, the effects of globalization are not equally distributed (Held et al., 1999; Newlands, 2002). Citizenship education of the future must acknowledge shared responsibilities for addressing global challenges and affirming that our humanity does not stop at national borders (Nussbaum, 1996; http://www.realizingrights.org).

Given that we have been deeply schooled in differences and borders and taught to see the world in terms of civilized or primitive, north or south, we must engage in the conscious process of critically understanding the roots of this divide; namely, deconstructing the invisible legacy of imperialism that continues to influence generations (Nyambe and Shipena, 1998; Willinsky, 1998). This legacy of imperialism must be deeply understood by students who will make decisions in this global age (Willinsky, 1998).

It is equally imperative that young citizens develop what Pike (2008a) calls a global ethic—the notion that individuals should exercise some responsibility for what happens not only to themselves but to human beings generally, around the globe. Students will need to ask what is in the common good and what will protect the rights of all people (Merryfield and Wilson,
This global ethic might be constructed through dialogue and reflection with others (Dower and Williams, 2002). In sum, Oxfam (1997) states:

**Students must respond to imbalances in power and inequities by assuming their role as a global citizen, respecting and valuing diversity, understanding how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally and taking responsibility for their actions to make the world a better place to live.**

Globalization has important ramifications on teaching for citizenship. The authority, function and autonomy of the nation-state are changing and supra-national institutions and non-state actors are on the rise (Held et al., 1999; Mittelman, 2005; Stiglitz, 2007). There is a significant gap between the rich and the poor and the free and the oppressed, yet there remains much promise as to what globalization can do for our world (Held et al., 1999; Newlands, 2002; Stiglitz, 2007). The advancement of the public good, and how we choose to define the public, is an urgent and crucial endeavor (Held et al., 1999).

**Statement of the Problem**

Contemporary literature in the fields of global education and global citizenship education indicate that we should consider shifting paradigms—from that of educating individuals solely for citizenship in a nation-state to educating individuals for effective citizenship in a 21st century, globalized world (Davies et al., 2005; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Lee and Leung, 2006; Mitchell and Parker, 2008; Osler and Starkey, 2003; Parmenter, 2006). Along these lines scholars have examined teachers’ knowledge about and experiences in the world (Holden and Hicks, 2007; Merryfield, 2000); sought to understand curricula, its implementation, and professional support needed (Gaudelli, 2006; Larsen and Faden, 2008; Lee and Leung, 2006); considered students’ identities and lived realities as a means for educating
citizens in a globalized world (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Mitchell and Parker, 2008; Osler and Starkey, 2003; Parmenter, 2006); assessed youths’ knowledge and experiences as global citizens (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Dean, 2008; Holden, 2008a; Osler and Starkey, 2003); identified discourses and frameworks that ascribe meaning to citizenship (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Parker, 2006; Pike, 2008a), and outlined various characterizations of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2006; Nussbaum, 1996; Oxfam, 1997). Despite all of this research, however, education that prepares young people for responsible participation in both a democratic nation and global community is not enacted in most classrooms in meaningful ways.

The idea of global citizenship (a term which is akin to “teaching for citizenship in a globalized world” or TCGW) is the general notion that human beings are citizens of the world; that we are members of the wider community of humanity, going beyond the scope of the nation-state and exhibiting some form or amount of identity, loyalty or commitment (Dower and Williams, 2002). However, as this study demonstrates, precisely what global citizenship means is a matter of debate as is whether we are or should be global citizens (Dower and Williams, 2002; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). Pike (2008b) rightly asserted that the very idea of educating citizens for global citizenship is fraught with ethical tensions and political viewpoints amidst a complicated educational context: “The challenge for global citizenship education appears to lie more in the interpretation of, and justification for, its central concept” (p. 473). In addressing this deeper challenge that Pike claimed the field had not yet adequately addressed, this study affirmed Pike’s (2008b) notion to the extent that making meaning of and evaluating the legitimacy of global citizenship is important. My findings go further, however, in
asserting that the core challenge to global citizenship is posed by one’s identity. Britzman’s (1991) idea that tensions between knowing and being are enacted in every pedagogy is further established, as teachers’ concepts of citizen and their understandings of teaching for citizenship were reciprocal. The study concluded that significant change is possible through the address of the concept of citizen or teaching for citizenship when we recognize our identities as locations of agency for global citizenship. Our identities are locations where we can make alternative choices about who we are, how we want to relate to others, and what kind of world we want to live in.

While this study resulted in a focus on identity, it was originally designed to investigate “teachers’ internal beliefs and perspectives” about what it means to educate young people for a changing world. This study promoted the wrestling with and exposed to change teachers’ understandings of ethical tensions and political interpretations that to varying degrees confounded or prevented teaching for global citizenship. In sum, this research set out to contribute to the broader scholarly discussion by having examined and documented an inquiry into three particular secondary social studies teachers’ conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship and then reporting on the evolution of their constructions in the context of participatory action research (PAR).

In recent years, the possibility that knowledge can be created from the process of engaging in research and not only as an outcome of research has been given acknowledgment (Lind, 2008). In fact, Fullan (1993) and Tharp and Gallimore (1991) hold that successful evolution of understandings of pedagogy requires that teachers are collaboratively involved in the change process. The authors hold that long-term collaborative venues that foster joint
productivity between researchers and teachers and teachers among themselves are the determining factor in critical reflection and change in education practice. More specifically, we also know that professional development that transmits knowledge and skills to teachers in formal or direct manners may be insufficient to improve teachers’ practices toward developing active student citizenship (Myers, 2006). Additionally, Moll, Amanti, Neff and Gonzalez (1992) found that collaborative settings are essential to reflection, analysis and planning change in light of new understandings regarding students’ funds of knowledge when they come from socioculturally diverse contexts—an issue essential to rethinking citizenship education in a multicultural and global world. Given these important factors and its well-documented history of generating change (Fals-Borda, 1977; Freire, 1982; Lewin, 1946; 1947; Martin-Baró, 1994), participatory action research was chosen as the research methodology which would drive our collaboration. PAR is collective, self-reflective enquiry undertaken in order to create new understandings which lead to the improvement of society (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000).

Research Questions

This chapter will preview the process by which three secondary social studies teachers and I addressed the following research questions:

1. How do teachers’ conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW) change through the process of participatory action research?
   A. In what new ways do they construct their own concept of citizen?
   B. What new understandings of educating for citizenship do they develop for themselves?
In the pages that follow I will provide a brief discussion of my methodology in addition to how I gained access to a purposeful sample of teachers, how I collected and analyzed data, and highlight some of the ways I sought to establish trustworthiness and validity throughout the study. Chapter three, Methodology and Methods, provides full detail on the aforementioned parts of this dissertation. This introductory chapter will also describe how my personal identity and decision-making impacted the conduct of the study and influenced interpretation of the data. Finally, this chapter addresses the significance of and terms used in the study, and gives an overview of the organization of the remaining chapters.

Qualitative Research

My choice to conduct a qualitative investigation signaled my intention to deliberately plumb within and understand the complex world of human experience—in this case from the perspective of teachers (Krauss, 2005). A deep and sustained qualitative examination of the many personal ways the teachers thought about citizenship would be necessary in order to capture the “wrestling with” and possible changing of ethical positions and political interpretations that confounded or inhibited the evolution of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world.

Based on these ideas and using a critical focus group method, I approached this study as a means to dig deep and investigate the ways in which we have constructed our concepts of citizen and TCGW through our past experiences and the ones we shared in this participatory action research project.

This study proved ripe for the kinds of in-depth means required to search into such an
area where little is known (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 1990) as its purpose was never to quantify and generalize certain truths. Instead the study’s purpose was to illuminate the experiences of three teachers at a particular place and time, and to highlight our role in creating and interpreting the data therein (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Readers should note that the teachers are alternately referred to as participants and as co-researchers throughout the study.

Methodology

As a researcher committed to evolving citizenship education, I wanted the methodology and overall design that I chose to reflect my concern for justice, engagement, and freedom, and my belief in peoples’—in this case teachers’—creative agency. Action-taking was first formally integrated into experimental social science research with Kurt Lewin’s publication of Action Research and Minority Problems in 1946 and Group Decisions and Social Change in 1947 (Calhoun, 1994). Lewin explained action research was a three-step spiral process: (1) planning (which involves fact-finding); (2) taking action based on the facts; and (3) fact-finding about the results of the action and so on (Calhoun, 1994). According to Herr and Anderson (2005), action research (AR) exists in multiple forms and is implemented in varied intellectual traditions. While AR is thought to transcend knowledge creation to include personal and professional growth as well as organizational and community empowerment, in PAR (note the addition of the word “participatory”) research and action become a single process, and researchers indistinguishable from change agents (Calhoun, 1994; Herr and Anderson, 2005). I looked to Carr and Kemmis’ (1986, p. 162) description of participatory action research as a guide. PAR is:
A form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situation in which the practices are carried out.

Kemmis and McTaggart (2000) noted that PAR is historically associated with profound change or transformation of what are considered “underdeveloped” nations and that it has strong theoretical roots in human rights activism. Paulo Freire made PAR popular internationally through his politicized action research with Brazilian “peasants” which called for “conscientization”—a strategy in the liberation of oppressed peoples (Bryceson, Manicom and Kassam, 1982). Conscientization or critical consciousness focuses on achieving understanding of the world through the perception and exposure of social and political contradictions and taking action against that which is illuminated by the new understanding (Freire, 1982).

In this study, I identified a community of teachers as a marginalized group. In doing so I recognized Freire’s (1982) assertion that we are all the oppressed and the oppressors. I then sought to combine my critical insight with that of the teachers in order to co-generatively fuel new awareness and a search for alternatives in re-conceptualizing teaching for citizenship. This was important as a great deal of what we know about teachers’ perspectives related to TCGW has been limited to their content knowledge or needs and other obstacles faced in terms of curriculum implementation, assessment and other issues related to practice. Much of this knowledge was generated by university researchers through observations, questionnaires, and interviews, with limited substantive participation on the part of teachers themselves. An unwinding and examination of the ethical tensions and political viewpoints inherent in global citizenship education led us to ponder our identities, and this required the critical participation of teachers. In this study, as knowers and researchers, the teachers drew on their own
capabilities—their own power—to generate new ways of thinking about educating young people for a changing world.

Through PAR the co-researchers’ experiences, knowledge and worldviews were unearthed and new and different issues were constantly borne out that reflected more and different perspectives (Potter, 1998). This process reflected Vygotsky’s (1962) constructivism and the transactional nature of knowing as a social act and Dewey’s (1933) notion of the problematic which asserts that uncertainty created by intellectual tensions is essential to inquiry (in Potter, 1998). As we shall see, tension was key to the growth of participants in this study. The PAR process helped us to begin to think about the discourses, the arena of work, and the social relationships of power that limited self-development and determination (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000).

PAR’s distinguishing characteristics—shared ownership of research, community-based analysis of problems, and an orientation toward action—made it the most suitable methodology for this study (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). From my perspective, development of the field of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world requires more of teachers’ critical participation—at a time when teachers are often precluded from meaningfully participating in decision, meaning, and policy-making.

Educators regularly work in isolation from one another, and grappling with complex issues such as global citizenship/education requires time, space and support that schools rarely provide (Pike, 2008b). Yet we know the effects that group discussion and interaction have in producing commitment and support for changes in individual attitudes and behavior (Calhoun, 1994), and as we now know, identity, as demonstrated in this study. This kind of critical
participation shifted attention to three teachers whose experiences, while not generalizable, was nonetheless important (Cahill, 2007a).

I believe it was particularly appropriate that a research methodology intended to address the imbalances of an unjust world was employed to examine teaching for citizenship in a globalized world; an idea which can be deeply imbued with notions of justice, power and participation.

Methods

Beginning in mid-February and ending in late May, data were collected in focus group discussions approximately every other week for about two hours each session resulting in almost 15 hours of group recordings and 357 pages of transcribed data. Additionally, teachers were engaged in unstructured interviews (before and after the focus group process) resulting in almost four hours of recordings and 78 pages of transcribed data. Throughout the course of the study I described and explained my interactions in the research process in writing to myself (Janesick, 2000) and these reflexive notes served as another means of data with the word-processed portion totaling approximately 105 pages. The text of particular email messages is included as data because I copied and pasted them into my reflexive journal for study. Email messages in general were omitted as a source of data because they were few in number, I had not planned for their inclusion and analysis and it is likely that most substantive emails were at least considered as part of the data record by virtue of being pasted in my reflexive journal. I also omitted the inclusion and analysis of individual and group diagrams regarding our before and after conceptualizations of citizenship as their text and meaning was scant, and the co-
researchers showed very little interest in their use as a means of demonstrating our progress. Additionally, I had not planned for diagrams as a category of data, and I wished to keep the data corpus manageable.

Focus Group Discussions

To answer my question this study employed PAR primarily through a series of bi-weekly, critical focus group discussions based on relevant professional and scholarly literature. I drew much inspiration from the dissertation study of Dawn Shinew whose focus group design and intent influenced my own. Shinew’s (1998) dissertation, *Disrupt, transgress and invent possibilities: Feminist interpretations of educating for democratic citizenship*, employed feminist educational research in a postmodern framework whereby teachers were engaged in ‘critical’ discussions over several months. In *Disrupt*... teachers successfully disrupted the traditions that defined their professional knowledge of civic education and constructed many possible meanings for citizenship education that spoke to emancipation. *Disrupt*... appealed to me because Shinew believed that research should involve teachers and support their rights to grapple with theoretical literature usually reserved for the academe (p. 44). I refer to these focus groups as critical as they, too, were employed in the historical-feminist sense and used for consciousness raising and the promotion of a social justice agenda (Madriz, 2000).

I selected focus group discussions as my primary means of data collection because I believed they would allow me to conduct rich and dynamic participant observation and individual interviews at the same time (Madriz, 2000). The discussions proved to be most effective in unearthing compelling issues, questions and contradictions regarding teaching for
citizenship in a globalized world and each session fueled the readings, foci and reflections for the next with both researcher and co-researchers contributing to the cycles. Compared to individual interviews, group discussion gave me the advantage of creating multiple lines of communication and fostering the kind of multivocality among diverse participants (Madriz, 2000) that would support critical and post-modern theory. Whether asking questions, sharing ideas or challenging each others’ beliefs, the many expressions helped us all to get at the root of our community’s problem, construct new understandings, and yet doubt what we thought we knew over time. Like Shinew’s, our group discussions helped the teachers to support and challenge one another’s thinking but also to ultimately give rise to new possibilities (Shinew, 1998) and action. Focus groups, including their limitations in this study, are further discussed in chapter three.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Interviews provided another rich venue for data “collection” and understanding in what are increasingly recognized as active, dynamic, non-neutral interactions—this time between university or “main” researcher and individual teacher (Fontana and Frey, 2000). The selection of this method complemented the focus group discussions in that interviews allowed time and space for singular voices. The interviews were congruent with the PAR process as they were cast as negotiated data and viewed as the accomplishments of both the researcher and teacher (Fontana and Frey, 2000). The semi-structured format allowed for pre-planning, yet flexibility on my part in inquiring as to participants’ biographical experiences with citizenship and proved indispensible in the unpacking of before and after conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship.
Semi-structured interviews benefited the study by allowing me to focus on understanding rather than just asking questions and collecting information (Fontana and Frey, 2000).

Reflexive Journal

Reflexivity is the conscious experiencing of the self as a researcher and as a participant (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). As I am not neutral, my perspectives and worldview influenced both the conduct of the study and my interpretation of the data. As yet another source of data, I kept a reflexive journal in which I attempted to explain and scrutinize everything from my selection of participants to the re-presentation of the findings in order to unmask my not-always-apparent beliefs and prejudices (Lincoln and Guba, 2000).

Selection of Participants

Action research holds that the professional knowledge a researcher brings to a study is important and valuable, but that local knowledge, too, is a vital ingredient in research. With their “front-line” experience, teachers were deemed critical to the process of identifying problems in re-conceptualizing teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (Greenwood and Levin, 2000).

To capitalize on the notion of local knowledge, teachers for this study were identified through purposeful sampling—facilitating the selection of members closest to the issue under investigation (Patton, 1990). As a practical and logistical matter, teachers were limited to the Covey County area to guarantee a reasonable commute to the regular, in-person focus group discussions that were core to our engagement.
Invitations to teachers to self-nominate were widely circulated using email through multiple avenues including:

- A large, local University’s social studies professional development school;
- A local 16-district consortium organization;
- The Covey County affiliate of the Council on World Affairs;
- The Covey County Educational Service Center and
- A non-profit center for law-related education.

The invitation was also presented in person at a Futura City Schools Social Studies Conference and by regular mail to all middle and high school principals and curriculum directors in the 16-district Covey County area.

Individuals who were interested in participating in the study were selected based on the following criteria.

- Their status as a grades 7-12 social studies teacher;
- Their interest in global and/or citizenship education;
- Their interest in social justice and/or interpersonal and group processes (related to PAR) and
- Diversity (Attention was paid to soliciting and forming a group of individuals of various ages, genders, ethnicities, races and formal or informal “citizenships,” although attrition from the study resulted in little participant diversity).

While the recruitment effort yielded 11 applicants and 10 were selected as participants, four declined to accept the invitation after being selected and an additional three who had
consented to participate exited the study for various personal reasons. Details regarding the final three-teacher sample is presented in chapter three.

Data Analysis

Data analysis and management methods were designed to balance the preservation of as much of the participants’ original discussions and interpretations as possible while permitting ongoing analysis and theory development (Charmaz, 2000). Theory development began the moment data were collected and continued as I immersed myself in our recordings, transcripts and reflection (Charmaz, 2000). I gradually categorized and interpreted data through the development of open codes (themes) using emergent design (Charmaz, 2000).

Since PAR is a spiral of the self-reflective cycles of planning a change, acting on and observing the consequences of the change, grounded theory development was a good companion to my methodology (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). Data were subject to constant comparison throughout the life of the study meaning that individuals were compared to one another and data from the same individuals was compared within themselves and at different points in time (Charmaz, 2000; Ryan and Bernard, 2000). The constant comparative method fueled the agenda for each successive focus group discussion and each discussion subsequently impacted our analyses.

From this process two kinds of codes emerged, one category related to tensions present in the teachers’ initial conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world and another category related to newly evolving dimensions of a re-conceptualized citizenship education. The tensions identified included: Loss of identity, distribution of resources, universal
versus culturally relevant rights, and creation of a one-world government. The dimensions which emerged were citizenship-as-identity and belonging, citizenship-as-connection, citizenship-as-empowerment, and citizenship-as-relation. The data analysis process is addressed at length in chapter three.

Re-presentation of Findings

One of the toughest challenges in honoring PAR was presenting our work so that it might be acted on by others (Cahill, 2007a; Lincoln and Denzin, 2000). A number of styles of re-presentation were employed (for instance, readers’ theatre), while a form of civic journalism served as the active conceptual framework by which we invited readers to become participants in addressing meaningful public problems (Charity, 1995; Lincoln and Denzin, 2000). Civic Journalism values writing that moves a public to meaningful judgment and meaningful action; exposes complacency, bigotry, and wishful thinking, and promotes a form of textuality that turns citizens into readers and readers into persons who take democratic action in the world (Charity, 1995; Lincoln and Denzin, 2000).

While participants did not actually write within the dissertation, two of them did create stand-alone letters to readers in which they shared personal insights resulting from our process. I did ask them to be involved in the creative process (brainstorming, framing, etc.) of determining the re-presentation of our findings although they ultimately left these choices to me. For practical reasons and given the demands of completing the dissertation, I acknowledge that my voice by far was given special privilege (Gergen and Gergen, 2000). Having said that, I amplified the authentic voices of the teachers to the maximum extent possible.
Validity

The following sections describe the kinds of validity sought throughout the conduct of this study. Triangulation, construct validity, face validity, catalytic validity, reflexivity and the disclamation of validity through multiple voices are addressed.

Triangulation

To improve the “accuracy” of my findings I employed triangulation (Denzin, 1970; Janesick, 2000). I used data triangulation by drawing data from multiple sources (focus group discussions, interviews, and reflexive notes). This helped ensure that the patterns which emerged were not coincidental. Additionally, each participant acted as a co-researcher (investigator triangulation). Expanding notions of who can be the knower is consistent with PAR and it brought diverse intellectual power to bear on the problem under study. Investigator triangulation helped to engage more worldviews and protect the study from my biases (to some degree). Finally, multiple perspectives were used to interpret the data (theory triangulation). Engaging participants in interpretation brought multiple perspectives to bear as we sought to explain our findings in terms of theory. Critical theory and checks on critical theory were frequently employed.

Construct validity

This study was created to address the tensions between teachers’ internal values and beliefs and TCGW. It was designed through my particular global worldview to problematize current conceptualizations of citizenship education. Given that goal, I was at risk of conceptual
over-determinism—meaning it could be easy for me to find what I had in mind (Lather, 1986). Action researchers are often accused of lacking methodological rigor; but sometimes we collect certain data because it is relevant or makes sense to us (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). It is also said that focusing on evidence that is relevant and deemed valid by participants increases the potential for action and transformation of our world (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). In this study, construct validity was grounded between my notion that we would have a changed conceptualization of TCGW, the teachers’ own thinking/understandings about TCGW and our prolonged engagement with the problem and each other.

Face validity

Face validity in this study is achieved by member checks. Member checks permeated our research process in both formal and informal ways. Whatever I thought I was finding or we were finding was brought back to the group (for every session of discussion) to then be re-grappled with and refined in light of our further reflections (Lather, 1986). Participants were also provided numerous formal opportunities to verify, modify or dispute whatever we had captured (Janesick, 2000).

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is the conscious experiencing of oneself as a researcher and as a participant in the study (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Lincoln and Guba (2000) explain that reflexivity requires us to scrutinize everything from our questions to our choice of methodology to the many decisions we make in the research process. Throughout the course of this study I journaled
about and reflected on my interactions in the research process (Janesick, 2000). Examples of this reflexivity are woven throughout the dissertation. My intent was to work democratically but the positions I assumed were not neutral and they affect the reality I captured in my research (Herr and Anderson, 2005; Potter, 1998). While bias is impossible to avoid as no one is neutral, I hope that my reflexivity helped to mitigate the risks associated with my bias and to more clearly render my worldview to readers (Janesick, 2000).

Catalytic Validity

In PAR, catalytic validity is demonstrated in warrants for action. If our community believed their research was valid, they would risk their own welfare by taking the actions arrived at—e.g. assuming new conceptualizations, trying to influence peers, changing their curriculum, etc. (Greenwood and Levin, 2000.). There is substantial evidence that the teachers took such actions throughout the study.

Multiple Voices

A significant means of actually disclaiming validity is to employ multiple voices within the research (Gergen and Gergen, 2000). This study intentionally sought to include a range of teachers’ perspectives, claims and concerns that would otherwise go unheard (Gergen and Gergen, 2000; Lincoln and Guba, 2000). PAR is often utilized because it has the potential to listen to and amplify not only multiple voices within the collaborative but within the self (Potter, 1998). Too, a study can be made richer by favoring a complex and oppositional accounting of participant perspectives, even when presenting the findings (Herr and Anderson, 2005; Shinew,
Disagreeing and collectively analyzing our differences was central to our work (Cahill et al., 2008; Shinew, 1998).

Trustworthiness

Several other techniques were employed throughout the study to promote trustworthiness. These include thick description, committee and peer review and informed consent.

Thick Description

This study employed thick description meaning that I wrote to comprehensively express the realities of the participants, not just my own (Stake, 2000). In subscribing to thick description, I made every effort to convey the complexities and nuances of reality as lived and constructed by participants, and direct quotations from various sources support the representations (Janesick, 2000). While trekking through the findings in chapter four may be a somewhat arduous task—and some might say that too many raw data were presented—such thick description benefited the study by maintaining the focus on the community of teachers, enhancing the integrity of our work as defined by PAR.

Peer and Committee Review

My peer’s 16 hours and committee’s 12 ½ hours of review aided me in many respects, but particularly in unprivileging my white and western worldview. The process generally ensured that I operated within the bounds of the human subjects research board, introduced
me to fresh perspectives and interpretations of my work, exposed my biases and supported my first foray into the research process. Examples of the impact of the review process are discussed throughout the dissertation.

Informed Consent and Confidentiality

The purpose of informed consent is to protect participants by explaining to them the research process and the risk for harm associated with their participation (Fine, Weis, Weseen and Wong, 2000). Accordingly, each participant was provided with an oral overview of the research proposed, and instructed as to process, risk, confidentiality and withdrawal. Participants were also provided time to ask questions and to consider consent. Finally, written consent to participate was obtained using the standard IRB form and protocol. I documented the consent process in detail.

Participants’ anonymity was protected by the use of aliases in our public materials. Consent forms and all raw materials (including coded data) which contain identifying information are being kept in a locked file accessible by only myself. The records will be retained for a period of three years after which identifying information will be destroyed. In the case of electronic records (which I also printed out), the same procedures are being employed with two additional safeguards: electronic records are protected by a password which is known only to me and the records have been permanently deleted. Participants were apprised that only those individuals employed as a transcriptionist, peer reviewer or doctoral committee member were privy (in limited fashion) to their confidential information at any given time.
Ethical Considerations and Limitations of the Research

This study is limited by the researcher herself. I am a 41-year old, white female with limited multicultural experiences and personal connections at home or abroad. My day-to-day environment leaves my strongest cultural assumptions unchallenged, even as I sought to challenge those of the participants. Despite constant study and reflection, I am doubtlessly imbued with mechanistic thinking (Pike, 2008b) and my circumscribed, privileged western, white world was a potential source of bias in all of my decision making and interpretation regarding rethinking citizenship education.

In the strictest sense I am an outsider to the teaching community. Complicating this further, I am also a former insider—a former secondary social studies teacher who was passionate about global education and teaching for citizenship. I carry with me very positive, agented experiences as a teacher, but these experiences are now dated and they may have been romanticized over time. Having been out of the classroom for eight years now, my work may reflect a bygone era or a certain naivety.

Another limitation was that our PAR work was not authentically participatory at all times (Cahill, 2007a). This project already bore the burden of having a problem that didn’t emerge organically but was defined through a scholastic, not a community process. Transparency about just how much the research project is genuinely shared is of utmost importance. For instance, much of the interpretation and analysis in the study occurred away from the group, regardless of efforts to engage participants. Certainly, the culture of dissertations largely discourages collaborative work (Herr and Anderson, 2005). The need to successfully complete my dissertation which is accompanied by a reward—a Ph.D.—may have
also subconsciously steered me to control outcomes. While I took great care not to simply recreate a power structure whereby teacher participation was diminished and the status quo reigned, I must admit this was at least a possibility (Lind, 2008).

Another possible limitation concerns the fact that PAR serves two masters in that both research and action are important; for some this sets up a research/action tension. For those focused on action, much of the process or documentation that must accompany this dissertation may be a nuisance or indication of impurity. For those concerned more with scholasticism, this research may be lacking as some of what took place is invisible to others in that it is not outwardly quantifiable or recognizable (Herr and Anderson, 2005).

Also limiting this study was the fact that my participant selection engaged people who would be interested in global citizenship education or PAR (perhaps valuing social justice, a belief in collaboration, etc.). This means that the findings will carry a certain naivety in that the participants may have been more amenable, malleable or easier to dominate along the process. This study is further limited by having confined the selection of participants to social studies teachers generally; educating young citizens happens across subject matter, just as all good teaching and leaning occurs. I traded the richer discussion that would come from multiple disciplines for the comfort of my subject area, its pedagogy and its history.

This leads to the next limitation which is the study’s inability to produce universal truths, and as such, it is not generalizable. Because the knowledge was co-generated, it includes local knowledge and analyses steeped in a particular local context. This study embraced multiple explanations and interpretations within this community, so no one “correct answer” or universal truth emerged. The study is also obviously limited by its small sample size. Even with diverse
participants sharing their many voices, the research remains the product of a very small group of individuals.

Finally, a most important ethical consideration is this: While the research findings needed to withstand scrutiny from my dissertation committee and the scholarly community, it is the teachers who really live with the consequences of the actions taken throughout the research (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). I also recognize that generating new awareness within the teachers and amongst the group may have done little if anything to change conditions outside of the group; this could lead to unhappiness, pessimism or apathy (Lind, 2008).

Terms in the Study

While educating young people for their role as citizens is not a new idea (Pike, 2008b), new conceptions of citizenship are emerging in the global age (Gaudelli, 2006). These multiple conceptions have been labeled world, cosmopolitan and global citizenship to name a few—with each containing a variety of ideological positions within themselves (Pike, 2008b). For this reason, I propose to define terms as they are used in this study.

World citizenship can be traced back to the Cynics whose notion of cosmopolitanism indicated loyalty to the world or cosmopolis rather than a single community (Hahn, 2003; Pike, 2008b). Cosmopolitan citizenship is composed of two contradictory and intertwining strands. One, the idea that we are all fellow citizens with obligations to one another, and two, the idea that everybody matters but isn’t the same (Appiah, 2006). Appiah’s conception promotes both universal concern and respect for legitimate difference.
Akin to the notion of a cosmopolitan citizen is a global citizen. Oxfam (1997) describes a global citizen as someone who is:

- aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally;
- is outraged by social injustice;
- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from local to global;
- is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place and
- takes responsibility for their actions.

Scholars have sought to delineate the development of the field supporting educating citizens in a globalized world from the aforementioned cosmopolitanism to a place of world studies (the study of regions primarily to develop knowledge) to international education (comparative study of nations) to of course, global education (the study of the world as an interconnected system) (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005).

International education, for the purposes of this paper, is further conceived as education that blends a focus on traditional academic disciplines (namely math and science) with twenty-first century skills such as knowing more about the world, critical thinking, and using information sources critically (Parker, 2006; Pike, 2008b). The goal of international education...
education is to prepare U.S. students to compete in the global economy and to preserve national security (Parker, 2006; Pike, 2008b).

Global education can broadly be described as learning about the interconnectedness of people, problems and issues across the globe within economic, cultural, political, technical, an environmental systems (Heilman, 2006; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005; Pike, 2008b). Global education is also sometimes thought of as education for global citizenship (Heilman, 2006) although it doesn’t necessarily articulate citizenship (Pike, 2008b). Global citizenship education certainly borrows from global education in promoting global civic consciousness, but relies more heavily on the tools of democracy and human rights (Davies et al., 2005; Pike, 2008b). The addition of the word citizenship signals a direct concern with social justice, rights and responsibilities, duties and entitlements and implies action is required by individuals (Davies, 2006).

Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) recognize that we could debate the definitions associated with all forms of global citizenship education endlessly, and there is merit in this exercise. As we shall see in chapter four Findings, citizenship is an invented concept to which many interests are associated (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Pike, 2008b). (Please note that this section exists in elaborated form in chapter two under the Evolution of Global Citizenship Education).

Organization of the Study

The proposed study is presented in six chapters. This first chapter provides an introduction, a statement of the problem, a brief description of the methodology, research
design, and limitations of the study. Chapter two provides a review of recent literature which helps to frame current challenges related to educating young citizens in a changing, globalized world. Chapter three details the research methodology, research design and methods for writing up the findings. Chapters four and five present the findings. Chapter six discusses the findings.
Chapter 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter I review the works of researchers who have contributed to my understanding of the development of the field of global citizenship education, identity pedagogy, and other factors and phenomena which are currently impacting conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW). I begin by defining the scope and rationale for the literature reviewed and proceed by exploring the evolution of the field of global citizenship education broadly to provide some historical context by which broad conceptualizations are based. I then discuss recent literature related to the topic of global citizenship education which helped shape my approach to this study and to further develop my methodology.

Scope and Rationale of Literature Reviewed

Strategies employed in locating literature for this review included use of Worldcat, Ohio Link, Google and Google Scholars search engines; the use of reference lists in articles and books reviewed; and the use of my own library and articles referred to me by my advisor and committee. Where possible I sought to employ literature found among the most reputable publications in my field (e.g. CitizEd) and from well-regarded researchers (e.g. Graham Pike).

The following research reviewed was selected to:

- Contribute to my, the participants’ and the readers’ understanding of the problem;
• Build/provide a rationale for my research;
• Highlight the more recent, relevant developments regarding notions of global citizenship education;
• De-emphasize studies of traditional citizenship education that have been well-reviewed elsewhere and
• Illuminate scholarship reflective of diverse scholars from across the globe.

The final criterion was particularly important as a study of conceptualizations of global citizenship education must take into account multiple perspectives and worldviews, especially those emanating from the “South.”

While the majority of the research reviewed herein was in place prior to the collection of data, this section and literature woven into this document more generally was updated to reflect newly discovered works and to ensure that new lines of thinking were linked to relevant or new literature as they emerged. It should be noted, however, that this review was instrumental in defining and clarifying the statement of the problem for this study. It was through the conduct of the review that I realized an absence of substantive teacher voice and connected this void with Pike’s (2008b) notion that the challenge for global citizenship education might be found in the interpretation and justification for its core concept. Only the section on identity and pedagogy was added after the findings were constructed.
The Evolution of Global Citizenship Education

Until most recently, the fields of global education and citizenship education have been conceived of separately despite the fact that the outcomes of globalization impact what today’s students need to know and be able to do (Davies et al., 2005). The field of education, global education and the expanded concept of global citizenship education now includes references to Multicultural Education, Human Rights Education, International Education and Cosmopolitanism (Pike, 2008b). The linkages between and amongst these social sciences are crucial to understanding globalization (Mittelman, 2005) and educating students for this 21st century.

While educating young people for their role as citizens is not a new idea, new conceptions of citizenship are emerging in the global age (Gaudelli, 2006; Pike, 2008b). These multiple conceptions have been labeled world, global and cosmopolitan citizenship to name a few—with each containing a span of ideological positions within themselves. For this reason, teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW) and the many forms of global citizenship are sometimes thought to be empty abstractions or slogans of globalization (Davies, 2006; Dower and Williams, 2002; Gaudelli, 2006).

education’s basic goals have been adopted amongst a number of grassroots followers (Pike, 2008).

In May 2001, the U.S.’s National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) issued a “Statement on Preparing Citizens for a Global Community.” In the statement, NCSS asserts that students should “develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes needed for responsible participation in a democratic society and in a global community in the twenty-first century” (retrieved April 30, 2009 from http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/global). Global citizenship education, thought by some to be an emergent form of global education, is now a hot topic of interest in many circles (Pike, 2008b).

The idea of world citizenship, however, dates back to the Cynics whose ideal cosmopolitanism indicated loyalty to the world or cosmopolis rather than any community (Hahn, 2003; Pike, 2008b). In the U.S., cosmopolitanism received renewed interest with Martha Nussbaum’s (1996) For Love of Country in which she questioned why human compassion should stop at national borders. Further interest followed with Kwame Appiah’s (2006) Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers in which Appiah spoke of a cosmopolitanism composed of two contradictory and intertwining strands: One, the idea that we are all fellow citizens with obligations to one another, and two, the idea that everybody matters but isn’t the same. Varieties of cosmopolitanism (and cosmopolitan education), however, are known to range from an Appian call for dialogue, to a minimum framework of rules agreed upon by transnational institutions, to a call for world government (Held, 1995).

Amidst all of this complexity, scholars have sought to delineate the development of the field supporting educating citizens for a globalized world from the aforementioned
cosmopolitanism to a place of world studies (the study of regions to develop knowledge) to international education (comparative study of nations) to of course, global education (the study of the world as an interconnected system) (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). Gaining in popularity in recent times, international education blends expertise in traditional academic disciplines (namely math and science) with twenty-first century skills such as knowing more about the world, using information sources critically, and generally practicing higher level thinking (Parker, 2006; Pike, 2008b). While the goal and content of international education can vary from district to district and state to state, there appears to be a strong focus on preparing students to compete in the global economy and to preserve national security (Parker, 2006; Pike, 2008b).

In elaborating on global education through the perspective of its devotees, one might say it is sometimes thought of as education for global citizenship although historically global education more likely implies than stipulates citizenship (Heilman, 2006; Pike, 2008b). Global citizenship education certainly borrows from global education in promoting global civic consciousness, but perhaps relies more heavily on the tools of democracy and human rights (Davies et al., 2005; Pike, 2008b). The addition of the word citizenship signals for many an explicit preoccupation with rights and responsibilities and duties and entitlements and implies action is required of the individual (Davies, 2006).

In 2005, Davies et al. examined global and citizenship education in several areas including focus and origins, the attitude of the government and significant others and the adoption of pedagogical approaches. The authors found that citizenship education and global education are not the same thing. For instance, global education is more politicized and its scope much wider while citizenship education enjoys a strong, defined tradition and more
widespread support. While noting that both global and citizenship education are lacking in certain areas, and conceding that there are some overlaps, Davies et al. (2005) caution us against adding international content to citizenship activities or global education activities to citizenship programs.

Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) recognize that we could debate the definitions associated with all forms of global citizenship education endlessly, and there is merit in this exercise. As we shall see in chapter four Findings, citizenship is an invented concept to which many interests are associated (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Pike, 2008b).

The purpose of the remainder (and core) of this chapter is to present a review of literature pertinent to the course of this study. The review focused on what we know about 1) Teachers’ knowledge about teaching about the world; 2) Immigration and diversity in the context of citizenship education; 3) Young people as global citizens; 4) The current discourse on International Education and 5) Identity and pedagogy.

Teachers’ Knowledge about Teaching about the World

Central to the issue of connecting teachers’ understandings of globalization to educating young citizens is that teachers themselves must be educated about globalization and how it is changing the world. Research indicates that teachers know little about the world and that they feel unprepared, anxious or unconfident to teach about global issues or make global connections (Gaudelli, 2003; Larsen and Faden, 2008; Lee and Leung, 2006; Merryfield, 2000; Merryfield and Kasai, 2004). Teachers often lack meaningful multicultural and global experiences (Holden and Hicks, 2007; Merryfield, 2000), are left to grapple with complex
curriculum (Gaudelli, 2003; Larsen and Faden, 2008; Lee and Leung, 2006), and deal with a myriad of complicating contextual factors such as a focus on testing or other subjects, lack of time, or lack of support (Davies, 2006; Larsen and Faden, 2008; Lee and Leung, 2006).

In a study of teacher training in England, Holden and Hicks (2007) raised questions about the knowledge, understanding and motivation that teacher trainees brought to their studies. A questionnaire was used to investigate students’ knowledge of global issues so that some comparisons could be made between the responses of trainee students in relation to their knowledge of and interest in global issues. Themes in the questionnaire formed the basis for in-depth, follow-up interviews (Holden and Hicks, 2007).

The authors noted that the trainee teachers coming from four universities provided data for three samples reflective of the paths taken by most prospective teachers. The samples were comprised of primary Post Graduate Certificate in Education trainees, secondary Post Graduate Certificate in Education trainees and primary undergraduate trainees. The secondary trainees were being trained to teach a national curriculum subject which was based on their degree (e.g. English) with the exception of the group training to be secondary citizenship teachers, a new national curriculum subject, where their degrees came from fields such as politics or law. Primary students in the study were being trained to teach all subjects of the national curriculum with an emphasis on English, math and science. The under-graduate students were in their first year at university (Holden and Hicks, 2007).

Holden and Hicks concluded that many trainee teachers are motivated to teach about global issues and are confident in their own knowledge but that further analysis indicated that there were differences in levels of knowledge and motivation between the samples. Secondary
trainees (subject specialists) were more confident in their knowledge than primary trainees and primary undergraduates were the least confident group. The authors noted that prior experience living or working abroad and contact with other cultures seemed to influence trainees’ interest in and knowledge of global issues. Faring the worst were the undergraduate students who had the least experience with other cultures and were least likely to have lived or worked abroad. Such experiences are crucial as they can impact the way teachers view those cultures and their own and subsequently impact the way they teach about the world (Holden and Hicks, 2007; Merryfield and Kasai, 2004).

Clearly more research into teachers’ understanding and motivation to engage with global issues is needed if we are to have a new generation of educators equipped to prepare students for our global times (Holden and Hicks, 2007). There is a dire need for teachers to teach for equity, diversity and global interconnectedness, yet colleges of education may be challenged to produce such teachers (Agnello, White and Fryer, 2006; Merryfield, 2000).

Research suggests that teachers are the product of their own knowledge, experiences and comfort level with diversity (Merryfield and Kasai, 2004). General travel, online interaction, simulated experiences at home and abroad, teacher exchanges, student teaching abroad, teaching abroad as a career, taking study-abroad courses, Peace Corp experiences or any kind of extended learning with/about others are keys to successful teacher preparation (Longview Foundation, 2008; Merryfield and Kasai, 2004).

Such experiences appear vital in preparing future teachers, and thus are vital to teacher educators. Merryfield (2000) conducted a study whereby 80 teacher educators who were recognized by their peers for their success in teacher preparation were asked to reflect upon the
experiences that most impacted their work. Several key findings emerged. Across the educators, most had significant experiences with people who differed from themselves or those they interacted with in terms of race, ethnicity, class, language or national origin. Many of those experiences had to do with some form of discrimination, poverty, or injustice that comes from being treated as different or perceived as the Other (Merryfield, 2000).

For example, Merryfield (2000) reported that first-hand experiences living in another country may provide insights into one's own sense of privilege and help to tackle previously unexamined realities. Merryfield found that these kinds of experiences created a tension between previously held beliefs and the many new realities of the experience; such contradictions can lead to puzzlement and the kind of reflection that leads to change (Merryfield, 2000). While experiences alone do not make a person a global educator, interrelationships across identity, power, and experience can lead to the identification of multiple realities and support teaching about the world (Merryfield, 2000). Although Merryfield acknowledges this study is limited by a small number of participants, it does sufficiently plant the question of whether all of today's teacher educators can successfully develop teachers of multicultural and global education. Attention to improved recruitment and hiring may be more effective than trying to incrementally develop a largely white and middle class faculty (Merryfield, 2000).

It is imperative that teachers are knowledgeable in order to grapple with a global citizenship curriculum for which there is no consensus; indeed global citizenship curricula are vast, complex and changing (Gaudelli, 2003). To begin with, global citizenship itself can still be perceived as something unimaginable when people typically live in their own culture.
surrounded by similar people (Gaudelli, 2008; Pike, 2008). Gaudelli (2008) goes further in saying global citizenship (which must be enacted within national systems of education) suffers from a lack of a constituency and curriculum history in addition to a lack of epistemological clarity. Gaudelli asserts that on one hand the curriculum is not a recognizable body of knowledge, skills, and attitudes because it tries to be everything to everyone (too open-ended). On the other hand, Gaudelli posits that the curriculum is a laundry list of basic knowledge and skills that fails to account for the complexity of global citizenship education. Both extremes could hinder the teaching of citizenship in a globalized world.

In 2006, however, Lynn Davies explored the notion of global citizenship and concluded that there is reasonable agreement on the knowledge, skills, values and behaviors which would comprise a valuable global citizenship education curriculum. Both Gaudelli and Davies do agree that what students do with learned curriculum is of utmost importance and requires greater attention.

In addition to curriculum resources, professional development, and peer observations, the sharing of experiences is also important to promoting teachers’ global learning (Po, Lo and Merryfield, 2007). Using a case study, Po et al. (2007) explored what and how global learning was conducted in general studies classrooms in a typical school in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Using observations, documentary analysis and interviews, the study analyzed students’ global learning experiences by closely examining six vignettes. The study revealed that overall, the new curriculum (a new global understanding strand in the general studies curriculum at the primary level) had a positive effect on students’ learning. Students
studied global issues, had authentic learning experiences, and developed skills related to information technology.

However, students’ experiences varied. Oftentimes, students experienced only superficial understanding of issues and critical thinking and reflectivity was not developed. Teachers needed greater skills required for conceiving, developing, negotiating and implementing the curriculum in order to advance the students’ experiences (Po et al., 2007).

Teacher educators in methods courses can provide opportunities to support development of teachers’ pedagogical practices so that they might help students to better understand the world (Longview Foundation, 2008). Courses in technology, instructional strategies, interdisciplinary approaches and authentic assessments combined with time for educators to reflect, experiment and share ideas with peers support a practice in tune with the demands of the global age (Merryfield, 1985).

For instance, the global age demands that students develop skills in perspective consciousness. This ability to recognize how people different from oneself construct events and issues through their own histories, cultural lenses, and experiences can be fostered through the use of media, first-hand experiences, and literature written by people around the world (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). Global perspectives must be infused into the education of citizens because we cannot isolate our nation’s well-being and that of future generations from that of others across the planet (Merryfield with Duty, 2008). Teachers must be prepared to help students learn about global issues and support students’ development of global thinking to understand the big picture (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005; Pike, 2008a).
It is also important for teachers to be prepared to support students’ understanding of the effects of global connections in their lives. As part of students’ citizenship education they can research how people and organizations across the planet affect their own community and other communities across the world and then identify ways in which their actions and those of people in their region affect others and the planet (Merryfield with Duty, 2008).

Globalization also affects the knowledge, skills and experiences young people need in order to engage in discourse and decision-making in culturally diverse settings and global cultures. Intercultural skills, substantive culture learning and cross-cultural experiences prepare young people to live, work and mediate cultural conflicts and misunderstandings in culturally diverse world (Merryfield with Duty, 2008). Teachers must know how to help students learn to recognize and reduce their own parochialism, resist stereotyping, and develop the ability to empathize (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005).

If students are to be educated for global citizenship, there is a need for them to experience democracy and human rights in their daily lives; this means that students must have a role in decision-making at school (Davies, 2006). Teachers must know how to foster participation outside of school in local and global communities through service learning projects or other collaboration (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). This experiential learning can be attained through volunteering at a community center or working online for Amnesty International (Pike, 2008a). Whatever the case, students will benefit as they create authentic products and collaborate with students in their local area and across the world (Agnello et al., 2006).

Lastly, teachers have an obligation to help students develop skills in research and evaluation of conflicting sources of information using the most extensive source of ideas and
information about the world (Merryfield with Duty, 2008; Pike, 2008a). New electronic media give teachers and students access to documents, media, and other visual resources as well as allow interaction with people in nearly every part of the world (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). The opportunities to enhance the curriculum are seemingly, endless.

However, is teacher development towards these ends enough? Myers (2006) explored the limits and opportunities associated with implementing citizenship curriculum. Myers examined the ways politically active secondary teachers involved in either politics or social movements practiced citizenship education in Porto Alegre, Brazil, and Toronto, Canada. Myers explored the complex intersections between these teachers’ roles as citizens and citizenship educators in their local contexts. The research questions focused on the influence of teachers’ political ideologies and participation on citizenship education practices and the ways that local political and educational contexts mediated the process. In terms of the influence of ideologies, my study was similar in looking at the influence of teachers’ personal beliefs and values.

Based on data collected from 14 secondary teachers (selected based on the criteria of having current and in-depth political participation) in Porto Alegre and Toronto, and using an interpretive case-study design involving interviews, classroom observation and curricular and policy document data, Myers conducted several analyses. Myers’ analyses revealed that teachers active in formal politics in both cities focused on public issues for deliberation. They often took a balanced approach and presented multiple perspectives in class, often drawing on their personal political experience. By contrast, the social-movement teachers taught in terms of using student-centered approaches and incorporated nontraditional actors into their lessons, often citing movements concerned with social justice.
The study also revealed that the standardized, more regimented, outcomes-based Ontario curriculum presented teachers with fewer opportunities for their own modifications than the Porto Alegre curriculum which was open-ended nature. However, in both cities, the teachers active in social movements were more willing to challenge rules that they viewed as marginalizing important topics (Myers, 2006).

Myers notes that official curricula may provide openings for rich citizenship education but that teachers may need to be active themselves in order to best utilize openings. Myers suggests that professional development that transmits knowledge and skills to teachers in formal ways may be inadequate in helping them improve practices geared toward active student citizenship (Myers, 2006).

In contrast, Larsen and Faden (2008) revealed that more typical teachers are likely to embrace global citizenship education when provided with user-friendly resources that are aligned to the official curriculum and accompanied by professional development. Larsen and Faden’s study involved examining teacher perceptions, attitudes and beliefs about becoming global citizenship educators. Typical teachers comprised the sample, meaning they were not exceptionally committed to global citizenship education or political or social activism. The researchers used pre and post surveys, interviews post-lessons, and an end-of-project debriefing session to assess values, attitudes and perceptions related to teaching global citizenship education as part of a larger project involving the development and piloting of a global citizenship education teaching kit.

Many barriers to teaching global citizenship education are reported in Larsen and Faden’s study, but lack of teachers’ personal political or social activity is not mentioned.
Instead, participants reported challenges of the usual nature. Such challenges are typically lack of knowledge, curriculum, time, professional development, curriculum overload, testing and fear or lack or discomfort (Davies, 2006; Lee and Leung, 2006; Larsen and Faden, 2008). The authors conclude that global citizenship education can only be widely implemented with the development of instructional materials that are aligned to the curriculum and that meet teachers’ needs. Given the contradictory nature of the features attributed to teachers teaching or not teaching global citizenship education, more research is needed to understand the primacy or combination of factors that may conduce or inspire teachers to teach global citizenship education.

Complicating these matters is the majesty ascribed to subjects other than global citizenship. A subject hierarchy creates barriers to the enhancement or augmentation of citizenship meanings in the formal curriculum, and as Lee and Leung (2006) discovered, civic goals are thought to be less critical than goals in areas such as science.

In a study of global citizenship education in Hong Kong and Shanghai secondary schools, Lee and Leung sought to understand teachers’ knowledge, skills and values toward global citizenship education, the curriculum available and its implementation, the difficulties of implementation, and support and change needed to effectively implement global citizenship education. The study, comprised of 1,281 completed questionnaires and eight rounds of focus group interviews also provided data for comparing the similarities and differences in the two major international cities in China.

The study found that teachers in Hong Kong and Shanghai share in various challenges, e.g. problems associated with exam-oriented curriculums, difficult-to-teach global topics, and
implementation of a knowledge-based rather than action-oriented global citizenship education.

There are interesting contrasts too; in terms of interest in global (Shanghai) or local (Hong Kong) affairs, focus on knowledge and skills (Shanghai) versus values (Hong Kong), and concepts of global citizenship education as ranging from enhancing economic competitiveness (Shanghai) to teaching diverse values (Hong Kong) (Lee and Leung, 2006). The study, perhaps most importantly, illuminates the importance of cultural context in teaching for global citizenship and rightly asserts a need for attention as to how global citizenship is conceptualized (Lee and Leung, 2006).

Educators in both cities call for a range of supports to combat insufficient teacher training, insufficient time for teaching and preparation and the lack of teaching resources. Lee and Leung, however, state that many schools claim they don’t have the money to invest in supervising citizenship projects, or they feel that such activities take time away from more important subjects. Lee and Leung explain that as teaching training is mainly offered and funded by the government, any inadequacy in teacher training reflects how government sets priorities. Hence, this study reveals a gap between policy and implementation and casts doubt on the government’s assertion that it wants to emphasize global citizenship education (Lee and Leung, 2006). This same phenomena is experienced locally in Ohio where calls for global competence have become commonplace, yet little global citizenship education takes place in systemic fashion.
Immigration and Diversity

There appears to be a pervasive ignorance about the changing demographics of the world and their implications for educating for citizenship. While many American education policy makers speak of a need for cross-cultural understanding or intercultural competence, they are quick to look across the ocean but not in their own neighborhoods.

Globalization has led to increased migration and demographic changes everywhere (Banks, 2004; Osler and Starkey, 2003) and people residing in one particular country may experience multiple national affiliations and loyalties (Abu El-Haj, 2007, Chinchilla, 2005). The United States is experiencing its largest influx of immigrants since the beginning of the 20th century, and immigrant adolescents comprise one of the fastest growing segments of this population (Banks, 2004; Callahan, Muller and Schiller, 2008). As we connect our understanding of globalization to educating for citizenship, immigration and diversity should figure prominently in the equation... yet most educators know little about how to best engage diverse identities for citizenship (Callahan et. al., 2008).

In the U.S. and throughout the world, nation-states (whose numbers have risen from about 43 in 1900 to 190 in 2000) are faced with the challenge of developing citizens that share core values while still honoring their racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural identities (Banks, 2004). In the U.S., it is the public school which emerged in the mid-19th century that is charged with the task of preparing a democratic citizenry (Callahan et al, 2008).

Banks (2004) proposes that the definition of citizenship upon which current citizenship education is based, is lacking. At the core of the idea of citizenship is inclusiveness, and citizenship is not yet inclusive (Lister, 2008). Gloria Ladson-Billings (2004) contends that all
citizenship is historically and racially constructed and Banks posits that the historical “whiteness” of citizenship works to prevent the real inclusion of many students in school and society. The whiteness of citizenship can be traced back to ancient times.

Greeks and Romans, despite the creation of democracy and the republic which we adopted, were restrictive in who counted as citizens (Hahn, 2003). The U.S. later embraced Enlightenment thinking which was used to justify slavery (Ladson-Billings, 2004). Across our history, those who were granted citizenship rights were subjected to assimilationist goals. Members of non-white, non-western European ethnic groups were required to shed their native identity and become American to prove their loyalty to the U.S. (Banks, 2004). Still present in current efforts to educate citizens is a fear that recognition of diversity or multiple identities will undercut the strength of the ideal America or to some extent the meaning or place of the nation-state itself (Banks, 2004; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006).

Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) analyzed wide-ranging scholarly and curricular English language texts published from 1990-2003 which focused on citizenship or citizenship education. The analysis identified multiple distinct frameworks in Western democracies (particularly in the US) that give meaning to citizenship. However, civic republicanism and liberalism (associated with preparing people to be loyal citizens of the nation) remained the principal discourses in citizenship education. Knight-Abowitz and Harnish contend that while transnational and critical discourses associated with multiple identities are growing, they do not yet challenge the dominant discourses. This examination of discourses is timely in its criticism of the narrow and sanitized view of citizenship prevalent in K-12 schooling (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006).
Several studies suggest that we should consider students’ many identities and lived realities as a means for educating citizens in a globalized world (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Mitchell and Parker, 2008; Osler and Starkey, 2003; Parmenter, 2006). Citizenship is more than legal status; it is also a matter of feeling, belonging or identity (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Hahn, 2003; Osler and Starkey, 1996; Osler and Starkey, 2003). In this dissertation study, we shall see in chapter four that citizenship-as-identity and belonging became a core dimension in the participants’ evolving conceptualizations of citizenship education.

In 2003, Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey proposed education for cosmopolitan citizenship in the context of globalization. Osler and Starkey examined understandings of community and civic engagement with young people living in Leicester, UK. The project administered questionnaires to 600 young people aged 10-18 from four schools, and data were collected from volunteers in year nine from contrasting inner city areas who participated in workshops ran at each school. The study resulted in the identification of multiple identities and loyalties of young people, and the identification of home and community as sites of citizenship learning (Osler and Starkey, 2003). Youths define themselves through multiple languages, ethnicities, cultures, races, religions and values (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003). The authors noted that nations are simply not homogenous, and education for national citizenship fails to engage with the experiences of students (Osler and Starkey, 2003; Parameter, 2006).

Likewise, in a study of citizenship education in Japan, Lynn Parmenter (2006) asserted that constraining students to the aim of being Japanese people who can live in international society is less desirable than promoting multiple territorial identities and citizenships. Too
often, minority children are faced with either assimilation or exclusion in school (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003; Parmenter, 2006).

Through an analysis of selected policy and curriculum documents, Parmenter examined how policy was used to shape Japanese children’s identity and citizenship. The review revealed that Japanese students are taught that they are distinct from other Asians and that their society is homogeneous—which is not the case. Parameter’s work concluded that globalization is used as a rationale to support nationalism, even while the concept of homogeneity in Japan is losing credibility. Numbers of immigrants and children of international marriages are on the rise, yet citizenship education remains limited (Parmenter, 2006).

Different minorities, however, experience belonging in complex ways (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003). Drawing on data from a multisite ethnographic study of Palestinian and other Arab youth conducted for three and a half years in a large U.S. city, Thea Renda Abu El-Haj (2007) wrote extensively about data gathered from a 3,500 student high school enrolling around one hundred Arab students at any given time. The Palestinian students in this study were all U.S. citizens, and most were transnational migrants. Many of them were born in the U.S., spent childhood years in Palestine, and moved back and forth over their lifetimes.

Abu El-Haj formed a group to create a space for Palestinian students where they could share their knowledge, experiences, and stories. These meetings were documented, interviews were conducted, and four students (two males and two females representative of the range of ways youth negotiated transnational identities and schooling) became focal participants for the study. Students were shadowed through school and to community and family events.
Abu El-Haj found that the students felt a sense of belonging and identified with a diasporas Palestinian community, and that they appreciated their U.S. citizenship status and the rights it entailed. Abu El-Haj reported that students experienced the uncoupling of their national and citizenship identities in a range of ways—from feeling conflicted about whether pledging to the flag was a sign of supporting the war in Iraq (and the killing of Arabs) to offering alternative perspectives on U.S. policy in the Middle East (in a volatile climate). Abu El-Haj concluded that the students leveraged the rights and privileges of their U.S. citizenship to choose whether or not to stand, and in offering alternate perspectives. In this way they maintained their connection to Palestine. It is clear that immigrant or transnational youth do not have to be civically disengaged.

The growing diversity within nations and increased migration across borders has antiquated the notion of the nation-state as the sole provider of citizenship. Nation-states are still important but have become less relevant as the central organizer for people’s sense of belonging (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). This implies a need to pose some basic questions and challenges to the traditional meanings of citizenship and citizenship education. The literature reviewed suggests that we examine how we reduce, sterilize or otherwise ignore citizenship meanings in the curriculum (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Parmenter, 2006) and that we consider a richer, more nuanced understanding of citizenship and citizenship education (Abu El-Haj, 2007). In part, this became the charge of this study’s action research participants.

The studies propose we consider re-conceptualizing education for citizenship to include and build on rather than diminish multiple identities (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003;
Parameter, 2006). Immigrant identity often requires a kind of dual citizenship or the development of multiple loyalties (Banks, 2004, Hahn, 2003; Osler and Starkey, 2003). Citizenship education should examine how rights and resources are afforded to those in various racial/ethnic groups, especially newcomers or transnationals, and address the formal and informal barriers to citizenship which they face (Banks, 2004; Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003).

While nationalism without reflection will keep students from developing attachments to the global world, multiple national affiliations can act as a resource for engaging with multiple perspectives on local and global issues (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Banks, 2004). We might consider that striving for authentic participation and engagement, rather than trying to develop a one-size-fits-all sense of national identification, may prove a stronger base for developing active, “loyal” citizens (Banks, 2004; Abu El-Haj, 2007). Currently, education provides an insufficient context in which to effectively integrate today’s youths’ experiences and identities (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003).

Recognizing Young People as Global Citizens

Any investigation into teachers’ connections between their understandings of globalization and educating citizens must address the precept that young people are already global in their outlook, and are already acting as global citizens (Davies, 2006; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). The youth of today have been born into an interconnected world and thus they don’t need to imagine the world is global—it simply is global (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005; Mitchell and Parker, 2008).
As addressed at length in the previous section, education for national citizenship often treats young people as empty vessels, ignoring the considerable knowledge, experiences and insights that they bring to their, and perhaps our, citizenship learning (Davies, 2006; Holden, 2008b; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005; Osler and Starkey, 2003). As educators and policy makers contemplate educating citizens in a globalized world, students are acting as global citizens through the exercise of multiple identities, consumer decisions, use of technology, environmental practices, adoption of global culture and development of frameworks for thinking about global issues (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005; Myers, 2008; Osler and Starkey, 2003).

Participation is vital to citizenship and young people should be seen as active participants in the construction of their own knowledge (Holden, 2008b). The rights of children were made explicit in the Convention of the Rights of the Child (Holden, 2008b) and there is recognition that citizenship experiences, education and formation begin at birth. A recent round of studies conducted across several nations reveal that young people are already global citizens. The conclusions reported by several countries are reviewed below.

Hicks and Holden (1995) explored the hopes and fears of students aged 7, 11, 14 and 18 in the UK, tracking the development of young people’s thinking about their world. The study concluded that older students were more cynical than their younger peers, but that they showed increasing awareness of social and environmental issues and expressed concern at the local and global levels. This research was followed up by Holden and others (2008a) in a study that extended from 2004-2007 using a common research design across nations with students ages nine to 12. Students were given a questionnaire and asked to write about their hopes and
fears for their personal future, the future of their local area and the future of the world. Three closed questions asked if they thought life in the future would be better or worse for them personally, their community, and people in the world. The questionnaire also asked about particular issues such as conflict and racism, asking children if they thought that these issues would get better, stay the same or get worse in the future. Finally, the questionnaire asked about the students’ action for change. Samples of children were interviewed from each class in small groups to further illuminate students’ responses. The focus of this study was to provide qualitative data which explored students’ thinking. The results for South Korea and Pakistan are presented below (see Holden 2008a for results from all countries).

Huh (2008) reported that Korean children share concerns about global warming, Middle Eastern conflict, and poverty in Africa. The youth envisioned reunification of their divided country at the same time they expressed concerns about the threat of nuclear weapons in North Korea and the possibility of inter-Korean war. Huh noted specific concerns included fear of becoming a colony of China or India or again becoming colony of Japan.

Huh pointed out that increasing contact with people from other countries and cultures has helped to shape its young people global citizens. Technology was cited as one means of improving the world (Dean, 2008; Huh, 2008). Over half of the children in the study thought there was a lot they could do to make the world a better place, but few participated in any activities. Huh noted that a significant gap between children’s desire to take action and the limited opportunities available to youth. Citizenship education was cited as an important means to help children realize their ambitions as global citizens.

Pakistan is a society troubled with poverty and illiteracy, and its children are aware of
the social and political issues facing their own society, the world, and the interconnection between them (Dean, 2008). In a study by Dean (2008) youth expressed a fear of war and violence and a hope for justice and peace. Specifically, these youths pointed to the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine, noted that terrorism would increase, and expressed the belief that Muslims were the targets of all wars in the world today. The fact that these youths suggest the need for developing tolerance and respect for others at the local and global levels to prevent violence and war demonstrates their optimism and their active notion of peace (Dean, 2008).

Research supports the notion that news of war, violence and crime from around the world enter students’ homes through information technologies (Dean, 2008; Huh, 2008; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). Many students also strongly believe in the power of technological innovations to help solve problems (Dean, 2008; Huh, 2008). Dean notes that children should be provided with opportunities to learn about local and global issues such as war and peace, environmental pollution, and sustainable development (Dean 2008; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005) and acquire skills such as information-gathering and processing, critical thinking and communication as well as form dispositions to promote equality and justice (Dean, 2008; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005).

In an altogether different study, Myers (2008) made a significant contribution to research in examining U.S. students’ explanatory frameworks for world poverty. After students’ participation in a five-week international studies program for one hundred high school students at the Pennsylvania Governor’s School for International Studies (PGSIS), 20 of 77 students providing informed consent that completed the program were selected for semi-structured
interviews. Myers was candid about PGSIS’s intentional selection of high achieving students, and the sample was diverse in terms of gender, geographic area and ethnicity.

The students in this study explained the existence and distribution of poverty in the world according to a range of explanatory frameworks, interpreting and making meaning of information in various ways. Perhaps most important, this study revealed that a low number of students articulated globalization as an explanatory factor in their frameworks for poverty. Myers concluded that despite the school’s emphasis on globalization and global issues, students still had trouble connecting nation and globe. This study therefore stands somewhat in contrast to those previously reviewed.

When we do entertain notions of a more global citizenship education, we often strive to move students’ sense of belonging from that of self and family to nation and finally, to all of humanity. The assumption that the last stop (global humanity) is automatically the most difficult or unnatural position for the student to reach, is questioned by Katharyne Mitchell and Walter Parker (2008).

Mitchell and Parker’s conclusions rest on data taken from group interviews of approximately 250 students at three high schools and two middle schools in a U.S. metropolitan area post 9/11 and prior to the war in Iraq. The questions, literature and images chosen as prompts for discussion were selected with teachers whose classrooms were visited, and teachers were selected using a snowballing technique.

The teenagers interviewed in the study moved in a constant, non-linear, multi-directional manner along the scales of self, nation and globe depending on context (Mitchell and Parker, 2008). Mitchell and Parker concluded that it is us, not young people, that believe affinity
or belonging is attached to particular scales and that we move along those scales in a particular way. Mitchell and Parker enlighten us by revealing that young people produce, not receive scales, and that the scales are flexible. This affirms that our adult conceptualization of affinity—moving from self to nation then globe—is antiquated.

Overall, the literature reviewed demonstrates that young people are knowledgeable about the world they live in and that they interact with local and global issues and have experiences with rights, justice and equality both in school and in the community from an early age (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Dean, 2008; Holden, 2008a; Osler and Starkey, 2003). It is also clear that young people can take action (Abu El-Haj, 2007) but that some have too few opportunities to do so (Huh, 2008). Young people are growing up global, and their visions for the future consider alternatives to present day realities (Dean, 2008). Youths are producing their own ways of organizing belonging, and it’s the adults who have some catching up to do (Mitchell and Parker, 2008).

Implications for policy makers and teachers are clear. Effectively educating citizens in a globalized world requires listening to and accepting young people as thinking, active agents (Mitchell and Parker, 2008; Davies, 2006); must take into account youths’ knowledge and experiences as global citizens (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Dean, 2008; Holden, 2008b; Osler and Starkey, 2003) and requires that education addresses the needs, concerns and wishes of learners within global citizenship (Davies, 2006; Dean, 2008). Young people will need to be involved in shaping approaches to citizenship education in their own schools (Davies, 2006). Mitchell and Parker (2008) poetically offer that the most valuable critique of current citizenship and citizenship education comes from our youths.
The Discourse on International Education

In the previous section, Mitchell and Parker (2008) illuminated the fact that in today’s world it is the national not the global civic space that has to be invented. If this is the case, however, we must return to the question of why so few conceptions of citizenship education concomitant with diversity, multiple identities and young people as agented global citizens are communicated in schools.

Most schools are national institutions shaped by national identities with their self-preservation, sovereignty and success foremost in mind (Gaudelli, 2006; Heilman, 2006; Pike, 2008a). Many researchers contend that schools feature some mix of control of teachers, students and learning, the rise of standards, standardization, and/or accountability—all in the name of preserving a dominating economy, patriotism and national security (Heilman, 2006; Parker, 2006; Pike, 2008b). In the U.S., fear of terrorism, the threat of economic competition from India and China, an urgent need for exceptionalism in math and science, an ineffective public school system and more are featured prominently across various media, initiatives and legislation. Together, these things form the core of what is more commonly understood (with some exceptions) as the new international education movement (Parker, 2006).

Parker (2006) researched and analyzed a variety of documents to understand how influential and well-resourced voices were framing the international education movement’s goals and using political opportunities to advance them. Using social, discourse and frame analysis, Parker uncovered dominant discourses on globalization and school failure.

Parker found the discourse on globalization to include (on one hand) the communications revolution, the free flows of labor and capital, deregulation, an increasingly
integrated world economy, the weakening of the nation-state system, and talk of flattening and transformation. But Parker also found a focus on national defense and military might. For instance, to meet new security needs, America needs to create a new pool of foreign language experts (hence the push to add Arabic and Chinese language learning in schools) so that we can compete economically and protect ourselves from terrorism (Parker, 2006). A second discourse revealed by Parker was one touting failing public schools that are unable to help students compete in the new global economy. Parker concluded that the new international education movement was nationalistic.

Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) teach us about the roots of such discourses, reminding us that meanings of citizenship are formed over time through cultural struggles and influenced by political interests, some with particular ideas about what democracy and the nation-state should look like. Using discourse analysis, these authors examined English-language texts related to citizenship and citizenship education from 1990 through 2003.

Recall that Knight-Abowitz and Harnish found that schools commonly teach citizenship as civic republican literacy (factual knowledge of America) combined with patriotism and the liberal virtue of tolerance. These civic republican and liberalist views dominate the current curriculum with their vision of a more cleansed and idealized citizenship than actually exists for youths (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). In fact, Knight-Abowitz and Harnish found that on the theoretical level at least, alternative discourses that challenge the dominant views of citizenship are emerging—among them are queer, feminist and transnational discourses to name a few.
For adults in particular, however, the notion of such alternatives, a global village or a global civic space doesn’t fit with the story of their lives (Pike, 2008a). Pike (2008a) discusses how these stories—really legends—blend fact and myth in powerful ways that shape our cultures and how we come to understand ourselves.

Legends tend to leave us deeply schooled in our differences and borders as we are taught to see the world as either civilized or primitive, north or south (Nyambe and Shipena, 1998; Willinsky, 1998). We must engage in the conscious process of critically understanding the roots of this divide; namely, deconstructing the invisible legacy of imperialism that continues to influence generations (Nyambe and Shipena, 1998; Willinsky, 1998). Willinsky (1998, pp. 2-3) states that:

We need to learn again how five centuries of studying, classifying and ordering humanity within an imperial context gave rise to peculiar and powerful ideas of race, culture, and nation that were, in effect, conceptual instruments that the West used both to divide up and to educate the world.

This legacy of imperialism must be understood by students, less legends continue to preclude us from decision-making on critical issues with real perspective on issues of rights, equity and justice (Willinsky, 1998; Pike, 2008a).

Identity and Pedagogy

In the years following the advent of multicultural education, a number of pedagogies reflecting the importance of identity have been developed. These practices, namely critical pedagogy, equity pedagogy, critical race pedagogy, social justice pedagogy, and culturally relevant teaching, support non-traditional conceptualizations of citizenship education. Each pedagogy is briefly discussed in this review in order to illustrate their importance to the evolving
dimensions of a re-conceptualized citizenship education in chapter five and the central theory on identity discussed in chapter six.

The ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960’s and 70’s fueled by the American Civil Rights Movement challenged the traditional, assimilationist brand of citizenship education (Banks 2004). Multicultural education, as it came to be known, was education that responded to diverse and marginalized groups who wanted to maintain their “other” identities as well as participate fully in civic life as American citizens (Banks, 2004).

Banks (2004) contends that identities are multiple and overlapping and need not disparage unity but could enhance it. Banks also proposed that minorities are more likely to become truly attached to a nation when it affirms the legitimacy of their “other” identity, and multicultural education was one solution to the schism minorities experienced between the rhetoric of American ideals and their lived realities. Banks believes that citizenship education in a multicultural society must help all students, including White mainstream students, to develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes to participate in and help reconstruct society (Banks, 1997). The development of reflective cultural, national, and global identifications and attachments is essential so that that unity may be balanced with diversity in the face of two contradictory trends—nationalism and globalization (Banks, 2004).

Recognition of diverse people, revisionist histories, cooperative learning, service learning, and constructivism all comprise a core of practice that constitutes multicultural education today, but how knowledge is constructed is of particular importance in educating young people for citizenship (Banks, 1997, Hahn, 2003). Banks asserts that we must affirm that knowledge is neither neutral nor static but is culturally based. Descriptions and interpretations
of the settlement of the West, for example, illustrate how people of color have been conceptualized in American history. Turner described the frontier as empty (which it was not) and noted that American rugged individualism (a tenant of democracy) was developed here (Banks, 1997). This ongoing transmission of history ignores the destruction of Native Americans and their society.

Knowledge construction processes allow students to deeply understand how knowledge, and citizenship itself, is created and influenced by racial, ethnic and social-class positions of individuals and groups (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Banks, 2001). Ladson-Billings concurs that citizenship education must stop proposing the United States as the Ideal democratic society and engage students in an understanding of the many contradictions found among our history, culture, politics and economy (Ladson-Billings, 2004).

Equity pedagogy, a pedagogy reflecting the importance of identity, broadly supports multiculturalism when teachers use techniques or methods that facilitate the achievement of diverse students (Banks, 2001). Banks cites research that identifies the learning styles of various diverse groups that could be used to support their success. Equity pedagogy is thought to engage minority students in ways that make sense culturally. However, not everyone agrees that cultural “learning styles” are static and apply to every member of a cultural group. Banks and Banks (1995) contend that pedagogies should not merely prepare students to fit into society and the social class mobility scheme which is part of existing structures; equity pedagogy requires the dismantling of existing school structures that foster inequality.

Critical Race Theory in education presents an alternative to equity pedagogy as not only a
“pedagogy” but a “curriculum and research agenda that accounts for the role of racism in U.S. education and works toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination in education” (Solorzano, 1997, p. 7). Critical Race Theory, like Freire’s critical theory, calls for investigation into practices, policies and systems that create and perpetuate racist and classist inequalities in schooling—but the central focus is on racism as a form of oppression (Berry, Jay and Lynn, 2010). The rigorous focus on societal analysis through the lens of race is thought to be a better framework for pedagogy as race is central to our history (Allen, 2004).

Allen (2004) is most critical of critical theory on these grounds as economic changes were not likely to occur unless whites confronted their own racism and understood how it has prevented cross-racial solidarity. Whiteness continues to shape the racial politics of the US. And the problem of race relations is predominantly a white problem (Allen, 2004). Well-intentioned movements such as critical pedagogy have been normalized around a discourse that sees class as the principal determinant of social and political life, leaving race to inhabit a subordinate position (Ladson-Billings, 1997; Allen, 2004).

Critical theory pedagogy disregards the limited consciousness of whites, and thus requires the spark of knowledge that comes from people of color (Allen, 2004). In this way whites can learn how whiteness functions, although white privilege is structural and cannot be erased unless the structure that creates it is erased (Allen, 2004). Allen contends that whites must engage in discussions with people of color about dismantling white supremacy in order to avoid acting without their trust. Doing so holds promise in that we might grow in our understanding of whiteness as a system and our own white identity development (Allen, 2004).
Ladson-Billings (1995a; 1995b) has argued for a culturally relevant pedagogy that responds to the racialized realities of US classrooms (Allen, 2004). Ladson-Billings has defined culturally relevant teaching as similar to critical pedagogy, but specifically committed to collective as opposed to individual empowerment. Culturally relevant pedagogy or teaching is based on students experiencing academic success; students develop/maintaining cultural competence; and students developing critical consciousness through which they challenge the current social order (Ladson-Billings, 1995b).

Culturally relevant teaching and social justice pedagogy share the same ontological assumption that the world is socially unjust (Park, 2008). While culturally relevant teaching examines the cultural gaps between European and African American students based on the perspectives of the oppressed, social justice pedagogy begins with the realization of the socially unjust reality from the perspectives of both the oppressed and the mainstream (Park, 2008). As culturally relevant teaching focuses on culture, social justice pedagogy prioritizes the socio-political consciousness of the socially unjust reality. Park (2008) suggests that social justice pedagogy, by design, is then more inclusive than culturally relevant teaching.

Amidst this variety of pedagogies, one thing seems certain. Teachers, namely those participating in this study, cannot allow their students or themselves to succumb to a simple postmodernism of voice (Allen, 2004). Allen is clear that the mere sharing of experiences will not lead to self-directed transformation. Creating an environment of dissonance, for instance, that brings us whites to a point of identity crisis is essential (Allen, 2004)—from crisis we might also discover opportunity.
In Summary

Unfortunately, harkening back to the first topic reviewed—teachers who know little about teaching about the world or who have had few meaningful, reflective, intercultural experiences may be imbued with and uncritical of the dominant Legend Pike describes. The global age requires that we move toward a critical paradigm of global education and this endeavor demands knowledge about the world that is grounded in balance, inclusiveness, and multiple perspectives (Nyambe and Shipena, 1998; Kirkwood-Tucker, 2003).

Teachers who cannot envision alternatives to the Legend will be less likely to help young citizens find themselves in the stories that help us make sense of our lives. Coupled with a pervasive ignorance about the changing demographics of our neighborhoods and world, this will serve to amplify feelings of exclusion and alienation in students who experience identity, belonging or citizenship in complex or alternative ways. While strong nationalism absent reflection will keep students from developing attachments to the global world (Banks, 2004), multiple national affiliations can act as a resource for engaging with multiple perspectives on local and global issues (Abu El-Haj, 2007). Authentic participation, and given that the young are already participating, may prove a stronger base for developing active, loyal citizens (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Banks, 2004).

The youth of today are more global in their outlook than adults, and are already acting as global citizens (Davies, 2006; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). This implies that teachers will have to work differently in order facilitate learning. Movement away from the sage on the stage approach is critical if teachers are to maintain any guise of expertise or value-added contribution with their students. Such movement is complicated by a focus on testing, fewer subjects, and
even fewer experiences extra-curricularly or in the classroom—experiences that are vital to the
development of citizen knowledge, skills and behaviors (Davies, 2006). It is difficult for students
to think and connect with complex controversial issues when confronted with poor pedagogy
and the goal of memorization and regurgitation of facts. There is an opportunity here, however,
for teachers to partner with and learn from students, and vice versa. The development of
practice that encourages such reciprocity, creativity and meaning-making may hold promise in
this age of information. There need to be studies of how, in particular, citizenship education
may be informed in this manner. Perhaps participatory action research as practiced in this study
could be of value.

We will need to recognize that some teachers may have an interest in reproducing the
status quo, as they are privileged by its preservation. Mitchell and Parker (2008), assert that the
global cosmopolitan and the national patriot are the only two alternatives to which students are
pointed. It seems teachers, too, need more “identity” choices. Engaging in pedagogies which
call on us to do “identity work” will not only serve our students but help us to grow, ourselves.

In this study we addressed an opportunity to increase our understanding about the
many meanings and goals we bring to citizenship education in the global era. I chose to engage
in participatory action research (PAR) because it seemed a natural fit for a field of study
concerned with peoples’ engagement and agency. The critical focus group discussions through
which PAR was carried out were a productive vehicle for plumbing the literature discussed
above. As demonstrated in the findings, what teachers know about teaching for citizenship, the
role of diversity and immigration, students as global citizens, the discourse on international
education and issues of identity and pedagogy, are all issues germane to global citizenship.
Chapter 3: METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will illustrate the methods and methodology by which three secondary social studies teachers and I addressed the following research questions:

1. How do teachers’ conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW) change through the process of participatory action research (PAR)?
   A. In what new ways do they construct their own concept of citizen?
   B. What new understandings of educating for citizenship do they develop for themselves?

In order to better understand how the research questions relate to the chosen participatory action research methodology, this section reviews PAR and provides a discussion of my relational ontology and epistemology, my selection of a purposeful sample of teachers, how I collected and analyzed data, and the many ways I sought to establish trustworthiness and validity throughout the study. This section will also describe how my personal identity and decision-making impacted the conduct of the study and influenced interpretation of the data.

A Qualitative Inquiry

My choice to conduct a qualitative investigation signaled my intention to deliberately plumb within and understand the complex world of human experience—in this case from the perspective of teachers (Krauss, 2005). A deep and sustained qualitative examination of the many personal ways the teachers thought about citizenship would be necessary in order to
capture the “wrestling with” and possible changing of ethical positions and political
interpretations (and as I discovered, their identities) that confounded or inhibited the evolution
of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world.

Based on these ideas and using a critical focus group method, I approached this study as
a means to “dig deep” and investigate the ways in which we constructed our concepts of citizen
and TCGW.

This study proved ripe for the kinds of in-depth means required to search into such an
area where little is known (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 1990) as its purpose was
never to quantify and generalize certain truths. Instead, the study’s purpose was to illuminate
the experiences of three teachers at a particular place and time, and to highlight our role in
creating and interpreting the data therein (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Muguth, 2009).

Selection of Participants

Action research holds that the professional knowledge a researcher brings to a study is
important and valuable, but that local knowledge, too, is a vital ingredient in research
(Greenwood and Levin, 2000). In recognizing that what seemed to be missing was critical
attention to teachers’ internal beliefs and perspectives about what it means to educate young
people for a changing world, their “front-line” knowledge was deemed critical to this process of
identifying problems in re-conceptualizing teaching for citizenship in a globalized world
(Greenwood and Levin, 2000).

To capitalize on the notion of local knowledge, teachers for this study were identified
through purposeful sampling—facilitating the selection of members closest to the issue under
investigation (Patton, 1990). As a practical and logistical matter, teachers were limited to the Covey County area to guarantee a reasonable commute to the regular, in-person focus group discussions that were core to our engagement.

Invitations to teachers to self-nominate were widely circulated using email through multiple avenues including:

- A large, local University’s social studies professional development school;
- A local 16-school district consortium organization;
- The local affiliate of the Council on World Affairs;
- The Covey County Educational Service Center and
- A non-profit center for law-related education.

The invitation was also presented in person at a Futura City Schools (large urban district) Social Studies Conference and by regular mail to all middle and high school principals and curriculum directors in the 16-district Covey County area.

Individuals who were interested in participating in the study were selected based on the following criteria.

- Their status as a grades 7-12 social studies teacher;
- Their interest in global and/or citizenship education;
- Their interest in social justice and/or interpersonal and group processes (related to PAR) and

Diversity (Attention was paid to soliciting and forming a group of individuals of various ages, genders, ethnicities, races and formal or informal “citizenships,” although attrition from the study resulted in little participant diversity).
While the sample recruitment effort yielded 11 responses and 10 selected participants, four declined to accept the invitation after being selected and an additional three left the study after consenting to participate. Participants exited the study citing various personal reasons.

The following excerpts from my reflexive journal speak to my selection process more intimately:

I must admit I took a less than rigorous approach to the pre-selection interview in that I purposely focused on relating to the candidate, and initializing a relationship. This meant that I didn’t reveal the same exact things about myself or the study to each candidate… instead each conversation was personalized. Of course each candidate got the same nuts & bolts information about the particulars of the study and I was consistent in the core questions I asked, but I really approached pre-selection as the beginning of our relationship. In fact, I have a blue sticky note that says “It’s all about relationships” that I moved from sheet to sheet as I connected with participants. Did I get everything down that was said? No… but critical notes were made. This wasn’t an exercise in transcription. I would estimate most calls went the better of thirty minutes and each replied that they were still interested in the study when asked at the close of our conversation.

These words demonstrates that I was clearly intent on living within my ontology. The remainder of this entry speaks to some of my technical process and ends with words that gave rise to some of my earliest reflexivity.

I started the studied, careful process of selection by browsing through the sheets upon which potential recruits’ pre-selection interviews were captured. I scanned the forms briefly, letting my notes call up the essence of the conversation, and whatever was distinctive about the individual. After a round of getting reacquainted, I recopied the forms, editing only up and not down (for instance, where I recalled and had noted an exact quote such as “I was born one” in response to the “Is there anything you would like to share with me about your citizenship?” question, I added quotation marks. The copying process helped me to unfurl my crass abbreviations and study the participants’ words as they were used. For instance, one potential recruit, when asked about her race/ethnicity, responded that she was first generation and that her parents were both from the island of Puerto Rico. It wasn’t until re-writing this that I realized she hadn’t referred to herself as Puerto Rican. What does this mean? Anything? Nothing?

As it turns out, this did mean something— it said something about me. I expected the candidate to call herself Puerto Rican because to me, a member of the white majority, I
ascertained her otherness and registered her accent before I saw the fact that she was like me.

Sometimes my reflexivity was at work while writing an entry but many times new perspectives surfaced as I studied my notes afterward. In the case below it was interesting to me that regardless of my careful preparation of the recruitment conversation form, it wasn’t until I was actually reviewing candidates that I realized a major conceptual flaw—and puzzle in what I wasn’t asking of candidates:

*Something else I noticed while reviewing candidates for selection was that before I asked folks about their “stats,” I told them they should always “feel free to pass.” Most of the stats would be filled in by this point in the conversation (e.g. sex, school, district, grades, courses, etc.). I would say this before asking mainly age, race/ethnicity and the wide-open citizenship question. No one declined to respond to anything—but did I do the right thing by saying they could pass? I feel like I should puzzle over this some more… I offered the pass as those items are typically treated as voluntary, or even private. I guess that’s ok—but it’s striking me now because this study is about citizenship which in my conception shares breathing space with race, ethnicity, formal/informal citizenship and even other “categories.” Maybe they’re not typically treated as voluntary… I suppose we have to answer to these categories on forms, for instance, or to apply for a job... I think I’ll take this puzzle with me to group for discussion.*

And upon further reflection, I concluded that these categories are in day-to-day practice mostly un-voluntary in that race, for instance, is one of the things that people recognize first.

More importantly, one’s race impacts one’s experience of citizenship (Banks, 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vick</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Caucasian, Italian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Suburban, quasi-rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1. Participants
I was surprised by how my own learning took off so early in the research process, and admittedly, I was unprepared for how emotional selection, and then attrition, would be:

My recruitment closes today, and I have 11 people who want to join the study. Although one of the recruits is technically a middle grades science teacher, she teaches at a Catholic school and regularly partners with another (elementary) teacher on civic projects. I called for grades 7-12 social studies teachers, however, which she is not... would it be fair to consider her as a recruit when others like her were not provided the same opportunity? Additionally, my IRB proposal stated I would have no more than 10 participants. While I could probably build a case to include her, the thought of going through IRB again is a tough one. Is not wanting to go through IRB again a good reason to exclude her? I suppose I don’t think it is—even though consideration of time (which is limited) is a factor one could reasonably consider. But it’s not a decision I’m making about IRB, it’s a decision I’m making about the sample. It is very hard—very, very hard—for me to exclude her, to exclude her potential contributions... I feel sentimental toward her too as she was the first person to apply! Would I make the same call if only four or five teachers had responded? I didn’t know that selection, or rather exclusion, would be so tough emotionally.

Based on this journal entry, it’s also easy to see how quickly a doctoral candidate shifts to personal needs, such as the need to avoid getting tied up in the Institutional Review Board process for a lengthy time. Concurrently, however, my commitment to PAR and personal notions of citizenship were also playing out.

Upon puzzling with my feelings, along the course of my work I’ve returned here in my journal to add this: “Underpinning the very idea of citizenship is inclusiveness, which currently, citizenship is not” (Lister, 2008). Participation is a principle of citizenship. I knew this academically, put didn’t pin the words on the emotion I was feeling in those moments. Funny, when I was proposing the project I talked at length about how my work with the teachers (public deliberation) and the way we would work together (democratically, sharing power) and create findings (learning to hold multiple points of view in tension rather than eradicating points of view for the sake of consensus)—it was an academic application then. Excluding Polly wasn’t a positive association with citizenship, and I wasn’t prepared for that...

It was equally painful to witness participants who had participated in the first session eventually signal their intent to leave the group. I did not press them for answers as to why they left as during the consent process I promised that they could leave anytime, no questions asked.
Three teachers who attended the first session and left the group willingly provided the following reasons: Personal reasons, a time commitment conflict and a scheduling conflict:

*I must say it is a loss on many levels. For one, he seemed extremely knowledgeable and talented. On a practical level it cost me $200 so far to have transcripts made—and some of that was for his interview and part in group (which is now sort of in the way). The typist transcribed his interview first, and others are not done, and she could have used that time elsewhere. Finally, he had the least availability (days) of the group so the day chosen to meet was for him... so yes, it’s frustrating. But so it goes. It didn’t matter that I asked if he could foresee any reasons why he would have to leave the group during pre-selection. He assured me he would see it through (I questioned his availability due to his many projects). Many lessons learned. And I do wish him well.*

Gaining Access

I should note that I took the process of gaining access to participants very seriously beginning with the submission of my proposal to the Human Subject Review Board of The Ohio State University. Only after my proposal was approved did I begin simultaneously circulating an Office for Responsible Research Practice-approved recruitment letter/flyer soliciting self-nominations. As previously described, prospective participants were screened and then briefed on the study proposal, given an opportunity to ask questions, and once selected were asked to consider providing their informed consent. The single applicant who was not selected to participate was contacted and thanked for her time and interest.

The intensity with which I followed the gaining access protocols made the transition to co-creating a productive site and context somewhat easier.

Site and Context

I am satisfied that from the onset I had planned for, and we had collectively begun to, accomplish the difficult task of establishing trust and building rapport (Janesick, 2000).
first meeting the teachers and I introduced ourselves, and we discussed our most productive collaborative experiences and determined the norms for our interactions. As time went on we organized ourselves in the process of PAR more organically (e.g. Vick tackling tough questions first, Mary providing alternate perspectives more subtly, and Ed playing devil’s advocate). Our context for working together was eventually as authentic as could be given the nature of dissertation research. In the end we found a way to share in the construction of knowledge versus my extracting data from them (Cahill, 2007a).

I believed construction versus extraction would be supported by my selection of our site, although there were many reasons the focus group discussions took place in my home. In a practical sense, I needed to audio record the sessions for transcription, and producing quality tapes for transcription was a key concern. In my home, I could account for noise levels, interruptions, etc. and I was able to test the equipment in order to produce the optimum seating, microphone and video recording arrangements. Maintaining the same site for all of our meetings also allowed me to request and gain site approval from IRB which wouldn’t be possible should I have waited to determine our location(s) with co-researchers.

While there was a risk of unduly influencing participants as they would be on my home turf, there were also benefits to participants. For instance, participants didn’t have to secure directions to different sites every other week, plan for different drive times or search for parking. Additionally, I removed the burden of planning for dinner on our meeting nights (always after long days at school). To offset any discomfort at meeting in my home, I attempted to support the establishment of a personal connection with and among group members by offering refreshments each meeting 30 minutes before group began. Our casual, unstructured
time seemed to facilitate comfort and the development of community.

Finally, I thought that having the discussions away from the school building (the typical place for such research) would intentionally work to expand the places where we have such civic discourses. It is conceivable that for some a more personal space (away from school) may be more conducive to free or critical thought. While it is equally conceivable that meeting in my home could quiet participants, we generated no evidence to support that proposition. While my decision to conduct the research in my home was initially lamented by my advisor for good reasons, I felt intuitively that opening my home to others would facilitate the opening up of myself and my mind. I believe the personal nature of the location of our interactions, my home, eventually led to the kind of friendship and community one might naturally expect to witness therein.

Methodology

As a researcher committed to evolving citizenship education, I wanted the methodology and overall design that I chose to reflect my concern for justice, engagement, and freedom and my belief in peoples’—in this case teachers’—creative agency. I was easily attracted to the work of Kurt Lewin whose publications of “Action Research and Minority Problems” in 1946 and “Group Decisions and Social Change” in 1947 (as cited in Calhoun, 1994) first formally integrated action-taking into experimental social science research. Lewin explained action research was a three-step spiral process: (1) planning (which involves fact-finding); (2) taking action based on the facts; and (3) fact-finding about the results of the action and so on (Calhoun, 1994). The co-researchers and I would mimic this process (non-linearly) using a critical focus group method.
According to Herr and Anderson (2005) however, action research (AR) exists in multiple forms and is implemented in varied intellectual traditions. While AR is thought to transcend knowledge creation to include personal and professional growth as well as organizational and community empowerment, in PAR (note the addition of the word “participatory”) research and action become a single process, and researchers indistinguishable from change agents (Calhoun, 1994; Herr and Anderson, 2005). I embraced this evolution in the methodology and looked to Carr and Kemmis’ (1986, p. 162) description of participatory action research as a guide for this work. PAR is:

A form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situation in which the practices are carried out.

Kemmis and McTaggart (2000) noted that PAR is historically associated with profound change or transformation of what are considered “underdeveloped” nations and that it has strong theoretical roots in human rights activism. Paulo Freire made PAR popular internationally through his politicized action research with Brazilian “peasants” which called for “conscientization”—a strategy in the liberation of oppressed peoples (Bryceson et al., 1982). In this study, I identified a community of teachers as a marginalized group. In doing so I recognized Friere’s (1982) assertion that we are all the oppressed and the oppressors. Teachers as a marginalized group would think about the discourses, their arena of work, and the social relationships of power that limited their own self-development and determination (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). From my perspective, development of the field of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world requires more of teachers’ critical participation—at a time when teachers are often precluded from meaningfully participating in decision, meaning, and policy-making.
Conscientization or critical consciousness focuses on achieving understanding of the world through the perception and exposure of social and political contradictions and taking action against all that is illuminated by the new understanding (Freire, 1982). The critical focus group process at the core of our PAR methodology would be the vehicle for our knowledge exchanges, reflection and subsequent action.

PAR emphasizes collective over individualistic problem solving and promotes development in the interest of ordinary people through ordinary people, not the wealthy or powerful (Calhoun, 1994; Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). Framed as an educational process for both myself and the teachers, PAR stood in great contrast to other techniques with its belief in teachers’ own capacity to produce and analyze knowledge thus questioning accepted wisdom about who could be the knower or researcher (Bryceson et al., 1982; Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000; Shinew, 1998).

In this study, combined my critical insight with that of the teachers in order to co-generatively fuel new awareness and a search for alternatives in re-conceptualizing teaching for citizenship. This was important as a great deal of what we know about teachers’ perspectives related to TCGW has been limited to their content knowledge or needs and other obstacles faced such as curriculum implementation, assessment and other issues related to practice. Much of this knowledge was generated by university researchers through observations, questionnaires and interviews, with limited substantive participation on the part of teachers themselves. An unwinding and examination of the ethical tensions and political viewpoints inherent in global citizenship education required the critical participation of the teachers, and this was an area not yet fully mined. In this study, as knowers and researchers, the teachers
drew on their own capabilities—their own power—to generate new ways of thinking about educating young people for a changing world.

So, what did this look like within the context of PAR? The methodological approach of PAR was informed primarily by focus group discussions and unstructured interviews but also by my reflexive writing. While we read together and questioned much of the literature that was reviewed in chapter two, it was through PAR that the co-researchers’ experiences, knowledge and worldviews were unearthed and new and different issues were constantly borne out that reflected more and different perspectives and interests related to citizenship education (Potter, 1998).

This process reflected Vygotsky’s (1962) constructivism and the transactional nature of knowing as a social act and Dewey’s (1933) notion of the problematic which asserts that uncertainty created by intellectual tensions is essential to inquiry (in Potter, 1998). Tackling the many tensions we had with our personal conceptualizations of TCGW was key to our growth as illustrated in the coming chapter on findings. This process helped us to begin to think about the discourses, the arena of work, and the social relationships of power that limited our self-development and determination (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000).

PAR’s distinguishing characteristics—shared ownership of research, community-based analysis of problems, and an orientation toward action—made it the most suitable methodology for this study (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). Educators regularly work in isolation from one another, and grappling with complex problems requires time, space and support that schools rarely provide (Pike, 2008b). Yet we know the effects that group discussion and interaction have
in producing commitment and support for changes in individual attitudes and behavior (Calhoun, 1994).

In sum, I believe it was particularly appropriate that a research methodology intended to address the imbalances of an unjust world was employed to examine teaching for citizenship in a globalized world. After all, global citizenship education is an idea which can be imbued with notions of justice, power and participation.

Framing the Inquiry

The following section outlines a relational ontology and epistemology informed by critical and post-modern social theoretical paradigms of inquiry in addition to the overall participatory action research methodology used in the conduct of the research. Parts of this framing have been in place for some time (selection and growing understanding of PAR) while other parts (application of theoretical frameworks) are new and my understanding of their contributions and complications is still evolving.

A Deeper Glimpse into my Personal Inspirations and Motivations

“Conceptions evolve simultaneously with new information; one possible meaning after another are held before the mind and considered in relation to everything else, including previously developed meanings… A conception which is newly evolved can only come to be if it clarifies dark spots or unties hard knots… Conceptions need a reason to come to life.”

- John Dewey (1933)

Revisiting Dewey during the framing of this inquiry prompted an important question: For what reasons might we coax, lift or force new conceptualizations to life? How might the information we gather, create, think and bat about become useful and meaningful in helping to
make citizenship work for humanity? This puzzle then took me back to the words of Cornel West (2000) discussing essential education as being Socratic in nature... he lauded “self-involved and self-invested wrestling with, grappling with, visions, perspectives, arguments, wrestling with oneself, mustering the courage to learn.” This kind of learning had resonated with me much of my life. But West (2000) went on to say that while Socrates tells us that "the unexamined life is not worth living," he added that it was Malcolm X who reminds us that "the examined life is painful."

I envisioned an opportunity to learn about our ability to evolve citizenship education. I see dark spots in the citizenship experiences of people everywhere and here; I see hard knots between the have and have-nots that need untied. I see that we are missing a “profound compassion, dare I say love... a deep sense of empathy: empathy being understood as the exercise of will and imagination that tries to convince us to conceive of what it's like to be in the shoes of other people, to walk a mile in other people's feet” (West, 2000, at http://old.essentialschools.org/pub/ces_docs/fforum/2000/speeches/west_00.html Retrieved October 7, 2010).

Relational Ontology and Epistemology

It was my intention in this study to try to relate to others, to “walk a mile in other people's feet” (West, 2000). This all began with the relationships among us—the participant-researchers—each relation being indispensible. Throwing off the image of the lone university scholar, I focused the proposed research within a relational ontology asserting that knowledge would only come to exist through my relations with co-researchers (Sandretto, 2004; Wasser and Bressler, 1996). A relational ontology is consistent with my belief that all of humanity is
connected, and that I cannot be myself without others. This way of being was a rejection of pure self-interest and imagined isolationism; it was instead recognition of the importance of the web of humanity, the common good and our interconnectedness (Sandretto, 2004).

Inspired by the work of Sandretto (2004) who examined social justice, I framed the inquiry within a relational epistemology, asserting that all knowledge is socially constructed. This epistemology is consistent with critical theory which expands notions of who can be the knower (Bryceson et al., 1982; Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000; Shinew, 1998). A relational epistemology is especially important to inquiries into citizenship as citizenship is socially, racially and historically constructed (Ladson-Billings, 2004).

As we interacted with each other in critical group discussions, we essentially participated in the minds of each other and saw into the how and why of our meaning making around citizenship (Krauss, 2005). This kind of meaning-making was reflective of Vygotsky’s (1962) contention that learning is a very social activity and that individuals constantly engage in interaction, taking thoughts and understandings to and away from dynamic contexts (Potter, 1998). Vygotsky’s believed that the particulars of human social existence, including history and culture, are reflected in “knowing” (Cole, John-Steiner, Scribner and Souberman, 1978). Vygotsky’s theory of social constructivism as Potter (1998) explains, gives credence to the theory of the social construction of knowledge and underscores why our evolving interpretations of citizenship education emerging from a collaborative environment proved so powerful and yet so personal to each of us.
Critical and Postmodern Theory

Kincheloe and McLaren (2000, p. 281) assert that:

*A critical social theory is concerned with issues of power and justice and the ways the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion and other social institutions, and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system.*

As the goal of critical theory is often described as emancipation from the status quo, we continuously tried to free ourselves from traditional notions of citizenship and make space to re-imagine citizenship education for a globalized world. Critical theory was employed to problematize the borders of citizenship, inquiring as to who counts (or doesn’t count) as a citizen and why. For instance, teachers reflected on the legal ideology that formed the basis of traditional citizenship which has been used to marginalize people of color and to maintain a system of power and privilege for whites. The teachers then developed a dimension of citizenship education called citizenship-as-identity and belonging which recognized the importance of the multiple identities of young people, and extended citizenship based on the concept of membership or a feeling of belonging. Critical theory helped to devise questions such as what is our basis for TCGW? In the citizenship-as-empowerment dimension I inquired as to Mary’s rationale for TCGW, and I questioned whether her basis of “caring” allowed her to maintain a sense of superiority or white privilege while ignoring white people’s complicity in creating and maintaining an inequitable world.

While critical theory was indispensable to this investigation in the challenging of our conceptualizations, I also recognized the limits of its application. Kincheloe and McLaren (2000) suggest caution in speaking about “emancipating” an individual as no one is ever fully or absolutely emancipated from their sociopolitical context: The world, ourselves and this
interaction is simply too slippery to be captured, critiqued and set free. This critique was best illustrated in our “unevenness” as co-researchers throughout the study. Sometimes the teachers held tightly to newly evolved, more critical conceptualizations and their accompanying assumptions and principles—and other times not.

While Brown and Jones (2001) posit that emancipatory projects such as this study assert universally agreed upon values, we know there can be no such absolute agreement. For this reason, multiple dimensions of a re-conceptualized citizenship education were sought out and re-presented in an explicitly post-modern move. The teachers did not agree to a universal brand of global citizenship education, nor did they agree within each dimension. Overall, application of the post-modern lens was important to the discovery of identity as a place of agency for global citizenship education: Without the search for multiple stories, I might not have seen the teachers’ identities alternately working “positively” and “negatively” as gatekeepers to new conceptualizations.

Tensions between PAR and Postmodern Theory

To be clear, our work involved a deliberate “mussing up” of what we thought we knew about citizenship and citizenship education, and this deviated from the rationalist stance that assumes and pursues stability, order and reason (Brown and Jones, 2001). This was evident in that we pursued, not ignored, our tensions with global citizenship/education. By design, PAR involves a change intervention in the pursuit of “improvement” (which cannot be agreed upon)
so our postmodern lens helped us to seek many, not one, new dimension of citizenship education therefore rejecting change towards one end (Brown and Jones, 2001).

Our current efforts to educate citizens is fraught with the fear that recognition of diversity or multiple identities will undermine the strength of the “Ideal America” or to some extent, the very meaning or place of the nation-state itself (Banks, 2004; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). Yet failure to recognize multiple identities results in failure to recognize discrimination (Banks, 2004). An orientation toward global citizenship “the Ideal,” would no more stop racial and ethnic discrimination than national citizenship (an Ideal) prevents people from hating whole groups of citizens (Martin, 1995). That our resulting, newly evolving dimensions of citizenship education are incomplete, overlap, or are not recognized by all of the teachers is acceptable—when one considers the alternative, pursuit of the “Ideal.”

Using PAR and postmodern theory, then, creates a tension between the assumption of the individual who is stable and using rationality to pursue an ideal, and the individual who is fragmented and made of multiple selves (Brown and Jones, 2001)—like the teachers who were always changing and “changing back.” For instance, Mary entered the study thinking she might be both a national and a global citizen, and then immediately declared she wasn’t sure. She later claimed she was a global citizen, then she questioned if she needed to be a national citizen first. By the end of the study, she declared herself to be a global citizen. The postmodern stance allowed us to see Mary’s many constructions of ‘citizen’ rather than tidy them up or present a generalized ending. Frankly, I don’t know if Mary thinks she is a global citizen today. We were limited in our ability to clarify our own identifications as citizens (Brown and Jones, 2001). By grasping and ‘letting go’ of our newly constructed, fluid, and plural dimensions of
citizenship education as we did, we were able to locate-relocate ourselves as citizens, diversely, as we exist. In the postmodern tradition we rejected one grand narrative about citizenship education and constructed four, personal, more temporal narratives that we could embrace and doubt, as anything else would prove unsatisfactory in speaking about this complex, globalized world (Agger, 1991).

Of course, we learned that part of citizenship is feeling a sense of identity—a sense of belonging—and sharing some universal goals with others. So we acknowledged that purely embracing an “anything is citizenship education” approach to the findings was wrong-minded, as this was not in keeping with taking meaningful action—the goal of PAR. We developed four “new” dimensions of citizenship education for ourselves, and while they are not accepted uniformly, they all challenge the status quo (traditional citizenship education) which is in keeping with critical theory (Shinew, 1998).

Methods of Data Collection

Beginning in mid-February and ending in late May, data were collected in focus group discussions approximately every other week for approximately two hours each session resulting in almost 15 hours of group recordings and 357 pages of transcribed data. Additionally, teachers were engaged in unstructured interviews (before and after the focus group process) resulting in almost four hours of recordings and 78 pages of transcribed data. Throughout the course of the study I described and explained my interactions in the research process in writing to myself (Janesick, 2000) and these reflexive notes served as another means of data with the word-processed portion totaling approximately 105 pages. The text of particular email messages is
included as data because I copied and pasted them into my reflexive journal for study. Email messages in general were omitted as a source of data because they were few in number, I had not planned for their inclusion and analysis and it is likely that most substantive emails were already considered as part of the data record by virtue of being pasted in my reflexive journal. I also omitted the inclusion and analysis of individual and group diagrams regarding our before and after conceptualizations of citizenship as their text and meaning was scant, and the co-researchers showed very little interest in their use as a means of demonstrating our progress. Additionally, I had not planned for diagrams as a category of data, and I suppose I wished to keep the data corpus manageable. In the pages that follow I describe all the methods of data collection in detail, owing to a level of data quality explicated below.

Quality of the Data Collected

Quality data in this study was data believed to be clearly demonstrative of the community’s critical issues and actions. These kinds of data are commonly referred to as thick data which purport to describe the realities of the participants rather than being solely concerned with the needs of the researcher or the academic community (Stake, 2000). A sizable amount of quality raw data relaying the teachers’ negotiations of tensions with global citizenship and the complexities and nuances expressed in their new dimensions of citizenship education are presented as lived and co-constructed by participants to better support representations (Janesick, 2000). In keeping with PAR, data were not “harvested” from the group but rather understood collectively through a prolonged process of gaining trust and building rapport (Cahill, 2007a; Fontana and Frey, 2000). Data which demonstrated movement away
from the status quo (traditional citizenship education) culled through application of critical theory as well as data casting doubt on teachers’ change or stability (application of post-modern theory) were considered quality data.

Critical Focus Groups

This study employed PAR for approximately four months through a series of bi-weekly collaborative, focused, organized, critical discussions based on professional and scholarly literature such as that reviewed in chapter two. I recorded and transcribed all focus group discussions with participants’ consent but did not take written notes during the sessions. Information related to particular situations, tone, or my perceived influence on the process was noted afterward, often after a day of percolation and reflexivity (Fontana and Frey, 2000). Through repeatedly listening to our recordings and reading and re-reading our transcripts, “sticky” or interesting and contradictory data, logical or illogical patterns in our work and items of concern to co-researchers received great attention in terms of recycling our thinking back into subsequent discussions. This recycling was organic to our process, but it was hedged by my more formal long-range plan to address a number of relevant topics.

Based on the theoretical assumptions on which I framed this study, I thought the use of critical focus group methods of inquiry would provide us the best opportunity to challenge and potentially change our conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world. I refer to these focus groups as critical as they were employed in the historical-feminist sense and used for consciousness-raising and the promotion of a social justice agenda (Madriz, 2000). The focus groups were critical in that they de-centered my authority as the university researcher to
various degrees and were crafted to provide safe spaces for the teachers to struggle with issues of power, justice, resources, race, class, and ideologies (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2000; Madriz, 2000) germane to changing conceptualizations of citizenship education. Our critical focus groups were a conduit for building and applying critical theory from the shared experiences of teachers just as women have historically, to aid their liberation (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis, 2005). Critical focus groups were well-suited to problem-posing and problem-solving pedagogies advocated by Freire (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis, 2005) and yet encouraged a post-modernism of voice reflecting teachers’ realities (Shinew, 1998). The following excerpt from a focus group discussion captures the essence of how the discussions were employed:

_i’m trying to be an honest broker, to put different things out there and let you mess with them and come to your own conclusions. The point of this, the title again is, How do Teachers’ Conceptualizations of Teaching for Citizenship Change through Collaboration? Nowhere in there does it say, how do I change you? I don’t think that’s how things happen. I think people can create new understandings for themselves, and what those are, that’s not up to me._

Because of the richness of the format, focus group discussions were our primary means of generating/collecting data. A major premise in selecting this method was the notion that a focus group format would allow me to simultaneously conduct rich, dynamic participant observation and individual interviews at the same time (Madriz, 2000). Compared to participant observation or individual interviews alone, the group discussions also provided the advantage of creating multiple lines of communication and fostering multivocality by the participants with their conflicting perspectives and conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship (Madriz, 2000). Such a format was necessary so that we might deeply share and interrogate ideas that were often of a sensitive nature.
My use of critical theory influenced the data collected in group by positioning me to look for and capture data expressing the tension thought to be essential in promoting change in the teachers’ conceptualizations. My post-modern lens influenced my seeking out and collection of data reflecting the different teachers’ many shades of change as my theory contends all individuals are fragmented. In brief, I collected data that served my theories of analysis and my expectation of “movement” on the part of the teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Participants Present</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vick, Ed, Mary, Larry, Jennifer, Howard</td>
<td>2-24-10</td>
<td>1:46:03</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vick, Ed, Mary</td>
<td>3-10-10</td>
<td>1:51:14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vick, Ed, Mary</td>
<td>3-24-10</td>
<td>1:59:59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vick, Ed, Mary</td>
<td>3-31-10</td>
<td>1:49:16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ed, Mary</td>
<td>4-14-10</td>
<td>2:12:08</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vick, Ed, Mary</td>
<td>4-28-10</td>
<td>2:17:39</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mary, Vick</td>
<td>5-12-10</td>
<td>2:59:45</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:56:04</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2. Focus group participation

As this section nears its close, I leave you with the following outtake from a discussion regarding the re-presentation of the “North” and the “South” in the classroom. This outtake wasn’t selected because it’s the most cohesive piece of discussion I could find; it’s quite the opposite. This discussion was running high on emotion and had legs that extended to parts of previous discussions and readings. Only in using a focus group method over time could we make sense of such multivocality, varied interests and sensitivities.
Ed: All the reading is just, I don’t know what world they’re living in. I don’t see reality. There are bad people in the world that are going to be able to do what they want to do when they want to do it, and to whom they want to do it. If you try to change that, if you’re there you’re going to die. You’ve got to realize that. It’s just life. Every time I’m reading, I wrote on the side: Proof? Says who? Delusion. Not always. According to whom? Their statements are like it’s a given. I’m sorry, it’s not a given. You have to prove it.

Vick: It’s even within our own culture. I don’t know if you heard the after-the-meeting conversation, we were talking about the kids going out and enlisting in the army after school. And that was in a white school. I’m in a black school and the kids say Army? Screw that, I’m not doing that. Same culture, same county...

Ed: Different reality.

Vick: Totally different reality.

Mary: Obviously there’s a north-south divide, that’s clearly there. I think there’s this view that, like the south sees the north as heaven on earth. These views, the way the north and the south are presented, you’re supposed to carefully present. They’re advocating how you teach this. But if you show all the problems in the south, then you’re skewing the legend they keep talking about. How much of the reality of what goes on in parts of the world-so many problems in the south, obviously—it becomes an overwhelming task because you want your students to know, there are all these issues and all these problems going on around the world, and I kind of wrote down, what’s enough? We don’t want to trivialize it, what’s enough and how do I become an expert in this culture? There’s bad people in the world and bad things going on, if I present this stuff, am I...

Lisa: Bad?

Mary: Perpetuating the legend?

As previously stated, I initially outlined various broad areas for inquiry (e.g. the danger of a single story), yet I remained loose enough in planning for sessions that both the participants and I could contribute to the research cycles. Sometimes discussion was dispersed amongst us as in the example above, and other times just two individuals might have a lengthy exchange on a given topic. Compelling issues, relationships, processes, questions and contradictions emerged from each focus group discussion (e.g. Am I perpetuating the legend?) and
subsequently fueled the readings, foci and reflections for the next (Madriz, 2000).

Over time, the focus group discussions helped teachers to support as well as challenge one another’s thinking about educating young citizens in a globalized world. In this way, our focus groups gave rise to new possibilities (Shinew, 1998) and gave import to the collective nature of knowing (Potter, 1998). By the study’s close, it was clear that “group” had become a place where the teachers could practice new forms of identity or “being” citizens.

Of course, focus groups have their limitations. Madriz (2000) reports that focus groups take place outside of natural settings and can therefore limit the range of information that can be gathered. I recognized this limitation and realized that classroom observation which occurs in a teacher’s natural setting, for instance, may have revealed another body of data which might have contradicted the findings enclosed. It is not unusual for a person’s actions and stated beliefs to differ, but it’s also not a given that they must be out of alignment.

Another limit of focus groups is that my presence could have influenced the authenticity of our interactions (Madriz, 2000). Regardless of how I intended and tried to share power in group, at the end of the day I was still conducting my dissertation, still facilitating the group, and so on.

Finally, focus groups might have been inappropriate in cases where the teachers wanted or needed to share certain information in a safer venue (Madriz, 2000). Because the application of critical and post-modern theories was transparent, it may have colored what teachers were willing to risk saying (i.e. teachers could have felt pressured to change or constantly evolve and therefore held back data that might have suggested otherwise).
Semi-Structured Interviews

Interviews provided another venue for data collection and understanding in what were recognized as dynamic and non-neutral interactions; this time between researcher and participant (Fontana and Frey, 2000). The selection of this method complemented focus groups in that interviews allowed time and space for singular voices and offered an appropriate venue for sharing sensitive information. The semi-structured format allowed for pre-planning and flexibility on my part without preventing myself or the teacher from exploring more emergent lines of thinking. The first interview discussion focused mainly on the biography of the participant in terms of conceptualizations of citizen and teaching for citizenship. The second interview discussion repeated the questions from the first, but was also naturally grounded in some issues that arose in focus groups. Semi-structured interviews benefited the study by generously allowing me to focus on understanding the participants’ conceptualizations rather than merely asking questions and gathering explanations (Fontana and Frey, 2000). The unstructured and interactive format was concomitant with the principles of PAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Interview 1 Date/Minutes/Pages</th>
<th>Interview 2 Date/Minutes/Pages</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vick</td>
<td>2-14/55/10</td>
<td>6-2/21:57/7</td>
<td>1:16:57</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>2-14/1:16/17</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2-15/40/10</td>
<td>6-2/38:15/13</td>
<td>1:18:15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:51:12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3. Interview participation
As with focus group discussions, I recorded interviews with participants’ consent and did not take notes until after the interview. The following excerpt provides a small window into an interview as well as my reflexive participation in the event.

February 14:

I arrived a few minutes early and Ed walked up to me. There was music playing, people talking all around the café, and a loud steady humming noise coming from the kitchen. I had to set the DVR near a tray, bagel and paper wrapping—and I prayed we would get a good recording. Once we started talking, I was able to block everything else out.

I was aware/knew I needed to ask him core questions, but I also wanted to follow a line of thought here and there and not be afraid I wouldn’t ask one of the core questions. How sacred were my questions? I didn’t want to be reading or thinking about the next question, I just wanted to listen. I ended up not taking notes during the interview because I wanted to be attuned to Ed. I think this was the right thing to do...

On the way home, before I started writing here, I was thinking about something I said—something about how I found myself listening to Ed as a person more than a researcher and that I hoped it bode well for the dissertation... I’m eager to go to the transcript and see this... why would my words belie me? I would never doubt that research which is personal is anything but good research... Is this statement a result of “old forces” still remaining inside of me?

As the major weakness of interviews is the un-reflexive reporting of events, my journaling about our interactions was an important part of my data collection process (Fontana and Frey, 2000). Another excerpt dated February 15 speaks to the exhausting and emotional nature of interviews, proving that interviews are far from being static events (Fontana and Frey, 2000):

This interview day was exhausting. We completed 4 interviews today, of which 2 ended up being by phone due to a near-blizzard. I don’t think I would do 4 in a row again; I found myself a little less receptive during #3 and by #4 the connections weren’t firing as they were before. What I mean is, of course I was listening and engaging, but previously, little sparks, little tidbits of ideas, connections or split-second analyses would fly between my brain and the participants words... by number 4 these sparks were fewer.
I kept to the same format as yesterday, and I wrote down no more than a few words during the conversation. I do feel like I’m really connecting with the teachers, and this is most important. During the second interview, the teacher began to tear up and cry... while I was sure to offer him a break or tissue, he wanted to keep going. He just became really passionate about what we were thinking and talking about...

Reflexive Journaling

When I began keeping a journal to reflect on my processes as demonstrated above, I used a notebook. Within just days I was discouraged by this method of storage as I kept remembering things to add to entries which had limited and un-editable space. I moved to keep my reflexive notes in an electronic, word-processed journal which served me well in two ways: One, I was able to add to entries and keep a semblance of chronological order and two, I realized that by typing my entries they would be ready for export into my final paper.

I will add that there was one interesting drawback to journaling electronically. E-journaling allows you to edit your thoughts, and I caught myself editing my reflections. I had typed the word participants, read it, erased it, and replaced it with co-researchers. I did this because I wanted to be consistent, and because I wanted it to appear that I was “really doing PAR,” thus they were co-researchers, equally involved in the process. Reflecting upon my editing allowed me to see that “our” PAR was always going to privilege my voice. My hope is that this admission allowed me to more authentically return to the business of co-researching in the truer sense. I have allowed the mix of the use of the terms participant, teacher and co-researcher as well as main researcher and university researcher to stand throughout this study as the mixed usage reflects the reality this PAR.
While there were strings of days that I journaled intensely (e.g. reflexively documenting recruitment, selection and consent), there were times that I escaped my research and my journal, hence there are gaps along the way. Sometimes I just needed a break:

April 7

Heard back from Steve, sadly Colleen’s father passed... I can’t help but think of one of Ed’s expressions, “Life, you’ve gotta live it.” Just since I started collecting data I’ve lost two aunts on my father’s side, my boyfriend lost his grandpa and his mother had a heart attack... You don’t stop being human when you’re doing research... if you’re lucky the research becomes more humane.

The practice of journaling was also important in that it was the major vehicle for interrogating and documenting myself and my decisions throughout the study, helping to expose my blindside (Herr and Anderson, 2005):

Have I been dividing my nation? Sifting through the people I meet? Teachers? I’ve been seeing liberals and conservatives for so long—forget all my talk about being forced into dichotomies. I’ve been creating them. I just realized that I measured all of them on a spectrum day one—and only through dialogues and relationships with them do I have the opportunity to see all the shades in between... this is how all teachers are I bet... it’s how I am. This is such a simple realization as to be profound. I bet I gave short shift to the one-world government notion last night too. So much for my open-mindedness.

The act of journaling in this case helped me to see more dimensions within the co-researchers, and helped me to see the political and moral positions I was taking up within myself as I re-read and re-listened to data. I had shunted concerns about the possibility of a one-world government during session because it did not figure into my personal conceptualization of global citizenship—I believed one could TCGW without believing in the one-world concept. I nearly dismissed the participants’ feelings and opinions, and I never did fully explain that there are in fact people who believe global citizenship requires some form of one-world government.
The Roles and Relationships of and Between the Researcher and Participants

It seems important within a discussion of methods and the context of PAR to step back and more generally contemplate the roles and relationships of and between the researcher and participants. The following section is intended to help illustrate the nature of our respective interactions and illuminate the connections between method (e.g. focus group discussion) and methodology (PAR).

The Role of Participants

The precise nature of the roles and relationships between researchers and participants vary as much as the PAR process itself, and roles and relationships therein are always changing (Potter, 1998). I will also add that as I’m not a participant in the traditional sense, I could never fully understand their role as they lived it—I can only describe their role based on my perspective (Potter, 1998). In this project, I witnessed teachers engaging in a number of ways—they participated in reading, posing questions and problems, engaging in critical dialogue, individual reflection, knowledge-giving, knowledge creation, collaborative interpretation, representation of findings, member checking, change-monitoring and conceptualizing the course of the research project itself. The teachers assumed participation in these different ways at varying levels of intensity at different times over the course of the study. Their enduring role as “knowers” is the role I speak to below.

As a group we acknowledged early on that while parity was key to authentic collaboration, it could not be confused with sameness in terms of the kinds of knowledge
contributed, power, status or influence; instead parity was about valuing the differences in contributions that still aimed for the shared goals of our collaboration (Potter, 1998). There were times in coding and analyzing the data that I felt I had wronged the group by “giving” or “telling” content, pursuing reflection in discussion too doggedly and so on... but those actions in and of themselves didn’t negate our shared work toward a shared goal. This is because PAR asserts that the professional knowledge a researcher brings to a study is important and valuable, but local knowledge is really the vital ingredient in this kind of research (Greenwood and Levin, 2000).

For instance, teachers may have learned about the research and knowledge creation process from me, but I learned about how the subject of global citizenship played out in reality—in classroom and school life (Potter, 1998). This was critical as researcher-generated knowledge about teaching typically demonstrates little understanding of the teaching environment which is personal, contextual, and relational among people (Herr and Anderson, 2005).

My Role

Below I briefly highlight and/or illustrate my role:

In practical terms, I brought the literature/content and the research process to the group, and I served as our organizer, facilitator and scribe. I managed our time and focus, involving them directly in “working through” my dissertation. As the main researcher, I played a leading role in facilitating the combining of my insight and knowledge with that of the teachers in order to trigger new levels of awareness (Bryceson et al., 1982):

*I think I blunted our thinking toward the end. I took the angles right off of the disagreements. I rounded everything out with “nice girl” talk. I realized this soon after everyone left... I’m going to*
restore those angles next session and see what happens. I need to see that data and try to understand why I blunted our dissention.

I also supported the group in developing a critical inquiry stance and other research skills:

Participatory action research is about getting to new knowledge by way of participation. Making sure people have a voice. I told you when I met you, I don’t feel teachers have enough of a voice. I see you all as my co-researchers. You will assume more of that role tonight. You will be helping to interpret the tensions, the findings... you’re going to be reinterpreting you’re own data from your interview.

I also played a critical role in establishing a safe and comfortable environment where everyone’s ideas are welcome and valued, where what matters to the teachers was discussed and where goals they had for themselves were shared and tended to (Cahill, Rios-Moore and Threatts, 2008):

Let’s pause there. I want to give Mary the floor. If you have something to share here, go ahead.

At the same time I had to meet the requirements of my doctoral program while guarding against the possibility of imposing my change agenda on the community of teachers. Perhaps the role of “honest broker” was the most difficult role to attempt to fulfill.

If there are things that are starting to become clear to you, things that you’re certain about or if there are things that maybe you’ve heard me or a co-researcher say that you seriously doubt, that’s wonderful. Whatever you are feeling, believing... whatever your conceptions are, I’d like to try to understand where we’re at...

What Challenges Did I Encounter?

It would be impossible to imagine living the PAR experience without encountering challenges along the way. I have elected to place this section on the challenges I faced after the discussion of our roles so that this text could continue to describe our work as participatory action researchers. I discuss three major challenges: The challenge of fostering participation; the difficulty of developing new knowledge; and the reality of limited time.
Challenge of Fostering Participation in a Community

PAR was not simple or predictable and the process was uneasy (Lind, 2008). While participation or collaboration can be difficult to muster within a single organization, it becomes more complicated across different kinds of organizations with an “unequal” history, e.g. secondary and post-secondary institutions (Potter, 1998). A certain amount of anxiety (but also excitement) followed the formation of our new relationships as we shared about ourselves and grew to challenge each other intellectually. The political and ethical nature of global citizenship education added yet another layer of interest in terms of topical degrees of volatility. Participation, while planned for, had to evolve somewhat organically over time along with trust, comfort and a belief in reciprocity. Collaboration may be defined as gathering together to work on the same project, but PAR requires a genuine and more difficult-to-kindle spirit of sharing power, ownership, leadership and responsibility (Potter, 1998).

Difficulty of Developing Knowledge

In terms of rethinking citizenship education for a global age, the content learning curve for participants was somewhat steep. Recall from chapter two that research indicates that teachers know little about the world in which they live and that they often feel unprepared, anxious or unconfident to teach about global issues or make global connections (Gaudelli, 2003; Larsen and Faden, 2008; Lee and Leung, 2006; Merryfield, 2000; Merryfield and Kasai, 2004). This created a challenge in that our work in group was based on theoretical or scholarly literature premised upon a fair amount of familiarity with the topics above. The teachers had to learn new content related to globalization as well as how to read and grapple with research
studies—all while learning PAR. As the teachers were used to discussing practice, facilitation was key to seeking the roots of our worldviews, avoiding rhetoric and artifice, and instead relating our perspectives to existing scholarship.

The Reality of Limited Time

While two hours plus travel time every other week may not seem like a big commitment to some individuals, for these teachers this represented the interruption and loss of an evening that would otherwise be spent planning lessons, grading papers, taking care of the home, the family, and so on. Even though participants committed to the study after being briefed on the hours required reading and reflecting, it was impossible to predict just how much focus and attention the study really demanded. The true engagement level could not have been accurately quantified for the IRB protocol. Time constraints no doubt emerged as school routines and otherwise full plates came into play, inhibiting focused attention to all tasks even when the benefits were perceived as valuable (Lind, 2008; Potter, 1998). Having said that, I believe the teachers really gave this study their all; they were completely dedicated. As the university researcher with my larger plan of action, deadlines, quality data needs and my “credential on the line” it would have been easy to lose sensitivity to participants’ boundaries and needs. While there was no real solution to, e.g. eliciting a more rigorous, perhaps written member checking of an interview, our time was productively managed and constant non-anxious communication around their respective needs was key. PAR is personal, non-linear and messy, and thus I remained flexible (Potter, 1998).
Data Analysis and “Writing Up”

In order to answer my research question about how teachers’ conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW) changed through the process of participatory action research, I employed the constant comparative analysis approach (Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to our focus group and interview interactions as well as my reflexive journal. I coded the first transcripts’ data descriptively, and it resulted in 40 “codes” reflecting summaries of what was said. This kind of coding took place with an incomplete corpus as subsequent focus groups occurred every two weeks. This is typical as the open-coding process usually begins with the reading and rereading of a set of raw data from which initial categories or open codes are formed, but later change (Charmaz, 2000).

I was re-reading our raw data when I saw the teachers’ tensions with global citizenship emerging, forming nine codes: Universal versus cultural (culturally relevant), isolation/ignorance, patriotism, uncritical of west/east-west divide, single story versus multiple stories, Marxism, identity and security, global citizenship abroad and “bad people”/reality. In actuality I coded this data as I had collected it, seeking problems related to global citizenship as my critical theory lens positioned me to look for the roots of the social problem we were experiencing. The naming of tensions was no doubt related to my critical theory which asserted that conflict or dissonance was essential to change (Allen, 2004). Seven codes (Identity, change, biography, naivety, different expectations, power, and global ideology) which were not tensions (but I didn’t know what they were at this time) also emerged. Here I use the word “emerged” knowing that as a non-neutral researching working within stated theories of critical and post-modernism, my subconscious, even then, was looking for the kinds of findings that I wanted to
disseminate. I wrote a memo of sorts indicating I thought the ‘other’ codes were related to the tensions, but I didn’t know exactly how. The codes change, biography and different expectations were linked to the “tension code” of identity and security.

At this point in the constant comparative mode, I reviewed individuals’ outtakes from the data in post-modern fashion seeking the ways teachers’ data related to conceptualizations compared with each other and within themselves (Charmaz, 2000). My decision to write up the findings to pointedly illustrate change was really made during this part of the analysis.

As a researcher practicing critical and post-modernism, the theories influenced identification of problems essential to critical transformation with an eye toward teachers’ change or action— at the same time I was seeking/finding individuals’ complex stories of changing and “changing back” (post-modernism asserts a fluid self). As my codes were interesting but not really responding to my research questions, my advisor suggested coding to answer my questions. Up to this point my coding had helped me to get to know the data, but my analysis lacked a sharper focus.

Five codes I labeled tensions emerged (one-world, resources, culturally relevant versus universal rights, American identity and loyalty) and five dimensions of a recon-conceptualized citizenship education emerged (citizenship-as-identity, connection, relation, experience and deliberation). Other codes which emerged but didn’t address my research questions included PAR (I wasn’t doing a study of methodology), term (the tension around the term itself was related to the tensions), self/relation (folded into tensions and dimensions to support the stories of changing and changing back), Lisa (I decided not to focus analysis on myself but was interested in my performance and efforts as a transparent facilitator, and finally, context.
While I decided that data coded context was not essential to answering my research questions, I did ask myself if context presented a viable answer to “how do teachers change their conceptualizations?” Did teachers not change their conceptualizations because of school systems’ control of curriculum and focus on testing? Was changing teachers’ conceptualizations of TCGW dependent upon them defying their contexts? The answer I constructed from an examination of the data against this theory was “no.” While the teachers indicated a battle with context generally, they also indicated that they practiced teaching as they saw fit—publicly or covertly.

In the process of reflecting with co-researchers and committee members and practicing writing as a way of knowing (Richardson, 1994), four tension-related codes and four dimension-related codes emerged in this final product. American identity and loyalty became “loss of identity” to more accurately capture that it was “loss” that was the tension. Citizenship-as-experience became citizenship-as-empowerment when it became clearer that one could have experiences without being empowered, and empowerment was the central dimension expressed by the group. Citizenship-as-deliberation first became citizenship-as-vision before it was wrapped into the final code of citizenship-as-relation. While determining one’s relation might happen through the process of deliberation, focusing on the word relation gave attention to the act of relating itself instead of any one process for getting there. In the final analysis, the code citizenship-as-vision which was about seeing “invisible” social systems did not have enough data to support its inclusion as a dimension.

The tensions and dimensions in this study re-presented the main problems teachers had with global citizenship and how they were trying to solve them. The explication of the tensions
and the dimensions constitute a contribution to the field as they are comprised of new empirical data which conceptualize what was going on and what was made possible by teachers’ committing to an inquiry into their conceptualizations of global citizenship education.

From the process of capturing/constructing our tensions and evolving dimensions of citizenship education, a theory regarding identity (which was the only code that was both a tension and a dimension) began to crystallize (and form the basis of discussion in chapter six). By laying bare teachers’ tensions and evolving dimensions in critical theory fashion, and then looking closely at teachers’ changing stories, this study makes two unique theoretical contributions to the field as the data “revealed” 1) that teachers change their conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world by shifting or recreating their identities (constructs of citizen and understanding of citizenship education were reciprocal) and 2) teachers’ identities are locations of agency for global citizenship and thus global citizenship education.

“Writing Up”

For practical reasons of needing to complete the dissertation in a timely manner and in order to meet scholarly requirements, I acknowledge that my voice was given special privilege in organizing and writing up the findings (Gergen and Gergen, 2000; Herr and Anderson, 2005). I asked participants to be involved in the creative writing and re-presentation process to some extent (brainstorming, sharing insights, member checking, etc.) and they provided some feedback. While participants did not actually write within the main body of the dissertation,
two of the teachers created letters to readers in which they shared personal insights resulting from our process.

In writing this dissertation I had two audiences in mind—the academic community and the teaching community. My re-presentation was structured to meet the requirements of a dissertation but also to tell what I hope is an engaging story that readers—teachers—may find themselves active within.

The story of the re-presentation began with brainstorming and organizing the findings in such a way that they responded to my theoretical frameworks; the re-presentation illustrated conflict and change (critical theory) and multiple, sometimes contradictory voices (post-modernism). Heavy-handed editing took place after I received feedback from my committee that my study over-emphasized PAR at the expense of my findings. This final copy sought to address that imbalance, and overall, to enhance reader comprehension.

I judged the quality of my “writing up” process using Charity’s standards of civic journalism. My writing is deemed “civic” if it meets the following criteria (Charity, 1995; adapted from Lincoln and Denzin, 2000):

- The writing moves the public to meaningful judgment and meaningful action;
- The writing exposes complacency, bigotry, and wishful thinking and
- The writing promotes a form of textuality that turns citizens into readers and readers into persons who take democratic action in the world.

At every step in the writing process I attempted to live up to Charity’s standards, however, only my readers can truly assess my performance and reflect it in the actions they
might take regarding global citizenship education. The selection of civic journalism criteria to evaluate my writing was heavily influenced by critical theory as I needed a standard that would embrace a problem-driven approach to change (Herr & Anderson, 2005). The teachers’ conflicts with GCE would need to be explicated in detail so other participants in similar situations might “engage” and improve the rationality and justice of their own citizenship education practices (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). Confrontation of inequities and enhanced consciousness are goals shared by both critical theory and civic journalism (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Charity, 1995).

Why did I use so much raw data in my journalism? I claimed, in engaging in PAR, that the community of teachers I identified was a marginalized group (see PAR Methodology for more detail). As the teachers were a marginalized group, I embraced the rule of ‘who speaks will often be more important than what is said’ (Said, 1986). In chapter six, I critique global education and global citizenship education for its “glossing over” of the tensions inherent in global citizenship. The use of “so much” raw data comprises a valuable contribution to the field—it details the conflict teachers experience with global citizenship and demonstrates how they work with and through the related problems.

This study was premised on a relational epistemology, that what we know is socially constructed. I deemed it was appropriate to show longer exchanges between the teachers in order for readers to witness their re/constructions of global citizenship. Teachers were invited to participate in this study as knowers because they are too often pushed aside when it comes to meaning, decision, and policy-making (see the Statement of the Problem), thus, teachers’ knowing, and specifically their words, were given special attention.
My writing was a way of knowing—“a method of discovery and analysis” (Richardson, 2000, p. 923). In this sense, when I was asked to re-write (in part) my findings by my committee, I was being asked to “know” something other than what I had found/constructed. While I sought to balance my re-presentation of the methodology (that was not the subject of this study) with the findings, I performed a balancing act in terms of maintaining the integrity of the findings as I saw them, and illuminating what all the data “meant” in a form that was easier to grasp. I maintained a focus on “before” narratives, tensions, and evolving dimensions because they reflected the teachers’ stories of change as we created/intended them; while I cut “extraneous” re-presentations from the dissertation, I was cognizant that content and form were inseparable (Richardson, 1994).

The re-presentations are indicative of post-modern theoretical applications as my chapters four and five are not an unproblematic report at research’s end; my writing was a method of collecting data, knowing, and constructing the world (Richardson, 1994). I made a decision to show readers the teachers’ tensions and how they worked through them into dimensions, in what some might still characterize as too much detail. However, the identification of a bevy of scenarios rather than a concise proposition (Lindblom, 1995) allowed me to avoid leading readers to believe these teachers’ worlds were simpler than they truly were.

Grappling with the Organization of the Findings

Re-presenting the evolution of our conceptualizations presented a number of challenges. For this dissertation to be successful, I would need to express: “Where the teachers
were” in terms of their thinking about citizen/teaching for citizenship as they began the study; show the tensions that the teachers held regarding TCGW and why they held them; and, present the teachers’ new understandings of citizen/teaching for citizenship, largely as a result of having shifted their identities.

First, imposing order on dynamic change required simplifying our evolutions to some extent. In “capturing” change for re-presentation, a false impression may be given—that change was more linear, neater, and perhaps more expected than it was in reality. Second, individuals experienced a series of spiraling shifts—many changes demonstrable in the data, and doubtless many changes internal and invisible to them, to me, and you, the reader. Working with the data, I decided to make clear the larger narrative or story of change, focusing on the more paradigmatic shifts in thinking and relying on thick description to import the nuance of the co-researchers’ experiences. Finally, each of the co-researchers began the study with unique conceptualizations, changed or didn’t change at various points over the several months (including “changing back”), and exited the study with yet more unique conceptualizations.

Accepting the fact that I would not escape all limitations no matter the depiction of findings, I proceeded to practice re-presentation in a way that I felt wielded “story power.” Hence, the findings sometimes focus on individuals and at other times on our collective. While the possibility of framing more or all of our evolutions as a community was deeply considered, it was avoided because upon trial it proved to be too muddy a depiction. Co-researchers’ conceptualizations evolved over time, and not all tensions were resolved or resolved at the same time by all individuals. In re-presentation, just as in analysis, attunement to individual voices was extremely important in avoiding forced or false consensus and giving balance to the
larger story. This in no way demeans the importance of the collective, but ultimately allows for an enhanced understanding of our dialectic.

I disclose here that I edited the words of co-researchers to improve the readability of the study throughout this dissertation, and I often shortened or streamlined their thoughts to aid readers’ comprehension. I did my best not to alter what I believed to be the intent of the participants’ ideas.

Holistically, it may be helpful to think of our work as expressing the following imperfect equation: Values and beliefs (became Identity) > Tensions > Breakthrough > Re-conceptualization

...although the movement between categories in reality was more recursive, repetitive and arrhythmic.

Values and beliefs: As I originally wrote this part of the dissertation, I wrote that “individuals came to the study with previously held values and beliefs; these values and beliefs had fed their constructions of citizen and teaching for citizenship over a lifetime.” Based on the study’s findings, readers should substitute Identity for values and beliefs.

Tensions: Tensions (as they came to be called) represented the incongruence between the individuals’ identities and their initial understanding of global citizenship. Tensions relay the gulf or schism between their original and new forms of educating for citizenship.

Breakthroughs: A breakthrough is conceived as an occasion in which the individual shifted or recreated their identity in order to change their conceptualization of ‘citizen’ and TCGW.
Re-conceptualization: Re-conceptualization refers to the new order of things; an altered identity and a re-conceptualized citizenship education (where applicable).

Teachers “before” narratives are presented at the beginning of chapter four followed by a readers’ theatre of “tensions” as both sections speak to conceptualizations before large, demonstrable shifts in identity occurred.

Readers’ Theatre

One strength of the re-presentation in chapter four may be that it allows powerful stories to emerge. Famed New York Times columnist Nicolas Kristof insists that people initially understand arguments emotionally, not rationally, and so he tries to tell stories that make his audience connect with individual people (MacDonald, 2010). My readers’ theatre is a form of civic journalism which invites readers to become participants in addressing meaningful public problems by blending the personal with the public and advocating for participatory democracy (Charity, 1995; Denzin, 2000).

While use of readers’ theatre in dissertations is not new (Konzal, 1995; Sandretto, 2004; Shinew, 1998), it seems prudent to discuss how it’s defined and how it was practiced in this particular research initiative. Each tension received a readers’ theatre treatment resulting in one short act. In each act, the reader should expect to find a general description of the tension and minimal interpretation of the act. Readers’ theatre was deliberately employed herein as a montage-like format to capture the complexity of our thinking (Donmoyer and Yennie-Donmoyer, 1998). Readers should note the use of the word montage as it generally signals the rules by which I re-constructed and re-presented our tensions. The technique of montage
involves the combining of elements from various sources (in this case, data gleaned from various focus group discussions, interviews and my reflexive journal) into a single composition (or act of readers’ theatre) to give the illusion that the elements belonged together originally or as a means of adding interest or meaning to the composition (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/montage on September 15, 2010). A single act may draw upon data or text from discussions taking place on different days over the course of the project, and this is congruent with the notion that readers’ theatre is a presentation of selected pieces of text that are thematically linked (Donmoyer and Yennie-Donmoyer, 1998). The coded data used in the theatre (tensions) were selected for their illustrative and evocative potential. My interpretation is minimal as the acts are intended to draw the reader into the script to create meaning from what may be suggested and to find in the texts parts of themselves (Donmoyer and Yennie-Donmoyer, 1998).

Note that the four short readers’ theatre acts also begin to tell us about the identities of the co-researchers in the study. The re-presentation of the tensions involved in TCGW are valid to these co-researchers who helped identify them, and I suspect that these tensions may be experienced by other teachers of secondary social studies elsewhere.

Keep in mind that the acts are short as tensions were identified beginning in session one, and that only a total of seven sessions played out over four months. Readers should not expect to see volumes of data regarding the tensions, but rather should expect tensions to be introduced. Readers’ theatre is meant to engage the reader, and in my estimation this meant leaving some things to the imagination. Chapter five further engages readers in the tensions that are re-presented in chapter four as complex re-conceptualizations of TCGW unfurl.
Validity

_The job of validation is not to support an interpretation, but to find out what might be wrong with it. A proposition deserves some degree of trust only when it has survived serious attempts to falsify it._

-Lee Cronbach (1980), p. 103

The following sections describe the kinds of validity sought throughout the conduct of this study. Triangulation, construct validity, face validity, catalytic validity, reflexivity and the disclamation of validity through multiple voices are addressed.

Triangulation

To improve the “accuracy” of my findings I employed triangulation (Denzin, 1970; Janesick, 2000). I used data triangulation by drawing data from multiple sources (focus group discussions, interviews, and reflexive notes). This helped ensure that the patterns which emerged were not coincidental. Additionally, each participant acted as a co-researcher (investigator triangulation). Expanding notions of who can be the knower is consistent with PAR and it brought diverse intellectual power to bear on the problem under study. Investigator triangulation helped to engage more worldviews and protect the study from my biases (to some degree). Finally, multiple perspectives were used to interpret the data (theory triangulation). Engaging participants in interpretation brought multiple perspectives to bear as we sought to explain our findings in terms of theory. Critical theory and checks on critical theory were frequently employed.
Construct Validity

This study was created to address the tensions between teachers’ internal values and beliefs and TCGW. It was designed through my particular global worldview to problematize current conceptualizations of citizenship education. Given that goal, I was at risk of conceptual over-determinism—meaning it could be easy for me to find what I had in mind (Lather, 1986). Action researchers are often accused of lacking methodological rigor; but sometimes we collect certain data because it is relevant or makes sense to us (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). It is also said that focusing on evidence that is relevant and deemed valid by participants increases the potential for action and transformation of our world (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000). In this study, construct validity was grounded between my notion that we would have a changed conceptualization of TCGW, the teachers’ own thinking/understandings about TCGW and our prolonged engagement with the problem and each other.

Within emancipatory projects like PAR there is always a tendency to theoretically imposition participants (as I was about to do below), but a systematized reflectivity regarding how my own understandings come to be changed by the logic of the data is helpful (Lather, 1986):

So now I’ve quickly pulled 15 or so out-takes from the data, positive/negative, good/bad, comforting/discomforting... and created an open-ended puzzle whereby the co-researchers could organize the data into categories like “students are blank slates” or “full slates” etc. so that they could tangle with interpreting their own words and creating their own understandings of the relationships between and among these provocations, tools, inconsistencies... Should I send it to them and make this the subject of our last interview? Or should I represent what I’m seeing in the findings (related to these out-takes) and have them member-check? I need to locate an end point to this research in terms of the doctorate, but it’s hard not to keep in-citing/sighting...

In the preceding example the data that jarred me was my own reflexive writing. Had I sent the chart asking participants to organize themselves by the very things I wanted them to
learn, I might have avoided (woefully) the wonderful diversity of our evolutions. A valid state of “change” is one that a participant chooses as freely as possible.

Face Validity

Face validity in this study is achieved by member checks. Member checks permeated our research process in both formal and informal ways. Whatever I thought I was finding or we were finding was brought back to the group (for every session of discussion) to then be re-grappled with and refined in light of our further reflections (Lather, 1986). Participants were also provided numerous formal opportunities to verify, modify or dispute whatever we had captured (Janesick, 2000). For example, participants were asked to review and edit/clarify transcripts from the semi-structured interviews and to member check multiple drafts of findings. Below is an excerpt from an email to participants regarding member checking:

As long as I'm writing, I'll take this opportunity to remind us all to submit feedback on the research questions and title and to keep in mind the possibility of creating a profile for me.

Please also member-check your interviews and profiles and let me know what you think. Please either affirm that the transcripts and summaries reflect your views, feelings, and experiences and (profiles) are an “agreeable” re-presentation of you in the “before” or disaffirm—they do not reflect you/your experiences, etc. (as we discussed at length in session.) It is important to me personally that you are each comfortable with the words, intent, etc. Your affirmation/disaffirmation must be recognized, it speaks to the credibility of our research overall. Please take a moment to let me know if transcripts & profiles are OK, or how we might address your reflections.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is the conscious experiencing of oneself as a researcher and as a participant in the study (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Lincoln and Guba (2000) explain that reflexivity requires
us to scrutinize everything from our questions to our choice of methodology to the many decisions we make in the research process. Throughout the course of this study I journaled about and reflected on my interactions in the research process (Janesick, 2000). Examples of this reflexivity are woven throughout the dissertation. My intent was to work democratically but the positions I assumed were not neutral and they affect the reality I captured in my research (Herr and Anderson, 2005; Potter, 1998). While bias is impossible to avoid as no one is neutral, I hope that my reflexivity helped to mitigate the risks associated with my bias and to more clearly render my worldview to readers (Janesick, 2000). Below is an example of my reflexivity taking root in group discussion, moving questions about authentic participation from paper to community:

What’s my agenda? I’m borrowing Ed’s words here, just putting it out there plainly and really—help me. What’s my agenda, because we all have one, right? When you look at what I’m asking you, the way I’ve asked it, or just drawing on our experience in group, what’s my agenda? And I’m also asking this because I reflected a lot this week. I’ve told you from the first night, I’m not neutral, and this is what I believe. But even having done that, I don’t know how I’m doing here about being an honest broker, and I don’t know if I’m really listening.

Catalytic Validity

In PAR, catalytic validity is demonstrated in warrants for action. If our community believed their research was valid, they would risk their own welfare by taking the actions arrived at—e.g. assuming new conceptualizations, trying to influence peers, changing their curriculum, etc. (Greenwood and Levin, 2000.). There is substantial evidence that the teachers took such actions throughout the study.
Multiple Voices

Looking toward post-modern theory, a significant means of actually disclaiming validity is to employ multiple voices within the research (Gergen and Gergen, 2000). This study intentionally sought to include a range of teachers’ perspectives, claims and concerns that would otherwise go unheard (Gergen and Gergen, 2000; Lincoln and Guba, 2000). PAR is often utilized because it has the potential to listen to and amplify not only multiple voices within the collaborative but within the self (Potter, 1998). Too, a study can be made richer by favoring a complex and oppositional accounting of participant perspectives, even when presenting the findings (Herr and Anderson, 2005; Shinew, 1998). Disagreeing and collectively analyzing our differences was central to our work (Cahill et al., 2008; Shinew, 1998).

Trustworthiness

Several other techniques were employed throughout the study to promote trustworthiness. These include thick description, committee and peer review and informed consent.

Thick Description

This study employed thick description meaning that I wrote to comprehensively express the realities of the participants, not just my own (Stake, 2000). In subscribing to thick description, I made every effort to convey the complexities and nuances of reality as lived and constructed by participants, and direct quotations from various sources support the representations (Janesick, 2000). While trekking through the findings in chapter four may be a
somewhat arduous task—and some might say that too many raw data were presented—such thick description benefited the study by maintaining the focus on the community of teachers, enhancing the integrity of our work as defined by PAR.

Peer and Committee Review

My peer’s 16 hours and committee’s 12 ½ hours of review aided me in many respects, but particularly in unprivileging my white and western worldview. The process generally ensured that I operated within the bounds of the human subjects research board, introduced me to fresh perspectives and interpretations of my work, exposed my biases and supported my first foray into the research process. Examples of the impact of the review process are discussed throughout the dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Tyson</td>
<td>April 12</td>
<td>Mozart’s</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Miller</td>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>Steve’s home</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Merryfield</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Merry’s home</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Miller</td>
<td>May 24</td>
<td>Steve’s home</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Miller</td>
<td>July 19</td>
<td>Steve’s home</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Time 12.5 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4. Committee review
Informed Consent and Confidentiality

The purpose of informed consent is to protect participants by explaining to them the research process and the risk for harm associated with their participation (Fine, Weis, Weseen and Wong, 2000). Accordingly, each participant was provided with an oral overview of the research proposed, and instructed as to process, risk, confidentiality and withdrawal. Participants were also provided time to ask questions and to consider consent. Finally, written consent to participate was obtained using the standard IRB form and protocol. I documented the consent process in detail.

Participants’ anonymity was protected by the use of aliases in our public materials. Consent forms and all raw materials (including coded data) which contain identifying information are being kept in a locked file accessible by only myself. The records will be retained for a period of three years after which identifying information will be destroyed. In the case of electronic records (which I also printed out), the same procedures are being employed with two additional safeguards: electronic records are protected by a password which is known
only to me and the records have been permanently deleted. Participants were apprised that only those individuals employed as a transcriptionist, peer reviewer or doctoral committee member were privy (in limited fashion) to their confidential information at any given time.
Chapter 4: TEACHERS’ INITIAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CITIZEN AND TEACHING FOR CITIZENSHIP IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Before I can address how teachers’ conceptualizations changed or didn’t change and why, it is important to assess their initial constructs of citizen and their initial understandings of educating for citizenship. First, a “before” narrative profile of each teacher is presented in order to help the reader get to know each participant individually. This is important as this study concluded that each teacher’s unique conceptualizations were connected to their identities. Second, readers’ theatre is used to illustrate the tensions that the teachers experienced with the concepts of global citizen and global citizenship. A brief but close examination of these tensions is important to the study as tensions had to be managed or resolved in order for the teachers to re-conceptualize ‘citizen’ and teaching for citizenship.

I ask the reader to consider the teachers’ initial conceptualizations in tandem with the tensions, and later with their newly evolving understandings of TCGW. Our story of changing or not changing is a post-modern tale. The tensions were representative of threats and possibilities posed to teachers’ personal identities as each tension was perceived and filtered through their “citizen lenses.” Our change was like identity—it was partial, never fully known, and always in motion. As critical theory contends that citizenship is historically, racially, and socially constructed, and we learn that teachers had something to gain or lose as they altered their identity. While our tale is post-modern in its embrace of the idiosyncratic, the partial, and the temporal, it is also critical as it questions traditional citizenship or the “status quo.”
The study concludes that teachers change their conceptualizations of TCGW by shifting and altering their identities—identities formed among centuries of creating “us” and “them” as a part of our “identity DNA.”

Recall that this study addressed the following research sub-questions:

A. In what new ways do they construct their own concept of citizen?

B. What new understandings of educating for citizenship do they develop for themselves?

In the beginning, while noting teachers’ constructions varied, it is fair to say that (A) teachers thought themselves to be American citizens in the traditional, legal sense of the term. To varying degrees, each teacher also related their concept of citizen to the larger world. This relationship ranged from a duty to help others in need to being a good neighbor to contemplating a global kinship. The teachers experienced many tensions with the concept of global citizen, and it was important to manage or overcome these tensions in order to re-conceptualize citizenship education.

The teachers’ initial understandings of educating for citizenship (B) were linked to their concepts of citizen. While the teachers reported the importance of preparing students to think critically, voice their perspectives, and in some cases take action, the teachers were largely preparing students for citizenship in the United States. Given what we know about traditional citizenship education and its disconnection to minority students, one can argue the degree to which students were being taught for citizenship at all.
“Before” Narratives

The following sections are devoted to and named for each of the co-researchers. Participants member-checked my understandings of them, helping to validate the baseline from which we would assess our change. These narrative introductions were written fairly early in our research process, but that doesn’t mean they aren’t corrupted by my biases.

Specific data were selected from the larger corpus based on its demonstrative power (I believed it would best describe participants’ conceptualizations) and for its evocative power (I believed it would create some amount of “mental unrest” on the part of the reader, potentially fostering change). The actual writing process began with my selection of one quote from each participant that I felt exemplified how they were responding to the research sub-questions, up to and at that point and time. I then allowed the data to tell me a story through reading and re-reading the selected data, and I subsequently organized the data and interpretation mimicking the storyline I created in my mind.

Mary

I have both views, I think we’re a citizen of the country but we’re also a citizen of the world.

Mary is a 12th grade government teacher at a high school in an upper-middle-class suburb of Covey County. Mary explained upon our initial meeting that her school was undergoing significant reform in order to better prepare students for the twenty-first century. In her words, she is engaged in a battle whereby some of her peers embrace a movement toward experience or service-based learning while others cling tightly to delivery of content-based knowledge. Mary’s story is interesting in that as she engaged in our critical focus group
discussions around TCGW, her school-based discussions sometimes mirrored the same questions and dilemmas.

*I don’t know if it’s the political, citizenship battle kind of thing or if it’s just a philosophical battle, but it’s very interesting because it’s a tough place to be. There are people with content, content—and that’s all they need to know. Then there are others who feel like there are other things out there; you don’t have to teach from the beginning of time.* (Mary)

Mary explains the extent of the staff division when she relays that some teachers dislike her and are furious with her personally because she has helped to bring about change. She has been integral to ushering in senior projects that she is confident empowers students to more fully stretch their intellect and sense of agency, more fully developing as human beings. Mary asks herself at one point in the initial interview, however, “*Why did I bring this change? Why did I think this was important?*” This kind of questioning is indicative of Mary’s inquiry stance throughout our journey.

Mary’s rendition of herself as a citizen is intertwined with her identity as a teacher. She explains that she always knew she wanted to be a teacher and that she felt a sense of duty. Mary is a woman of faith whose notions of citizenship are bound up with service to others. She also expresses her comfort with the political process noting that her mother has run for elected office. Mary toggles back and forth between expressing the concept of citizen in a traditional sense (an individual having rights and responsibilities within the confines of the nation-state) to a more expansive concept in which we are all citizens of the world with duties to help those in need.

For example, when asked how she describes her role in preparing students for citizenship in a globalized world, she shares that she wants to give students opportunities to feel empowered to participate and to give them knowledge and skills in the basics of government,
for instance, the voting process. But Mary also describes the animosity that exists in her classroom, how little understanding and respect many majority students have for first generation American students and generally for any minority inside or outside of the school. She recounts her efforts trying to “rock the world” of her privileged students by bringing in information that runs contrary to their present beliefs and asking them what they make of things.

At one point Mary declares, “I think that you’re a citizen of the world. I think that’s important. I think sometimes people do… I don’t know.” Data demonstrated early on that Mary is not quite clear about her conceptualizations. The following outtake illustrates Mary’s internal struggle surrounding conceiving of herself as a citizen, and in particular as a citizen in relation to others.

Lisa: Who is a citizen?

Mary: Everyone. I think, honestly, you don’t have to be 18 to be a citizen. Every person.

Lisa: Every person? And I’m drawing borders here with my fingers (making a box). Every person in the US is a citizen? Every person in the world is a citizen? I could ask that another way, I said who is a citizen—I could also ask you who is not a citizen.

Mary: I kind of have. It’s easy to look at who is not… I have both views I think, we’re a citizen of the country but we’re also a citizen of the world. So depending on what things are going on, you have things to do for this county, but also you have a responsibility and a place in the world, you have to see that, those two places. I guess it kind of depends on the issue too. I don’t know that I see that there should be one-world government; I think that we do need to cooperate and be aware of a world, not just the US. But in terms of who is not a citizen? That’s a tough question. If you look at people as people, it’s easy to say in a general sense, those people don’t deserve to have health care cause they’re not a citizen, they don’t deserve to have an education or this or that, but if you were actually to sit down or see someone it would be pretty tough to deny someone something, if you were face to face, or you knew their personal story or you knew—Then there’s also limited resources. So it’s how much stuff is there and how many things are there—I see that we have a need to look at things in terms—I don’t know how to answer this question. I don’t know what I want to say on this. I can see it from all different sides, on how things should be… I’m kind of like—it’s a twisty-turning answer, kind of a non-answer. (Mary)
Am I a member of the world? Yes. Am I a participant of it? Yes. Am I a citizen of it? No.

Vick teaches tenth-grade history and AP History at an urban high school in the Futura city schools district. Vick, who has 10 years experience as a teacher, is in his late fifties; he came into teaching later as a result of concurrent soul-searching and the downsizing and closing of businesses in an industry where he had worked most of his life.

Vick carries a self-described working class attitude towards his government, explaining that he grew up in a rural area surrounded by poverty. He experienced high school during the Vietnam War and later the Watergate scandal. This unique time in history fostered in Vick a willingness to question his government, and he harbors a certain wariness of politicians in general. Vick believes his personal history had an effect on making him the person he is today, and he believes his students will also be affected by their own personal histories.

Lisa: What if any is the relationship between identity and citizenship education?

Vick: That’s actually a very good question. You’re going to have an identity and that identity is going to be forged by those that you are active with and things you assume, simply because who you are, what you’ve experienced. After I started teaching—I teach in a school that is predominately African-American. We also have a large number of immigrants. Because of that my identity as a citizen has shifted. I can no longer just look at things from that white, native, protestant, Christian aspect because I see the effects that actions my local, state and federal government has upon people who don’t look like me, don’t come from the same background as me, don’t fit the same socio-economic status as me, and are of a grossly different age group than what I am…

Vick goes on to provide a specific example of how his identity was altered by a conversation with a (former) successful student, whom he heard was not going to college. In the course of questioning her decision, he realized she wasn’t a legal citizen.
That one incident immediately changed my identity, the recognition of the plight of illegal aliens in our country came home to roost because it wasn’t just numbers, it wasn’t just faceless people. It was somebody I knew. In my opinion, identity is indeed what citizenship is all about. (Vick)

Despite Vick’s attunement to the importance of identity as illustrated above, his own tightly held identity as a member of the working class sometimes works to limit the horizons of his students. On one occasion, Vick was explaining how he approached teaching the Gilded Age.

“Most teachers teach the Gilded Age from the viewpoint of your Astor, your Carnegies, your Rockefellers. I like labor history, I teach it from the aspect of the workers. The Gilded Age wasn’t very gilded for the workers.” When I asked him if he might consider teaching the Gilded Age from multiple perspectives, his reply illuminated the borders imposed on his students. “I could cover all the angles, but part of that thing is going to be limited by what your content is, what the time allotted is and also which direction you think—If I was teaching in a very affluent area where the majority of the kids were going to go into business, I would probably be teaching it from the aspect of Astor.” I inquired, “Why is that? I’m curious?”

Why is that? I’m teaching kids who more than likely are going to be workers. My kids are living at or below the poverty line. The likelihood of them going out and being entrepreneurs may be one in a million. Telling this time of history from J.D. Rockefeller’s point of view, they can’t relate to. They can relate to the exploitation of the worker that was going on because that’s what they feel. So if I want them to identify with the history and become more interested in the history, and to learn the best way to learn it, which is on their own, not relying on me to teach it, going out and learning, they have to identify. That’s my philosophy of why I do it that way. (Vick)

Vick describes his role as teaching history to teach kids where our country comes from, teaching geography to give students an idea of the world at large, teaching economics and government so that students are enabled to make decisions as adults. Foreshadowing what would later become’s Vick emphasis on interaction, he stated that such decisions would extend
to how his students’ lives interact with others and how their lives will be affected and need to affect the government.

When initially asked how he saw himself as a citizen he replied “It’s a question I’ve never really thought about. As a citizen I see myself as having, obviously rights, and along with those rights go certain responsibilities. Responsibilities towards my government, not only federal government but also state and local government. Also responsibilities to my fellow citizens. Responsibilities of respect and I guess, responsibilities to the common good.”

During the initial interview, the data seemed to illustrate that Vick conceptualized himself as a citizen of the U.S., but that he may also have leanings toward the global conception of citizen as well. It wasn’t until his thoughts were in a push-pull with other co-researchers that clarity emerged in terms of how he viewed himself, specifically in relation to others.

By definition, I can live in a country and not be a citizen of that country. Arguably up until 1920, women were citizens of the US yet they weren’t because they didn’t have full and equal rights, not that they have full and equal rights today, but at least recognized governmental rights to vote. For me to say I’m a citizen of the world, the whole term needs to be defined. Am I a member of the world? Yes. Am a participant of it? Yes. Am I a citizen? No. (Vick)

Ed

I am an American first, not an Italian first.

Ed is an eighth-grade American History teacher in a quasi-rural district. Ed also came into teaching later in life, and is now just a few years away from retirement. Ed’s conceptualization of teaching for citizenship was influenced by a teacher that made him love history, and another whose personal style was to keep students on their toes; always making him think. Ed himself focuses on teaching students to stand up, to let people know what they’re
thinking, and being aware of others’ agendas. Ed explains that he models what he wants from his students, and he emphasizes the question “why not do the right thing?” The importance of freedom of speech, voting and personal responsibility figure prominently in his explanations regarding the purpose of citizenship education.

*My thought was and it’s always been, that schooling was to make our students better citizens. All schooling was to make our students better citizens. We got away from that. Now it’s to give knowledge.* (Ed)

When I asked him how he saw himself as a citizen, he responded concisely: “As a citizen, I’m informed. I take part and I do what I think is necessary as a citizen’s supposed to. Pure and simple.” When I asked if he saw himself as a citizen of the nation-state or world he replied that he was a citizen “of the U.S. which is part of the whole world, living in and what we deal with in the whole world. My mom has only had a 3rd grade education. When she got up in age, she would always complain about people calling themselves Italian-American, African-American. She goes, no, I’m an American with Italian descent. That’s what I call myself, an American with Italian descent.” I then asked him to tell me more about his choice of words.

*I am an American first, not an Italian first... her mother came here in 1916 and her dad came here before 1916. My grandmother came here illegally because she was younger than what she said she was, no one knew that. She died when she was 60 some years old. I feel proud to be an Italian.* (Ed)

Ed goes on to explain his love of the language (he knows and uses a few words) and emphasizes how proud he is of his heritage, adding that “everyone should be proud of who they are.” His childhood was influenced by his mother who couldn’t read, and Ed has memories of reading the ballots to her in the booth. His conceptualization of citizen and citizenship is deeply rooted in his family’s experience coming to America, and thus he stresses an order of loyalty as an issue of importance.
My family, who are immigrants, everyone was, I know directly they were, they went though a process and they made it and they decided to be an American citizen. We’re one of the few countries in the world that allow people to come in and do what they want to do. Other people are very restrictive and we’re not. So I think being from an Italian descent, some insight somewhat, I think if you want to be an Italian, fine, if you want to be an American, fine, but you no longer back the Italians against the Americans. You may be feeling good about it but if something happens, you’ve got to make a decision. Can’t have a knife in one arm and a gun in the other and shoot both directions. (Ed)

Ed does believe you can have multiple loyalties, but that “when push comes to shove, you’ve got to pick one.” He explains that it’s “like loving two people, you get married, you have to get married to one, you can’t pick both, you’ve got to choose one. Once you’ve made that decision, the other one has to take second, it’s got to take second.”

Ed’s self-conceptualization as a citizen in relation to others manifests itself as being a good neighbor when you can, but prioritization of loyalties is clear.

We’re global citizens in the sense yeah, because we live in a world as a world. But I’ve got to preface that by saying I look out for number one first. That’s if your neighbor’s house is on fire, yeah, you want to help, but you better make sure there’s water on your house. So yeah, you want to help, but at the sake of having you being burned down, no, I’m sorry, I am very sorry, I’m going to take care of me first. (Ed)

As we move to the readers’ theatre to explore tensions, it’s helpful to think about the different positions the teachers take up along the spectrum of self-as-citizen and their understandings regarding citizenship education. What will Mary decide? What keeps her from more fully committing to TCGW? What’s your reading of Vick? Will Ed remain predominantly committed to the traditional, national conceptualization of teaching for citizenship?

Readers Theatre: Tensions

This section uses readers’ theatre to re-present the tensions we identified in the course
of working to evolve our conceptualizations of TCGW. These tensions came to the surface very early, beginning with “before” interviews and our first group discussion. The tensions were named or called tensions within the context of our dialogue. As the facilitator, I captured/listed each tension (loss of identity, distribution of resources, universal versus culturally relevant rights and creation of a one-world government) and recycled them back into discussion pointedly so that we might unpack their meaning and our respective understandings. This section like others was shared with co-researchers for editing, comment and critique. Ostensibly, we all agreed on the tensions that were identified amongst various group members.

The theatre is presented in four short acts, each act corresponding to a major point of tension identified in the data. The tensions provide a window into the incongruence experienced between individuals’ identities and global citizenship as they then understood the concept.

Loss of Identity

Recall from the literature reviewed in chapter two that citizenship is more than legal status; it is a feeling of belonging (Osler and Starkey, 2002). Personal identities and feelings are bound together, and all individuals—such as the participating teachers—require a context, places or ways to belong less they feel disempowered (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003). The following act displays tension around the loss of American identity through two lenses. While Vick was concerned that a loss of American jobs resulting from globalization constitutes a loss of American identity, Mary was concerned that we don’t know our true American identity because we don’t know others (Nussbaum, 1996).
Vick: Look at Gary. Where did all these jobs go? Where did the steel go? The steel is no longer being produced here. Where is it being produced? Well it’s globally produced. Look at Detroit. Why have the jobs all gone out of Detroit? Well, because up until the early 1960’s we only bought American cars. You begin to introduce others, something has to go. What happened to the jobs? What happened to the wealth? What happened to the security? It’s gone.

Mary: I was reading the Nussbaum article and what resonated with me is that, yes, we are citizens of the world. What I wrote in my journal was that we are ignorant if we don’t know it. We don’t see ourselves or we don’t know ourselves as well if we don’t know the world. That really resonated with me, because I think that’s an American issue.

Vick: I see products made all over the world it breaks my heart, because products that are made elsewhere put people out of work here. Globalization results in lost identity... You’re no longer unique. You’re just the same. Do I have to be the same as everybody else? And is that a good thing?

Mary: I think the ideal would be that we would be able to solve the issues that cross borders. I understand what you’re saying but ideally I would like to think that you would still be able to maintain what makes your culture unique... but we would all be able to be aware of each other because the circles are closer, the world is closer so we could solve these problems but we also have differing beliefs and cultures that... there are some fundamental differences.

Vick: The closeness can also create new problems.

Mary: This may be a dumb thing to say, but obviously we always feel like we are the leaders. Maybe in the future we’ll be just another player and not the leaders, and maybe that’s something we need to help our—you may shoot arrows at me—I don’t know if I really believe this or not, but maybe we’re just another player in the decision making process. We’re not the top dog, we’re just a part of the game. Part of the reason we have such a problem in the Middle East is because we have no clue about the history or the issues. We have no idea of the backgrounds of people’s lives and we go in there and we... do our thing and then leave and the people hate us, well why? If we had some understanding of people’s culture or perspective we might have a done a better job in terms of dealing with issues and maybe things may be better off. If we weren’t number one “yeah we gotta be top dog...” I don’t know...

In this scene we see Vick associate the loss of jobs with globalization, and globalization with the loss of identity. For Vick, global citizenship is an endorsement of globalization which he interprets as an attack on his own working class identity. This scene raises the question of whether Vick’s not wanting to be the same as everyone else has to do with maintaining
his/America’s wealth, and therefore privilege. For Mary, however, American identity cannot be found in terms of jobs, but in self-knowledge and reflection. Mary believes she can only come to see herself more clearly when she sees our American ways in relation to those of others around the globe (Nussbaum, 1996). Mary suggests that America needs a new identity if it’s going to pursue improved connections with the world.

Universal Versus Culturally Relevant Rights

The following act illustrates tension with the concept of global citizenship in that the term is understood by Vick and Ed to embrace culturally relevant over universal rights. They oppose global citizenship insofar as it would mean no act or thing could be deemed wrong. Global citizenship education is often viewed as promoting respect and sympathy based on a relativistic approach to culture (Burack, 2003) so this tension may be shared by others—particularly since September 11th where the roots of deep philosophical divides have been well tended (Appiah, 2006). Mary opens the scene by articulating the tension.

Mary: I think one that definitely would be a tension would be that global citizenship education means that somebody’s value would have to be right and nobody has a right to say what’s right in global citizenship. Figuring out whose value system is the correct value system? So who gets to determine? We stand for certain human values, justice, fairness, who determines that? As soon as you step outside the US and you go to the UN, you’re stepping on US sovereignties, and people, no, uh-huh. I think this would be a struggle and a challenge, interesting discussion and debate, not necessarily a right or wrong answer. I can see people saying, ahh, forget it.

Vick: What you’re talking about is what was covered in the Treaty of Versailles and self-determination. As citizens of the world, if a nation, if a group of people—first of all is it our responsibility to grant them self-determination? And if in that self-determination they decide that they are going to do their culture work best if they oppress a certain subset, females—whatever, in their culture, then as citizens of the world... must we step back and allow that to happen because they too are citizens of the world?
Ed: I’ve always been someone who does what he thinks is right. I may not be the most liberal person in the world, I may be somewhat conservative. When I was reading all this stuff, the thing that was going through my head was people better realize there are bad people out there that don’t give a care about what other people think and you’re not going to change them, I’m sorry. It’s all great what you’re saying we should take care of and be— I do that, I do that all the time, but there are people who don’t give a care. You’re not going to change that.

Vick: This goes back to the question I asked last time we met which was if we’re going to view ourselves as global citizens and if all people are citizens of the world, then all views have to have some validity. If that’s what you’re looking at, if all views have validity, then if a woman has to be totally covered, isn’t allowed to drive, isn’t allowed to do whatever, then I can’t question that. That has to be allowed to be right.

Ed: For themselves.

Vick: Right. Which throws out the concept of human rights. Because the concept of human rights says somebody judges what’s right and what’s wrong. What’s right and what’s wrong is what’s right and wrong in my world.

In this scene Vick and Ed are rejecting global citizenship as they believe it means human rights are then culturally determined, which doesn’t have to be the case. If one looks critically at the exchange, it suggests that some values might be attributed to whole groups of people or nations. This perception denies the richness and variance of values one might find in any given culture or nation, including our own. The American “culture” is likely thought to be homogeneous.

Resources

In this act, the co-researchers explored the tension associated with the notion that global citizenship would involve redistributing the world’s resources. While there is support for a form of global citizenship which entails duties, for instance, to contribute money to a fund for global redistribution (Van Den Anker, 2002), that is not always the case. Albeit, redistribution of
resources herein was assumed to be necessary in order to make the world more equitable.

Vick’s theory regarding global citizenship and redistribution of resources is that the rich will be robbed in order to give to the poor— and he questions this proposition. Ed agrees and expresses the naturalness of national loyalty while Mary struggles to reconcile a limitation of resources from the plight of individuals in need.

Vick: We had a little situation in class today. We’re in the cold war and a question came up about leadership, world leadership. I said, white men. An African-American girl speaks up. I said white men have run the world for hundreds of years. And she said but they’ve done such a bad job of it. I said no, it’s worked really well for white men. We have no interest in changing it. It’s worked well for us. She said that’s not right! I said, not right for who? That’s what you have to look at. Not right for who? For those in power it works fine, to say they should do things differently is to say you should give some of what you’ve worked so hard for to somebody else, that’s not in their nature.

Lisa: Tell me more. What do you mean?

Vick: I wrote down rob from the rich and give to the poor? That’s what they are saying here. If we’re going to teach global citizenship, you put your energy to better these other nations it has to come at a cost of somebody, generally it’s going to come at the cost from your own. Last time we talked about labor unions. Who suffers, if we transfer our industry to other nations? You don’t do anything to hurt yourself to better somebody else unless it’s an extreme circumstance. There are those that would give their lives to save somebody else, but as a rule you’re not going to take food out of your own child’s mouth to feed somebody else. There’s a difference between teaching somebody to farm and instead giving them your Birdseye plant.

Mary: I wonder if you can teach this, teach the market principles? There’s a lot of information about micro-financing and that whole movement. So can you teach global citizenship and push free market values? Can those things be taught together?

Vick: This isn’t in one of the articles, I apologize, but I’m going to say it anyway. Shortly after the earthquake in Haiti, one of my students, African-American girl, she said why are we doing this? Why are we sending all these people and stuff to Haiti? What have they done for us? When I first heard that, I’m thinking, what an extremely narrow minded attitude. But if we’re all global citizens, in effect, what have they done for us? If we’re going to look at global citizenship, and we’re all part of the same thing, we can no longer look at it as one nation has more, it’s up to them to always be giving.

Ed: We just brought this up in class today, we went over the word nationalism and we explained what it is. Extreme loyalty to one’s nation. I said, you need to understand that our talking
heads, that seem to be on television or radio, seem to think it’s an American problem, that we
are the most nationalistic. It’s been done through the ages, everyone has done it. I don’t care,
we’re not either all good or all bad, no one is, you need to understand that. Everybody has an
agenda.

Vick: It’s inherent in human beings to be exclusive, to be elite, and to struggle for control of
resources. To me it’s naïve to think that we will ever get to the point where we will be citizens of
the world and all the resources and all the wealth and everything will be divided evenly. Marx
suggested that and you know how well that turned out.

Mary: If you look at people as people, it’s easy to say in a general sense, those people don’t
deserve to have health care ‘cause they’re not a citizen. They don’t deserve to have an education
or this or that. But if you were to actually to sit down or see someone it would be pretty tough to
deny someone something. If you were face to face, or you knew their personal story or you
knew—Then there’s also limited resources. So it’s how much stuff is there and how many things
are there—I don’t know how to answer this question.

The overlap among the tensions becomes more evident in this act. For Vick, whose
identity is tied to a love and defense of the working class, it’s almost as if America has already
begun to redistribute its wealth. None of the teachers reference the United States’ role in
creating or maintaining an inequitable world, historically or otherwise. Vick’s statement
suggesting that all nations become ‘givers’ assumes circumstances that are somehow equal. We
see that global citizenship and global citizenship education will be rejected at this point (except
maybe in Mary’s case) because it appears to call for the unprivileging of those perhaps with the
most to lose.

One-World Government

This short act expresses the teachers’ tension with the idea of a one-world government
which they assumed to varying degrees was a tenet of global citizenship. This assumption
flowed from the perception that citizenship defines a legal relationship between a person and a
government entity (Dower, 2002). The teachers believed that if a citizen of a nation has rights
and responsibilities in regard to her nation, then a global citizen would have rights and responsibilities in regard to the world. The teachers believed helping other nations (within the context of global citizenship) to resolve their problems might mean consenting to one-world governance.

Below, a discussion regarding helping Haiti ensues. The one-world signs Ed references are displayed in central Ohio neighborhoods populated in recent years by Somali immigrants.

**Mary:** We have a responsibility probably because we’re better off than much of the world. So what are some solutions that we can look at to help solve that problem? I don’t think that one-world is where I want to go either.

**Vick:** I look at the Haiti thing as the evil isn’t that it happened, the evil is that the nations that were wealthy haven’t been doing anything for the last 50 years to help an extremely poor country. In order for so much of what they’re saying to work, you are almost looking at a one-world government.

**Ed:** Yeah, I know it.

**Vick:** My politics have gone to the left most of my life, but there is a lot of this reading that is extremely Marxist.

**Ed:** Drive down to East North Broadway and you see signs on the side: One World signs. I have, that’s fine, but you’ve got to take care of number one first. You’ve got to take care of yourself first before you can do for others.

**Vick:** Perception is reality. If your perception of citizenship is tied to the legal, then when you start talking about global citizenship, it is definitely going to be one-world government.

In reviewing this act, I wonder if the teachers fear loss of privilege as Americans, should a one-world government emerge? Again, these teachers of history do not reference the legacies of colonialism. What, in their minds, accounts for the world’s inequities? It seems global citizenship and global citizenship education will be resisted if they remain equated with one-world government.
Recall that the purpose of these short acts was to quickly *invite* the reader into the tensions of loss of identity, distribution of resources, universal versus culturally relevant rights and one-world government as the teachers experience them—not to resolve them. The task was to point out these serious problems exist. I assert that tensions such as these keep teachers from teaching for global citizenship. No amount of global citizenship education curricula or professional development is going to substantially alter these teachers’ practices when they fundamentally disagree with global citizenship itself. The next chapter of findings returns to these tensions within the context of the evolution of the teachers’ new conceptualizations of TCGW.
Chapter 5: DIMENSIONS OF NEW CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CITIZEN AND TEACHING FOR CITIZENSHIP IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

In the last chapter, I shared the tensions that the co-researchers held with their initial conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW). The tensions (loss of identity, distribution of resources, universal versus culturally relevant rights and one-world government) would have to be leveraged, resolved or at least managed in order for new dimensions of TCGW to emerge. In this chapter, we see the teachers constructing new dimensions of a re-conceptualized citizenship education. The major themes/dimensions identified through constant-comparative analysis were citizenship-as-identity and belonging, citizenship-as-connection, citizenship-as-empowerment, and citizenship-as-relation. The teachers’ identities were key to their change. The findings indicate that 1) teachers change their conceptualizations of TCGW by shifting or recreating their identities and 2) teachers’ identities are locations of agency for global citizenship/education.

Citizenship-as-Identity and Belonging

While loss of identity was a tension in the readers’ theatre, identity and belonging was established as a central theme in the teachers’ evolving conceptualizations of TCGW. The teachers’ understanding of the concept of citizen shifted from a purely legal concept to a membership-based concept. A critical stance helped the teachers to uncover their
epistemologies and ontologies regarding the concept, and they empowered themselves to reconstruct the concept of citizen.

Identities were established as sites of agency where students might find ways to connect to fellow citizens locally and/or globally, and places where teachers could take action to connect to their students. The questions “Who am I?” and “How do I fit in?” became the basis for the teachers’ evolving understandings of TCGW (citizenship based on identification and membership with others) only after the tension with the legal conceptualization was resolved. While the teachers were discussing the importance of identity to students’ sense of citizenship, their own identities were sites of agency where they took action in shifting and reshaping their own identities as citizens to accommodate new and different conceptualizations of TCGW.

In the following section you will witness both Vick and Mary’s breakthroughs regarding citizenship-as-identity and belonging, noting that Ed’s movement was slight. The readings spawned evocative questions and were key to Vick and Mary’s movement, as was evidenced by Vick’s “throwing out the lesson plan” and Mary’s connecting the readings to events at her school. Below Vick recounts his initial breakthrough upon reading “Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: Theoretical Debates and Young People’s Experiences” by Osler and Starkey (2003). Vick discovers that underpinning a new dimension of citizenship is the notion of inclusiveness, and that our present idea of citizenship fails on this mark (Lister, 2008).
coming from where I’m coming from. It talks about in democratic states, “citizens are constitutionally entitled to equal rights, to participate in, to influence government, however, there’s discrimination that goes on in every one of these democratic nations,” so what it sets out to do, it doesn’t do. (Vick)

Vick explained that the communities in the article resembled Forest Hill which is comprised of very diverse working class people. This observation was key to the resonance Vick experienced. Vick’s personal identity as a member of the working class and the similar identity he projects onto his students was reflected back to him in this article. During his initial interview Vick had explained that he, like his favorite historical hero Eugene Debs, “viewed America as a social experiment that had the theoretical possibility of being perfect but the historical reality as being far from that.” The article spoke to Vick’s identity as a working-class man in noting that America doesn’t always do what it sets out to do in terms of equality. Vick’s personal connection to the reading opened the door to new consciousness, and he saw that citizenship could be based on something more than legal status.

In the next segment, Vick states that to deny students’ many identities is to deny them citizenship, and he is shifting his own concept of citizen to include identification with others based on nothing more than “fate.” Vick is becoming aware of his previous generalizations and uncritical acceptance of the status quo. In true critical form, he constructs new knowledge for himself.

I began to think of my classrooms, my eighth period class today we were talking about— I have three Hispanic kids. One from Mexico, one from Honduras, one from El Salvador. To lump them as Hispanic is to deny their citizenship. I’m building towards something here that was kind of an epiphany that came from reading this. When the earthquake happened in Haiti, yes, it affected us all because we’re human beings. It affected us at Forest Hill more maybe than other places because we have Haitian students who couldn’t get contact with their grandparents. Turns out they were all fine. We had become, because of our relationship with these students, citizens of Haiti. It was that overlapping community of fate. I like that term, fate. It’s not like we had
anything to do with it, but it talks about accepting personal responsibility, and recognizing the importance of civic commitment. (Vick)

Vick clearly states that to deny students’ particular identities is to deny them citizenship, indicating again that identity and citizenship are integrally linked. We can surmise that to deny Vick his identity is also to deny him his citizenship—which is why Vick has resisted global citizenship up to this point. Vick’s personal identity as a working class man is preserved even as his identity shifts and re-forms to take on an identification as a global citizen or member of a “community of fate.” Vick’s change is pronounced as he moves beyond this new understanding to the realm of action, the goal of critical theory. In this exemplar, Vick works with his community of students to construct new knowledge, confront problems, and begin to take action to transform their world.

First period I had a class yesterday, they did some bookwork. Second period I read this article. Third period I threw the lesson plan out and we started something new. I started out by asking my students, what does it mean to be a citizen? The kids pretty much all said to be connected to the government, have rights, there’s laws. I shared with them, I agree with you and six weeks ago I would have said you are absolutely, positively right. But there’s more, what other type of citizenship is there? One of my kids said you can be a citizen of your neighborhood. That hit the nail on the head. The neighborhood has no political entity. There are no rights, there is no government, there are no laws for a neighborhood. We came up with citizenship is also membership. If you’re a member of this group, then you are a citizen of this group, even though there’s no legal definition of this group. If you’re a member of Forest Hill High School, you’re a citizen of Forest Hill High School. If you live on the earth, you’re a citizen of the world. So we came up with, for us, a new understanding of citizenship, not tied to anything except what you’re a member of. (Vick)

Vick then put students in groups to explore the negative and positive aspects of their high school and gave them the task of beginning an action plan for change:

One kid said one of the issues was the bathrooms aren’t clean. (Vick asked) As citizens how do we deal with that? (The student replied) We hire more custodians. Is that what a citizen would do? Make the custodians we have clean them better? (Student) Oh, we clean them ourselves! In their discussions it quit being I, or it quit being they, and it became we. If the answer to dirty bathrooms is we clean the bathrooms, then what’s the answer to global warming? It’s not you, it’s we. It blew me away, it absolutely blew me away. (Vick)
Critical theorists note that the concept of citizenship is historically and racially constructed, and that the legal basis of citizenship has been used to marginalize people of color, for instance, and to maintain a system of power and privilege for whites. Vick’s movement to embrace the personal and cultural aspects of citizenship, therefore, represents critical change.

Building on Vick’s enthusiasm, Mary relayed a breakthrough by virtue of reading research which reported on American students in a large U.S. city who, she said, primarily identified themselves as Palestinian.

*It was a lot about their identity, in terms of how they felt as citizens and where they belonged and I thought that was fascinating. When they were asked they would say they were Palestinian and that was very, very important to them. To me I was looking at this, ‘cause I was wondering how important that sense of identity was, your connection to your nations. What I got out of this is clearly you want to belong to something and connect to something. I think that we all feel that. What I seem to be picking up is when we have students in our classes that come from other nations, we need to be aware of that. They often times struggle in terms of their identity. They have a dual identity. (Mary)*

Mary’s conceptualization of citizen appears to be evolving as she connects the welcoming or alienation of student identity as key to students’ sense of belonging. Mary applies her new understanding of identity to question her school’s recent move to support U.S. troops by displaying pictures of past students serving in the military overseas on the school walls.

*It didn’t dawn on me, the perspective of our Arab students, this may be a struggle, their side, how they view this war. Here we have these pictures and this perspective of the war and it never even dawned on me how they might perceive this support and, I’m not saying that it’s right or wrong, but you know, we were really like glorifying these soldiers. To some of these kids that could very well have a different connotation and perspective. I never even, this kind of made me think… There’s going to be kids in our classroom that struggle with— that’s just one example. (Mary)*

Of course Mary’s students may or may not struggle with how they view the war, or may agree or disagree with military action abroad on a variety of grounds. However, what’s
significant here is Mary’s recognition that multiple perspectives may exist, and more importantly that the perspectives may be tied to the very personal and important ways we self-identify and belong or not-belong.

It’s not clear if Mary’s choice of words “students in our classes that come from other nations” is a verbal misstep, a habitual inclination to view students different than herself as not being native American citizens, or if the words are reflective of the students in her school.

Mary is in the process of gaining a better understanding of herself as a result of increasing her understanding of others—one of the goals she expressed around loss of identity in the readers’ theatre. As Mary increases her understanding of others, she shifts and re-forms her identity to accommodate not only new knowledge, but new ways of being a citizen. When Mary’s identity shifts, it then becomes a new/different location for agency. In this case Mary’s action-taking in regards to TCGW is changing.

While Ed also reported on a research study, his experience with the session’s literature was different. Ed found his related article which discussed students as already being global citizens to be invalid—believing that researchers could spin things however they desired. However, Ed’s words in a subsequent session indicate that he may have been impacted in some small way by the group’s discussion of identity and citizenship. The following excerpt is Ed’s reflection on his degree of change during a group member check-in. From the first session forward I reiterated that change may or may not happen, and that I could not change them; only they could create new understandings for themselves. Further, I made it clear that searching one’s own conceptualization and becoming more resolute in its construction was as enviable a goal as any other.
Lisa: I want to be really clear about this. If there is no change—

Ed: There is none.

Lisa: Then that’s perfectly fine because this is authentically what does or doesn’t happen to one being in the group. So...

Ed: As of right now, the only thing that has changed is in the sense that I’m more tolerant of those who are different, okay. Let’s say that much. I’m more tolerant. I’ve always been tolerant, just now I’m more tolerant. I see where they come from, from the students I’ve met, from the students that have been different from me. I had one last year that was a Muslim, and he was a great kid. I learned from him to, how I present what I want to present. Therefore I now do this, I make whatever I do fit, even if that person was there but he’s not. Therefore I’m aware that there’s people who are different, therefore that’s how I teach.

Lisa: So that’s becoming as we—

Ed: On the surface.

Lisa: Work through the sessions?

Ed: Yes.

Lisa: You’re going a little deeper in that sense.

Ed: On the surface, it just happens now. I don’t even think about it. Once I accept what I need to do, then I do it. I don’t hem and haw, I just do it. I like to do things like that on a daily basis. That’s how I conduct my classroom. To do it wide-open but understand there are differences, Viva la difference.

Ed reported that his reflection wasn’t deep, it was more automatic and instantly acted upon. Ed’s reference to his Muslim student, whom he called “Lamp,” potentially represents some amount of deeper reflection on his responses in our initial interview. Ed’s American identity has always encompassed some limited mixture of parochialism and a conservative form of cosmopolitanism, and this might help explain the ease by which he reinvents his understandings. It is also plausible that the “change” reported was simply superficial.
At a different point in our inquiry, I asked the group to warm-up by thinking about the many ways of conceptualizing citizenship. I asked that they consider commonalities and differences, and that they begin to sketch out “what things might look like.” It was an occasion where the co-researchers gathered around the table with markers and chart paper, and I was purposefully silent for fifteen minutes. A deep discussion ensued with Vick and Mary re-confirming their commitment to citizenship-as-identity and belonging while Ed’s tension regarding loss of identity was amplified. It becomes clearer that Ed relates any changes in his concept of citizen to changes in his own identity. Identity emerges as a location of agency, with Ed taking action to resist a new or reformed identification as citizen.

Mary begins by clarifying Ed’s thoughts and asks for his approval. “Here’s national and then once you’re done with that, you can then start talking about the global?” She draws a hierarchy of the two circles to capture Ed’s conceptualization.

You can’t help your neighbor until you make sure your house is in order. Yeah, you’ll go help your neighbor when there’s an emergency. That’s not the question. It’s the ongoing daily situation you have to look at. (Ed)

Ed suggests that he’s willing to help others which allows him to maintain his privileged status without appearing uncompassionate. The notion of being a good neighbor is deeply embedded in Ed’s identity, and he regularly uses it as a valid response to the obvious inequities in the world. Vick appeals to Ed and Mary to teach traditional and global citizenship at the same time by leveraging students’ identities.

What I think is important first, is this. Who am I? How do I fit? In other words, teach identity as a human being and that identity as a human being makes you fit into multiple groups and gives you multiple responsibilities and different entitlements at different ages. They have to know who, then they have to know how. How can I have influence? Once they figure out who they are, once they figure out that identity and then when you begin to put the hook on how they can have influence, then when you get into the how, then you’re branching off into the national and
the global. And that branching is easily done at the same time. If we can’t teach first and foremost you’re a citizen of your family, that there’s responsibilities that go with that, you’re a citizen of our classroom and there are responsibilities and privileges that go with that. You’re a citizen of the school. You’re a citizen of your city or county or whatever, and onward and outward.

Vick’s appeal, while supporting TCGW, doesn’t yet recognize that for his first-generation American and transnational students, family or local may be his global, not theirs. Vick is in the process of figuring out how to more critically perceive himself in the world, and bringing the identities of his students from the margins to the center of his logic will take work and practice. Most interestingly, Vick did state that the instructor has to understand their own identity and how they fit into global citizenship as the first step in teaching citizenship-as-identity. This suggests that Vick was able to alter his understanding of teaching for citizenship, however partially or semi-consciously, only after he decidedly altered his own identity as a citizen.

In the next exemplar, Ed demonstrates how one’s own identity can act as a gatekeeper to new conceptualizations of citizen and understandings of TCGW. Teachers’ identities are locations of agency that may positively or negatively impact diverse students’ notions or experiences with citizenship. In response to Vick’s idea to teach citizenship based on Who am I and How do I fit in, Ed pushed back stating his concern that the instructor would have to be completely impartial less some individuals come to see themselves as someone that deserves more or deserves less; that teaching Who am I? is the best way to get people to go along with your agenda.

On one hand, Ed is cautioning us not to do the work of determining a students’ identity for them as such a practice could be alienating or harmful to students. This is in keeping with the lessons learned from the literature in chapter two on identity and belonging. Also,
elsewhere, Ed has repeatedly spoke to the need for students to have their own voice. In this sense, Ed’s concerns may be more widely appreciated by global educators. However, Ed’s tension in terms of loss of American identity was so prevalent in our discussions that another interpretation is equally plausible. Ed fears that students will be indoctrinated by teachers to think that they are global citizens. Ed does not recognize that all citizenship is invented, and that we indoctrinate our students to believe they are American citizens first, too. Critical theory recognizes that those like Ed who enjoy power and privilege often find ways to resist any new order of things that would erode their own status while seeking to legitimize the status quo.

Vick clarified that what he would teach is a process for students to uncover who they are—but Ed, while he recognizes diversity, has expectations that individuals assimilate to a certain degree just as his family did in an earlier generation. Ed believes that to be American is to embrace a certain set of values and ideas regardless of whether or not the values and ideas act to exclude historically marginalized people from citizenship. Vick and Ed see the issue of assimilation differently as expressed in the following exchange. Vick is responding to how he might justify adding a global ring to citizenship. We see that Ed’s personal identity as a citizen impacts his conceptualizations.

Vick: Adding that ring? At my school it would be very, very easy simply because of the nature of our student body. It’s impossible to teach in a building like ours without recognizing that we are part of something bigger. Many of our kids will never be, will never consider themselves Americans. They will always consider themselves something else that lives in America. So to not be teaching that the something else is also part of the whole, and that we are part of the whole, is to do them and to do ourselves a disservice.

Ed: What makes people never think they’re part, never American, when they come here to live? A whole bunch of people did that before and became Americans. Is the government helping these people stay not American by allowing them to—

Vick: No.
Ed: Teach not in the language of the country but in the language of their own?

Vick: No, I think in this case you’re removing the sovereignty of the individual from it.

Ed says he believes a person can have multiple identities, but there is an order of loyalty within the identities. In reality, however, if the American identity is not a good fit for immigrants (for instance), they are left to suffer exclusion. Assimilation, of course, is not a guarantee of citizenship either as we know discrimination persists. If identity and citizenship are integrally bound, then when Ed refuses to recognize identities other than American, he refuses others’ citizenship.

In applying critical theory to Ed’s stance, we see that he interprets challenges to the ideal American identity as a threat to his identity. Ed lacks the will or the critical consciousness to see outside of himself and his privilege, thus he is not likely to substantially shift or reform his identity along the lines of global citizenship.

Throughout this section on citizenship-as-identity and belonging we see that citizenship and identity and belonging are integrally bound. To deny someone’s identity is to deny their citizenship; it excludes them from membership in communities whether local or global. We also learned that the teachers’ own identities and sense of belonging are bound with citizenship as only when the teachers’ shift or re-form their identities do they take on new conceptualizations of citizen or TCGW. Teachers’ identities are locations of agency—a place for action-taking—regarding global citizenship. Teachers’ identities act as gatekeepers to global citizenship, letting some citizens “in” and keeping some citizens “out.”
Citizenship-as-Connection

Citizenship-as-connection is the notion that we are all connected to each other in a globalized world. Wherever one lives, it is not in isolation from others (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005; Osler and Starkey, 2003). As it emerged in our discussion it was determined that connection was not a choice but a given; what happens in our neighborhoods affects others and the state of the globe (Stromquist, 2002).

In the opening exemplar, Vick uses imagery to breathe life into this newly evolving dimension. Vick is in the process of changing the “container” of his citizenship (his identity) to include the global dimension. Vick proposes a local to global pedagogy which resonates with Ed, bringing him on board (to some degree) with this particular approach to global citizenship education. Vick encourages Ed to try on a cosmopolitan perspective as Mary identifies and explicitly names the tension which came to be known as loss of identity.

Below Vick responds to a member check-in on the change we were or were not experiencing. He extends the dimension of citizenship-as-identity and belonging to that of connection.

In what new ways do I construct my concept of citizen? I’m looking at the question and a picture came to mind. Before I guess the way I was viewing citizenship was as a pebble in a pond, but focusing upon the pebble. I think the new way, my new concept of the citizen is not to focus on the pebble but to focus on the ripples, and where they go. So not so much on the action but how the action affects others. Kind of jumping on to number three, what new understandings of educating for citizenship am I developing for myself? The answer is, I don’t have to teach national citizenship, I don’t have to teach global citizenship, I don’t have to teach local citizenship, I have to teach citizenship. Citizenship is that interconnection and it doesn’t matter whether you’re talking about the interconnection within a classroom or the interconnection in the world, interconnection is interconnection. Who was it that wrote no man is an island? (Vick)

Vick says he is focused on the ripples and where they go; in his concept of citizen he now recognizes connections to others. This connection speaks to the new way he is experiencing his
‘citizen’ identity, in relation to others. Vick also proposed a local/global pedagogy whereby
students can come to understand their connections to others and think about the world as a
whole. Instead of trying to make students think bigger, he suggests making them think smaller,
e.g. personalizing global issues. The approach resonates with Ed whose classroom has a strong
personal responsibility orientation. Ed relates the proposed practice to a situation at his school.

*What he was saying about making it personal, down to the smallest so people understand it, the
better. Who’s to say what happens here doesn’t happen there? We have a girl in our school
whose father just died. They don’t have enough money to bury him. There’s nothing they can do
to put the father in a grave. You can’t bring it up in class, you can’t let this girl be embarrassed
in the school system. It does go on, to say it doesn’t is a fallacy. For us to believe, that what we
are is totally better? What’s better? Define what’s better for me. We are the same as
everybody else, we just do things differently. You can make it local that way. (Ed)*

Ed opened himself up to relating issues locally/globally, but his connection was one
related to poverty. As I interpret this as further evidence of Ed’s deficit view of “others” around
the world, it’s at this moment I also have to doubt what I think I know. Perhaps the example
that came to Ed’s mind was not about a deficit view; after all, he does essentially say, who is
better than another? It’s at this point in my writing (and therefore my knowing) that I must
concede that I judge Ed against my own preferred conceptualization of citizen. Readers can see
the measure by which I ascertain Ed’s evolution, and my limitation is that I assume my
conceptualization of global citizenship to be a universal one. My “universal” conceptualization
of global citizenship is also problematic in that it can be exclusionary.

In this closing outtake, Vick nonetheless shares in my preferred conceptualization and
attempts to shift Ed’s perspective to match ours.

*Ed: Everyone says the word citizenship. My feeling is yeah it is global, yeah it is national, yeah it
is community. It has to be personal. It has to be personal responsibility. That’s where I think
first. For anything, you have to be personally responsible for what you do. If we teach the kids
at a young age that they’re not responsible, how in the world are you going to start teaching
citizenship? Now you’ve got to take part in a larger society, you’ve got to do something to help others. You have no control of anything, you don’t care about anything. How do you transfer over to that?

Vick: It’s Osler’s belonging. If you’re not taking ownership, then you don’t belong and are not a citizen.

Note here that Vick means students will take personal responsibility when their identities are engaged, making them feel like they belong as citizens.

Ed: Yeah. That’s what I’m saying, personal responsibility, this can be a community. Your classroom should be the smallest unit, not Forest Hill, your classroom is the smallest. You expand from there. If it works small and you do the right things for that community, it’s much easier to go outward and continue to do those right things. Why not?

Vick: Osler in their writing says that to become cosmopolitan, to become a global citizen is not to deny your own national citizenship or even to lessen it.

Mary: I think that’s definitely a tension because there is that feeling that you’re giving up something and I don’t know if that’s on this list. Maybe lost identity?

The data suggest that Ed has not established that his students are already global citizens or that their local may be his global—which is given attention last in his order of priorities or identifications. Ed’s pedagogy is grounded on the ontological assumption that the world is just, so there is no impetus to do things differently.

In the preceding section we saw Vick articulating citizenship-as-connection, the notion that whether one chooses or not, one is connected to humanity. However, whether one has to actively do anything about or with the connection is a question prompted by Ed’s stance. As we leave this dimension it is important to note that Mary’s identification of Ed’s tension was central in this narrative; she goes beyond Ed’s order of loyalties to the root of the problem, which is loss of identity. Whether one “does anything” about or with the connection is regulated by one’s identity. In fact, doing nothing or maintaining one’s current identity indicates a preference for
the status quo. But just as Mitchell and Parker (2008) revealed that young people produce, not receive scales of belonging or connection, Ed produces his own scales. Ed’s affinity moves from self to nation then globe. In the spirit of doubt, however, I must ask myself if the very real problem created for students is solely Ed’s. Is it contradictory to ask Ed to embrace human diversity and then expect him (and everyone else) to be a cosmopolitan? (Appiah, 2006).

Citizenship-as-Empowerment

Citizenship-as-empowerment is the notion that students’ own development of a sense of agency is paramount in the education of the citizen. Central to this dimension is the development of students as active thinkers, decision-makers, stakeholders and action-takers in all spheres of society (Davies, 2006; Osler and Starkey, 2003). This dimension is premised upon the pretext that we must build on the knowledge, experiences and identities of students as a foundation to all citizenship education (Osler and Starkey, 2003). Citizenship-as-empowerment often runs counter to the discourse of citizens-as-workers articulated in chapter two whereby, for instance, the economic sphere is disconnected from moral or social discussion by insisting the latter have nothing to do with the former (Hyslop-Margison and Sears, 2007). In citizenship-as-empowerment, students are educated for citizenship as a means of potentially transforming society (Lawy and Biesta, 2006; Lister, 2008).

A series of out-takes below illustrate Vick’s “return” to citizenship-as-empowerment, Mary’s connecting of empowerment to belonging (again blending dimensions) and Ed’s articulation of citizenship-as-empowerment as seen through the lens of America’s eroding exceptionalism and supremacy. Analyses suggest that the tension regarding distribution of
resources resides in a much more powerful discourse on national superiority and economic competitiveness which Mary again links back to loss of identity. Questions of the basis for empowerment are raised in the analysis.

By now Vick has experienced the positive effect that his action projects had on his students initially (although they were more complicated to implement than to inspire), shared the work with his mentee who duplicated the lesson, and planned to change how he approaches his next student teacher in regards to conceptualizing citizenship as a result of his new understandings. At one point Vick remarks that “Maybe the problem is... we don’t give students the opportunity, teach them how to think beyond themselves and then stand back and let them do it. You know?” In this opening outtake Vick assumes a critical stance; so much so that he dispenses of the worthiness of voting, now rejecting (if only in the moment) citizenship education defined legally.

The major paradigm shift came in this, it was teaching what I’ve been teaching is still just witnessing. I was not changing anything. And the paradigm shift came to teach the individual as citizens, that’s doing something. If I can instill in my students that they are important and that they can make a difference, not because of their voting record, not because of what Martin Luther King Jr. did, but because of what they can do and who they are. Then that’s why I came into teaching, but somewhere in the 10 years, I had lost that and got all tied up in curriculum and test scores. The whole purpose of teaching social studies is to create good citizens. Good citizens don’t vote, good citizens make a difference. Good citizens don’t serve on juries, good citizen cause change. (Vick)

Like Lawy and Biesta (2006), Vick is coming to see that young people are encouraged to pursue activities such as voting for the good of society rather than engaging in other means of potentially more critical and transformative participation. As a result of our readings, discussion, and Vick’s reported classroom experiences, he is more keenly aware of how legal ideology has helped to legitimize civic values that constrain meanings of citizenship resulting in
the oppression of others (Tyson and Park, 2008). Vick is leveraging his working class identity in more radical ways, shifting and re-forming his identity along these lines. This more radical working class identity potentially provides his students with opportunities for more dynamic forms of citizenship.

For Mary, the dimension of citizenship-as-empowerment has a particularly powerful resonance. Mary has spoken about the role that her faith plays in the need to help others, and she herself experienced a very troubled, abusive childhood (she, like her students, was schooled in an affluent suburban community). Mary experienced the feeling of “not belonging” and disempowerment by her own admission. These things are a part of her identity as a citizen which in turn influences how she teaches. Below you get a sense of her passion and rationale for citizenship-as-empowerment.

*Just pushing them out... I had a girl, she’s raising a pilot dog. She couldn’t just raise a pilot dog, she had to go out so she took the dog to an elementary school and then she did a presentation on how pilot dogs help the community and she connected it to Helen Keller. Just doing that, she was like, “oh my gosh, it was so great.” Because she had to come up with questions, she was empowered by that. Then she went and interviewed someone, this disabled person, and how he uses a pilot dog. She would never have done that, this girl is so shy. She would never have done that. She was like, “this has changed my life.” Sometimes for these kids, we don’t come to their world where they’re feeling a lack of power...that’s in a sense where we lose them. (Mary).*

While this is a local service learning example, it points to the premium Mary places on transformative experiences. In this case her identity as a citizen facilitates the provision of meaningful citizenship opportunities for students as these same kinds of service learning experiences helped to empower her when she felt excluded as a young person. To the extent this dimension is new to Mary, it is new insofar as she associates it with the pursuit of TCGW: “I think through our time, understanding that service learning is citizenship too, before it was just
understanding; yes, that’s a broader definition of what citizenship is. It kind of gives me the confidence...” (Mary)

Citizenship-as-empowerment is concomitant with Mary’s notions of citizenship-as-identity, belonging and connection in that it begs the question of the relationship between students’ many different experiences (in and outside of school) and how young people organize conflicting experiences in positive, agented ways. Yet citizenship-as-empowerment has many contours. Mary’s school does engage in “global-reaching” service learning which reportedly involves learning about the stories of others and raising funds and resources to aid in the development of the conditions in which they live. This kind of citizenship learning is in keeping with a “softer” global citizenship which identifies problems in the world as related to a lack of resources or a need for help; this is different from a more critical global citizenship which would question the structures or power relations which help maintain peoples’ disempowerment (Andreotti, 2006). As time passed, Mary became slightly more cognizant of the influence of her own faith (duty to help others) as it feeds her ‘citizen’ identity which is perpetually concerned with “making a difference.” When confronted with Andreotti’s research, she appreciated it, and began to puzzle about her basis for caring. I will also add, however, that she was offended by the label of “soft.” While Mary’s notion of empowerment would seem liberal to some, it would appear conservative and nationalistic to others absent a broader and deeper examination of the economic and cultural roots of inequalities (Andreotti, 2006). Further, the whole notion of empowerment—as in to empower another—is wide open to critique. The term itself assumes and is enacted upon an established order of power relations (Andreotti, 2006). Mary’s rationale for wanting to teach global citizenship may allow her to feel superior to others and to
maintain her privileged status. If Mary was to change her basis for TCGW from caring to accepting responsibility for white people’s complicity in creating and maintaining an inequitable world, it would require a sizable shift in her identity.

Not surprisingly, Ed sees the empowerment of students somewhat differently. In the outtakes ahead, Ed’s reaction to the videos Two Million Minutes and Shift Happens is captured during a session in which only he and Mary were present. The videos are reflective of the U.S.’s new international education movement reviewed in chapter two. Recall that this discourse is found in most schools because schools are national institutions shaped by national identities with their self-preservation, sovereignty and success foremost in mind (Gaudelli, 2006; Heilman, 2006; Pike, 2008a). Ed believes that students are empowered when they are pushed to be exceptional in all that they do. Ed’s notion that America must be supported by the best citizens-as-workers becomes apparent as he laments the nation’s declining economic prowess.

I told my other teachers on my team. This is great, you got to watch it. Two million minutes. You got to watch it, it’s fabulous. We have a few smart kids in this school. But they have so many smart kids it’s more than our whole total number of students in all our schools. You wonder where we’re going to be at in 10-20-30-40 years. I pointed out Bill Gates can’t find people to work for his company because there aren’t enough smart people to fill the jobs. He has to go overseas to do that. How sad that is, to think that we don’t have the people smart enough in this country. We grew up with the idea that we want to be the best in the world but now we’re willing to settle, I mean, we’ve got a President that’s willing to settle for 2nd and 3rd or 4th. We should want to be the best. I think that’s part of the aspect of making everyone feel good about everything they do. I think we need to start letting people know — what you did may be good for you, but it isn’t good enough. You need to understand that you need to step up and really step forward and, ah, God, I... (Ed)

The message of the videos resonates deeply with Ed given his family’s sacrifices and subsequent devotion to American exceptionalism. It is important to recognize that Ed’s ancestors relinquished their own personal identities to some degree in the name of this traditional American identity, and this partially accounts for his resistance to global citizenship.
Ed is very clear about what is at stake should the American identity falter, yet he is not conscious of any discourse on citizenship at his school. I’ll note here, however, that the traditional citizenship discourse is often invisible to those it serves (Pike, 2008a).

That’s the way progression does. You take that back 2000 years, you’re talking about Rome, then you’re talking England. Then you go to the UN building, everything in the UN building is English and French. French is hardly spoken anymore. Now everywhere else, English is the number one language everyone speaks. Time changes and different people have more of an influence on other things than other countries. It’s always been that way, no matter who you are. You would think that ours took a long time to come. Short for us, long for us. Short for us in sense of time wise, long for us because we thought we were better than that and quicker. That was the only thing, in 1945-46, that’s when it started. Before that we were nothing. We were just an economic power, just like China was, just like China is and India is now, that’s what we were. We didn’t have any power (Ed).

To Ed, it appears that being empowered is knitted with American exceptionalism; be it in terms of economic or military might. He is completely untroubled by our legacy of imperialism and has found a way to rationalize its existence. For Ed, the “new” thought undergirding the international movement is a good fit. As Parker concluded, the new international education movement is really just nationalistic (2006)—and Ed’s identity is that of a nationalist.

Danielewicz (2001) states and (Barty, 2004) relays that teacher identity is made through the interaction of internal and external discourses. Ed’s conceptualization of citizen remains informed by his internal discourse (tied to his identity) and he understandably responded positively to the external discourse (rally to recapture or maintain the U.S.’s supremacy) presented within the videos. While significant change is possible when we make the power in our discourses visible to ourselves and see that we can make alternative choices about our and students’ identities (Barty, 2004; Marsh, 2002), the exchange (much longer in session) had no effect on Ed’s conceptualization of citizenship. Ed’s notion of empowerment, while strong,
remained so within national auspices or civic-republican and liberal discourses.

In the preceding section, Vick continued to shift his working class identity to make room for more radical forms of citizenship, and Mary’s identity paved the way for more personally transformative pedagogies such as service learning, although her rationale for TCGW is largely uncritical. Finally, Ed became energized by the discourse on international education which spoke boldly to him, leaving him to lament America’s declining exceptionalism, and hence the loss of his own identity. As we move to the next and last dimension of our evolving conceptualizations, the data refocus our story squarely on the importance of teacher identity as a site of agency for global citizenship education.

Citizenship-as-Relation

As opposed to citizenship-as-connection which claims all of humanity is interconnected in some fundamental way, citizenship-as-relation is exercised through constant, reflexive dialogue and choices about who we are, what’s important to us, and the kind of world we want to live in. Central to this dimension is the very personal, on-going search for how the individual sees herself as a citizen, and in particular how she chooses to see herself in relation to others. As such, this dimension more directly relates to sub-question B, What new understandings of the concept of citizen do participants create for themselves? Citizenship-as-relation mirrored our PAR process whereby the teachers made choices about their own identities, shifting and recreating them, in order to re-conceptualize global citizenship and global citizenship education.

Optimally, this dimension would have students analyze their own positions, contexts, and discourses and participate in changing their assumptions, power relations and identities as
they relate to the changing world (Andreotti, 2006). Cahill (2007a) says this kind of work requires the development and raising of consciousness which is not static but constantly recreated through the social-historical processes of knowing and being.

In the segments that follow, both Vick and Ed clearly articulate a way to embrace TCGW within some form of citizenship-as-relation. Mary and Vick manage the tension related to the issue of universal rights with Mary proposing that students create a new social contract. Later segments, however, question the veracity of this dimension’s potential insofar as teachers’ identities act as gatekeepers to the identities students might choose for themselves, and consequently how they might choose to relate to others.

_Vick:_ In teaching in a situation where to a huge extent are students of color, whether it’s Southeast Asians or Hispanics or Africans or African-Americans. That’s by and large the majority. Almost universally among these groups, they are lower income, and anything you teach them the first thing that’s going to come out of their mouth is why am I learning this? They’re looking for the practical. That’s why I think in order to get on board, in order to champion this, you have to look at the pragmatic. You have to look not at global citizenship as an ethereal thing, and it’s wonderful and fun, but when you get down to the pragmatic, the down and dirty, that’s where the questions rise up. And of course that’s where the fantastic debates will come from, is why and how.

Lisa: If you choose to--

_Vick:_ If you’re going to be a global citizen. If you are going to, if the student is questioning why am I going to do this, you have to be prepared as an educator to say to them, if you’re going to be a global citizen, there are trade-offs you’re going to make. It’s just like if you’re going to be a citizen of the U.S.

Lisa: I don’t want to put words in your mouth. Am I correct in assuming your current position is that you would teach for citizenship in a globalized world? That going forward you’re prepared to do that in such a way that you would incorporate the tensions?

_Vick:_ I would turn over 40 acres of earth, yes I would.

Lisa: The students themselves would be involved?
Vick: Most definitely. I’m the type of teacher that would more than likely engage them in the tensions. Throw the tensions out there and make them struggle with the tensions. To me a really good citizen isn’t saying this is a great place. A really good citizen says, you know something? This place could be even better if. That’s dealing with the tensions. How can I improve it? How can I make it better?

Lisa: You might say, you do have to address the tensions, I think in part because you want to get to the opportunities.

Vick: For me, if I’m teaching opportunities, it’s as though it’s a done deal. Especially with the student body that I teach. Okay, then why are you telling me this if it’s already been solved? Rather than throwing it out there and saying what’s this?

Should Vick facilitate multiple perspectives on global citizenship in his classroom through a critical pedagogy—encouraging students to define and work through tensions, to act as knowers and develop new understandings for themselves—he will have mirrored our processes in group. This approach to teaching for citizenship would go beyond more typical notions of classroom debate. It is not entirely clear the degree to which Vick will assume a more critical pedagogy (citizenship-as-relation) versus a more civic-republican-liberalist pedagogy of classroom debate. One can see the potential for the former below in Vick’s reflecting on his own experiences shifting his identity. Vick is a self-described working class leftist who can now interpret global citizenship in ways that work with, rather than against, his identity.

I think the readings had a lot to do with it. But maybe not in the way one would necessarily think. I think the way the readings affected me, the more I read, the more I realized that nobody knew what the hell they were talking about. Nobody had a clear picture of what global citizenship was, what it entailed. Which made me more open to it because I also didn’t have a concept of what it was. I felt empowered in reading the experts and seeing how the experts couldn’t come to an agreement on it, I felt empowered to put my own interpretation on it. When I feel empowered to do something like that, my mind begins to run with it and I begin to experiment with things. And I think that’s what brought me on board more than anything was that I can be on board with this and it’s not a cookie cutter. Nobody’s telling me this is what it is. It’s like this is still open to interpretation. So how can I interpret it? Can I interpret it as a working class leftist? And the answer was yeah. I can do that. And it will add to the Mosaic that’s being created, because let’s face it, it is just being created. You’re going to go away from
this whole experience with a different on global citizenship because of the input you’ve had from us. While I may not agree with Mary and Ed all the time, it’s impossible to have one of these discussions and walk away from here without having been affected by it. So you’ve been changed even if you haven’t necessarily... again the ripples. Yeah, I think that’s what did it for me. I can use my heroes to begin to define what this is. I can see Eugene Debs in global citizenship. As long as there is an underclass, I am of it. That’s global citizenship (Vick).

The notion of students contemplating their own relationships to others within global citizenship is further solidified by Ed by the close of the exchange below. I had asked him toward the end of our time together what global citizenship meant to him today.

Ed: It means to me that you are human and therefore you are part of human society and therefore, I adjust what I am talking about in class. One of the things is the slavery issue, we were talking about that. They were not considered humans, they were considered something other than human and to get past that and to understand that no matter where, what you look like, how you look, whatever the case may be, we’re all human. And therefore, don’t go out to harm others, go out to be helpful and be respectful. It’s amazing how sometimes we say something is terrible and yet we want to give people their diversity and yet we’re telling them they don’t believe like us and therefore they’re wrong. That’s wrong. People have a different way of doing things, a different way of helping, and a different way of acting and that to me is viva la difference. Thank God for the differences because if we’re all alike we’re boring.

Lisa: And when you came into group, was that your?

Ed: I’ve always been like that.

Lisa: The definition of global citizenship, is that what you thought it was?

Ed: I don’t like the idea of one world, I really don’t, I honestly do not like that. But to respect others, what more can you ask of anybody than to respect another human being for what they are, a living human being. I try never to stop learning and what I get from you guys, what I get from people, I get from students... Maybe I don’t accept it, maybe I don’t agree with it, but I give it to the students and let them think about it. Let them make a decision about it because, what’s horrible about making a student think? Make them wonder where they’re going, what path they’re going to take. That’s why things I’ve picked up in here, I may not agree with 100%, but I’m willing to let people think about it. And I think that in itself is a start for anyone.

Lisa: And I’m learning from you...

Ed: Yeah, if we stop learning we might as well die. If we stop learning, you might as well not be around any more.
As with Vick, Ed’s affinity for being engaged in global citizenship in open-ended ways was clear in his remarks as we reflected on our methodology in group. Ed had just finished reading the explanation of PAR in my dissertation prior to the session.

Ed: I enjoyed reading that by the way.

Lisa: You did?

Ed: Yeah. I thought that’s what you like to have in the group of people. People who are willing to have their own place in the group, in the sense you have the researcher sitting back absorbing but also giving part. And the other people that are talking and they are evolving; the discussion is evolving as their going along. They have a start but they have no end until they get there. When the end gets there, then they’re still not done because another group comes in, and you got new thoughts put into it. Let people get involved in what’s taking place.

That Vick and Ed can see a way to honor their own identities while potentially providing some depth of space for their students to make choices about their own relations to others in the world constitutes a significant step toward expanding the meanings of citizenship and TCGW. The data suggest that global citizenship may need to be a decidedly non-universal concept so that we might find ourselves authentically within its scope. Just as our students need a kind of citizenship education whose context recognizes multiple identities, teachers do too. Teachers, like students, also need to feel a sense of belonging. While teachers in general may or may not be aware of how their personal identity impacts their teaching (Gaudelli, 1999), our time in group appears to have imparted to the teachers glimpses of themselves previously not taken.

The next segment features Mary explaining her approach to values negotiation, further demonstrating support for the citizenship-as-relation dimension.

Vick: It’s Locke’s and the others idea of, these are natural rights. In other words in order to diminish someone’s rights, there almost has to be a baseline of what those rights are... According
to Locke, they were not ideals, according to Locke this is natural law and this is what is. Anything outside of that is an aberration to natural law.

Lisa: I remember you saying they could be interpreted variously. I just want to understand. So you would look for instances where those rights were denied?

Vick: Or at least altered.

Mary: Here’s the starting point, so what does this mean? Here’s the baseline—we’re entitled to—let’s define this then. Life, Liberty, here’s our baseline starting point. What are we entitled to? Are we entitled to a home? Are we entitled to certain income? So, use it as a springboard, a jumping off point. So where, all over the world? It’s still from that concept of looking at fairness, justice.

Lisa: So we’re still looking to see where citizenship has been diminished in this newly evolved citizenship education?

Mary: There is no citizenship, right? In the state of nature there isn’t. You as a group of people living together decide to create that society and in a sense you’re creating that citizenship.

While creating even a baseline can be problematic as no baseline is absent a worldview, and acknowledging that even the word universal is associated with the West’s established “knowledge” (not cultural values) (Andreotti, 2006), we did experience movement on the tension of universal versus culturally relevant rights. In previous discussions, Vick wasn’t sure how we could be global citizens without everyone having the right to do whatever they wanted to do (even when another inevitably found that something to be harmful). Now it seems issues of rights are ripe for discussion. Mary’s insight, that in the state of nature citizenship does not yet exist and must be created, could be particularly interesting in that students would negotiate this new social contract as a rich context within which they would define their own unique relations with others across the globe. The process of creating a new social contract could be anchored in reflexivity, dialogue, and an ethical relation to difference (Andreotti, 2006; Lister, 2008)—much the same as the process we created and modeled in our PAR. Mary’s approach
epitomizes taking critical action in the world as citizenship will be newly created by students, therefore dismantling the existing structures of citizenship that foster inequality.

As this dimension was articulated toward the end of our time together, I would be remiss if I did not disclose that we had less time to explore it more pointedly. Thus, I used member checking to better understand citizenship-as-relation. I am concerned about my own heavy hand here, although the co-researchers reported no coercion and merely clarified interpretations. Note that Ed was absent for this particular session.

Lisa: It sounds like there are more than just ripples. What I heard you saying is that you’re going to help kids to think through these things but ultimately they choose how to interact with and be acted upon within the cosmos, if that makes sense. But I have a long way to go if we think that’s really what you’re saying. How is that different than citizenship-as-connection?

Vick: I think it’s like we said before, it is no different, it’s just more. In other words, you teach identity then later on you teach connection, but until they master connection there’s no way they’re going to get relations. Does that make sense?

Vick’s words re-confirm the idea that the dimensions each build on or blend with one another. I suggest that they may be enacted more easily, however, if they are not received as static or linear as this may prove to be too confining to serve as dynamic a concept as global citizenship.

Mary: I think there’s more of an awareness, you can be connected but then really being aware and realizing, it’s like that higher level thinking.

Vick: Exactly.

Mary: I may know, and I may be connected, but being able to be above myself and seeing that impact of that connection is where I see this.

Lisa: That consciousness.

Mary: Relation… I see that as higher level.
Lisa: I think I like relation because it kind of gives us over to the fact that, yeah, there’s connection that can’t be denied, but it sort of denotes personal agency. How one chooses to lend oneself to the world.

Vick: Connection exists whether you want it to or not. Relation has the aspect of control. I can control the relationship, not completely because the connection is always going to exist... even more than intent, there’s action.

While this and other dimensions are nascent, it seems there are fertile grounds from which we may evolve a more critical and dynamic citizenship education. Andreotti (2006) reminds us, however, that all critical literacy is partial and incomplete, and that we need to continuously work to transform our views, identities and relationships. Below Vick and Mary illustrate this continuous project as Vick projects his own working class identity on his students and Mary questions his limiting of student identity that ultimately erodes or strips students of opportunities to relate. The teachers had established trusting, mutually respectful relationships that enabled them to challenge each other and tackle tough issues.

Vick: If you’re teaching a classroom full of poor working class kids, they really don’t care that much about the environment, what they care about is jobs.

Mary: I don’t know about that.

Vick: Trust me.

Mary: No.

Vick: That’s what they care about.

Lisa: Challenge away.

Mary: I don’t know, I don’t think it’s fair to say they all don’t care about the environment.

Vick: I’m not saying necessarily that they don’t care. Shelter and food is what comes first. I grew up in coal country and you know those old guys, it’s more about, yeah I understand the environment, but I got to feed my family.

Mary: Right.
Vick: So therefore, if the approach I would take with the kids would be all environment, it wouldn’t necessarily grab a hold of them. You got them something they believe in, something they’re really wrapped up in. Better jobs, more opportunity, they’re going to jump on that. Then you’re talking about redistribution of resources again because wealth is a resource. They begin to think outside themselves.

Lisa: Tell me more–

Mary: I just think we just have to be careful of assuming their stories. We don’t do that. I think what you said, keying into their interest is important.

Vick: Uh hum.

Mary: But you never know who’s sitting in your classroom, what their interest may be and I just don’t want to limit—I want to be that idealist—I want to be realistically ideal. I don’t want to say you’re not going to be interested in the environment because you’re coming from Hollyhill so of course you’re going to be this way. I just don’t want to make those assumptions about kids because I think it’s easy. I know I do it myself, I just assume certain things.

A close examination of Vick’s choice of words (“I grew up in coal country and you know those old guys...”) indicates that he substitutes himself, his own identity and relationship to global citizenship for that of his students. Vick’s identity acts as a gatekeeper for the experiences of the students in his classroom, and it limits their opportunities to relate to others.

In this last example, I willingly risk losing the readers’ agreement that Vick has truly “bitten” on the new dimensions at all. I asked Vick to explain a comment he had made in his initial interview regarding black students’ not having an identity. This was an intentional and very specific follow-up question I planned for Vick in the final session: “So you said there used to be an identity but then you said they really don’t have an identity now and I’m really confused by that.”

Vick: The identity that most Americans would recognize as African-American isn’t necessarily there. This new generation of poor blacks don’t necessarily identify with the heroes of the previous generation. A black teacher and myself were talking the other day at school. Well there was a white boy sitting there and we were joking back and forth, throwing up the white power sign and the whole nine yards. And I said you realize, I said to this kid, do you realize our
plan has come to fruition? It’s working? This black teacher’s standing there and she’s shaking her head and I said, hey, we don’t have to use the “n” word anymore, they call themselves that. We don’t have to keep them out of school, they do that themselves. The black teacher chimed in and started remarking on some things and said the whites through racism no longer have to do because this generation of blacks are doing to themselves. So this new generation of urban blacks, instead of identifying with those symbols of success are now identifying with people that the generation before them would have identified as failures. They see social growth through imprisonment, they glorify “da hood.” They denigrate education. They’ve lost the identity that the two generations before them fought so hard to attain.

Lisa: It’s helpful to have your broader thoughts on that. Going back to the conversation between you and the teacher, you said something like, the white person no longer has to do this or that because now they do it to themselves. Bringing this back with critical theory, the critical theorist would ask you, is that really the case or are there still forces at work that are keeping things the way they are in their current state?

Note that I am concerned that Vick is limiting his black students’ many identities by having created one story for all of them—an uncritical story at that. But was I seeking just one, not many, explanations, “truths” or stories? I sensed an opportunity for Vick to potentially analyze his own position, assumptions and the power relations amidst this context... yet I was surprised by how uncomfortable I was, attempting to ask critical questions while being non-judgmental and productive. I immediately recognized my own limitations as a facilitator of critical thought. I later realized the discomfort I felt was related to not calling out racism by its name.

Vick: There are forces at work but most of the forces at work are no longer legal and institutional. The forces at work are more and more self-imposed. It’s what you place value upon. In the 1950’s and 1960’s young black men and women were willing to face all kinds of horrible injustices and things like that in order to get the right to go to school. And I went over my attendance for the year on Tuesday and I’ve got roughly 125 students. I’ve got almost 3500 absences for the year. That works out to almost 28 days per pupil. They’re choosing to stay home. Nobody’s keeping them out, they’re choosing to stay home. Well, when you chose to miss six weeks out of the school year, you’re saying, I don’t want to have an equal chance in this world.
Mary: Can we say that they’re making that choice at that age or is there some other reason why they’re not coming? When we see injustice and obviously there’s injustice, I think it’s such a deep-rooted problem. So what’s the root of that?

Vick goes on to say that one parent homes and poverty are related to poor attendance, but neither Vick nor Mary link attendance back to citizenship-as-identity and belonging, or even empowerment, expressly.

Lisa: Let’s say it’s white students. Poor white students. So then what is the explanation for poor attendance?

Vick: In our district poor white students’ attendance will be about 5% better than poor African-Americans.

Lisa: So why, I guess I would ask, what is the story? What’s the difference?

Vick: I don’t know. If I knew that it would be me sitting for my Ph.D. and not you.

Shortly thereafter we wrapped up the segment and I wondered aloud if there could be more than one story to explain the phenomenon. To be fair, when Vick made his statements, he said they are about what he is seeing. He declares at the conversation’s end that “I don’t know what I’m going to do about it unless somebody talks about it.”

I included this exchange because among many things, it illustrated the limit of Vick’s change. If one goes back to the first dimension, citizenship-as-identity and belonging, you witness Vick’s breakthrough. Vick said to deny students’ identities was to deny them citizenship. At the close of this study, Vick is asserting that his black students don’t really have an identity; he is denying them citizenship.

At least in the way I re-presented our findings here, I feel as if we came full circle. Just as we were constructing citizenship-as-relation (making choices about how one sees oneself as a citizen, and in particular how one chooses to see oneself in relation to others) I am struck by
Allen’s (2004) simple assertion that identity is relational. If we define ourselves against others, if identity is teachers arguing for themselves (MacLure, 1993), what is Vick arguing for? We cannot separate teaching for citizenship in a globalized world from our own identities-- how we “relate” to ourselves.

Our critical lens whereby we examine our own identities and related worldviews and their impact on TCGW is still evolving. We are all works in progress. The questions to ask are as important as any response: Where did Vick obtain the discourse he spoke of? How or why was it thought to be legitimate? What other discourses were silenced as that discourse was privileged? I would also ask: Do we really seek alternate discourses so much as we seek one alternate discourse?

What I experienced on this evening was a willingness to talk honestly and openly; I witnessed both intellectual courage and humility. I learned that unless we establish and nurture the conditions under which such dialogues can take place reflectively and productively, we will never authentically evolve teaching for any kind of citizenship. I have work to do on myself; I judged Vick in this segment against my conceptualization of TCGW. I judged Mary the least throughout this study as her conceptualization was closest to mine. Knowing this, and making room for oneself to grow is essential in moving beyond unproductive judgements. Andreotti (2006) describes such criticality as discarding the notion that something is right or wrong, biased or unbiased, true or false; instead he says it is a commitment to understanding the roots of our assumptions and their effects. A certain level of consciousness is needed so that we might more critically choose who we are and how we want to relate to the world that we want to live in. I
agree with Andreotti that this work isn’t about unveiling the truth but about providing the space for us to reflect on our own and others’ epistemological and ontological assumptions.

When Vick member checked these findings, his main comment was that he thought in the end, the study was more about him than about TCGW. Yet he never asked me to change the findings, and he didn’t disagree with them. I was reminded that Barty (2004) notes it can be painful to realize our own values, biases and ideologies, and to some degree I think we each found this to be true. Our newly evolving conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world still lay next to a complex, popular and contestable narrative that is citizenship education. This study was about Vick—and Mary and Ed—in that we cannot separate teaching for citizenship in a globalized world from who we are or rather how we “relate” to ourselves.

Borrowing from the critical tradition as defined by Andreotti (2006), I propose that citizenship-as-relation may create safe spaces where we can all experiment with new forms of being/relating to one another.
Chapter 6: DISCUSSION

In this final chapter I create a space for discussion as I return to my research questions. I begin by reviewing the purpose of this study, and why the research study was completed. I then answer my research questions summarily, and turn to implications, recommendations, critique and suggestions for further research.

Citizenship education has traditionally focused on the attainment of the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to be an effective and loyal citizen within the nation-state (Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Peters, Britton and Blee, 2008). Over the last fifty years, escalating globalization of political, economic, technological and ecological systems has brought the world into people’s daily lives (Stiglitz, 2007). Such increased global interconnectedness challenges the nation-state’s claim as the only means and grantor of citizenship (Falk, 2002; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Merryfield with Duty, 2008; Osler, 2003) and new forms of citizenship, and thus, new forms of education, need to be developed (Davies et al., 2005).

Global citizenship is the notion that human beings are citizens of the world; that we are members of the wider community of humanity, going beyond the scope of the nation-state and exhibiting some form or amount of identity, loyalty or commitment (Dower and Williams, 2002). This study was created because despite all of the research indicating that students need to be prepared for some form of global citizenship (Davies et al., 2005; Knight-Abowitz and Harnish, 2006; Lee and Leung, 2006; Mitchell and Parker, 2008; Osler and Starkey, 2003; Parmenter,
global citizenship education is not enacted in most classrooms in meaningful ways.

This purpose of this study was to promote teachers’ wrestling with their conceptualizations of TCGW. The study was undertaken with the understanding that ethical tensions and political interpretations are bound inside of teachers’ conceptualizations, and this likely confounded or prevented them from teaching for global citizenship. The participatory action research methodology was integral to this inquiry as a great deal of what we know about teachers’ perspectives related to TCGW has been limited to findings regarding their knowledge of content, obstacles faced in terms of curriculum implementation, assessment or other issues related to practice. Much of this knowledge was generated by university researchers through observations, questionnaires, and interviews, with limited substantive participation on the part of teachers themselves.

By identifying a community of teachers as a marginalized group, I recognized Friere’s (1982) assertion that we are all the oppressed and the oppressors and set the stage for the unwinding and examination of the ethical tensions and political viewpoints inherent in global citizenship education. By the study’s close, we had moved from an examination of beliefs and perspectives to a focus on our identities.

In sum, this research contributed to the broader scholarly discussion by having examined and documented an inquiry into three particular secondary social studies teachers’ initial conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship, reporting on the evolution of their constructions through the negotiation of tensions, and theorizing that 1) Teachers change their conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world by shifting or recreating their identities and 2) Our identities are locations of agency for global citizenship and global
Response to My Research Questions

This study set out to answer the questions below:

1. How do teachers’ conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW) change through the process of participatory action research?
   
   A. In what new ways do they construct their own concept of citizen?
   
   B. What new understandings of educating for citizenship do they develop for themselves?

At the onset of our critical focus group discussions, we began addressing the relationship between teachers’ personal beliefs and perspectives and what it means to educate young people for a changing world. We quickly identified and began working through the many tensions with global citizenship that represented the gulf between their personal values and their initial understanding of ‘global citizen’ and ‘understandings of global citizenship education.’ Over the course of our constant comparative analysis of the data, it became clearer that it was the teachers’ identities—not merely values, perspectives or beliefs—that accounted for their relationship to global citizenship education. While sub-questions A and B were written distinctively to address concepts of citizen and understandings of citizenship education, their answers could not be understood nor addressed separately. Throughout the study, the teachers’ concepts of citizen were built and re-built to align with their understandings of educating for citizenship and vice versa.
The findings contribute to the development of knowledge in the field of global citizenship education by uniquely suggesting that in order for teachers to change their conceptualizations of teaching for citizenship in a globalized world (TCGW), they must shift or recreate their identities. While thinking about, reflecting on, or constructing new understandings of the concept of citizen and TCGW was important, it was insufficient.

Re-thinking our conceptualizations wasn’t enough because each teacher had a concept of what it means to be a citizen—an identity as a citizen—and this helped to define their understandings of teaching for citizenship. One can imagine that this same study might be conducted to examine teachers’ conceptualizations of mathematician, and understandings of teaching mathematics. However, most people do not have a personal identification bound up with mathematics nor do they identify as mathematicians; there is nothing at stake.

On the evening news, I’ve never heard a discussion about who can and can’t be a mathematician. On the other hand, everyone enjoys some status as a citizen. In the United States where citizenship has been historically, racially, and socially constructed to bestow power and privilege to some while marginalizing or oppressing others (Ladson-Billings, 2004), every teacher had something to gain or lose in rethinking citizenship. To alter conceptualizations of TCGW meant altering one’s identity as a citizen.

Looking closely at Vick’s words as he discussed his notion of global citizenship which he equated with a redistribution of the world’s resources, I noted his use of the word “of” instead of the word “to.”

I wrote down rob from the rich and give to the poor? That’s what they are saying here. If we’re going to teach global citizenship, you put your energy to better these other nations it has to come at a cost of somebody, generally it’s going to come at the cost from your own.
The key phrase here is “of somebody.” The loss isn’t “to somebody,” the loss is a being. Vick’s words speak to the importance of identity in changing our conceptualizations of TCGW. This work affirms Pike’s (2008b) notion that the challenge for global citizenship lies in its interpretation and justification for its core concept to the extent that making meaning of and evaluating the legitimacy of global citizenship is important in the process of changing one’s identity. I propose that the greater challenge to global citizenship is posed by one’s identity.

My findings contribute to the growing body of evidence that recognizes the tensions between identity or “being” and knowing that are enacted in every pedagogy (Britzman, 1991); my findings extend this notion into the field of secondary global citizenship education in particular. The teachers’ concepts of citizen and their understandings of teaching for citizenship were largely indivisible and reciprocal. Vick makes an assertion early in the study that:

“If we’re going to view ourselves as global citizens and if all people are citizens of the world, then all views have to have some validity. If all views have validity, then if a woman has to be totally covered, isn’t allowed to drive, then I can’t question that. That has to be allowed to be right.

We see through Vick’s eyes that assuming an identity as a global citizen would be linked to stifling his teaching practice in that no claims regarding human rights could be made. Vick didn’t say “if we teach global citizenship,” he said “if we’re going to view ourselves as global citizens.” Mary stated that relationship between her identity as a teacher and as a citizen simply and eloquently as she once asserted “that the two have woven themselves together.”

Throughout the data, my analysis affirmed a view of identity as central to teachers (Britzman, 1991). Britzman says that teachers’ roles speak to their function, but their identities
reveal their investments and commitments. This is made clear in Mary’s letter to the reader at the study’s close when she frames the importance of global citizenship education as a question:

*The question we need to consider, the point that he was making, was that we need to focus on how we want to live. What kind of people do we want to be?*

My findings concluded that our identities are significant locations of agency for global citizenship and global citizenship education (GCE). This study confirms Clarke’s (2007) notion that identity offers a site of agency in the process of continual becoming and extends it to the field of GCE. Throughout this study identity acted as a gatekeeper to global citizenship/education.

While identity could function “positively” as when Vick finds that he can interpret global citizenship through his working class identity, it also functions negatively, as it did with Ed. Ed said he believed a person could have multiple identities, but there was an order of loyalty within the identities. The primacy Ed gave to the American identity was so large that it squeezed all the other identities out. When American identity is not a good fit for immigrants (for instance), they are left to suffer exclusion. Assimilation, of course, is also not a guarantee of citizenship as we know discrimination persists. If identity (in Vick’s words) “indeed is what citizenship is all about,” then when Ed refuses to recognize students’ identities other than the “American,” he refuses others’ citizenship. Teachers’ identities act as gatekeepers for global citizenship, leaving some citizens inside the gate, and keeping others out.

When teachers did shift or recreate their identities to accommodate new identifications with each other and others (in considering being global citizens), their identities then became new locations of agency for other citizens—potentially spurring new movement in others’ identities, and so on. When Vick embraces citizenship-as-identity and belonging and realizes, in
reference to his classroom comprised of students from Mexico, Honduras, and El Salvador, that
“to lump them together as Hispanic is to deny their citizenship,” we might assume that Vick’s
students will then find new ways to see or identify themselves in light of Vick’s identity shift.
This proposal affirms Clarke’s (2007) idea that identities are in fact partly given and partly
achieved, and we are always defining ourselves in relationship to others. My findings affirm a
certain ontological assumption about identity in general. It endorses the African saying “I am
because We are, and because We are, therefore I am.”

As the teachers are citizens themselves, changing their conceptualizations of the
concept of citizen and the related understandings regarding TCGW held ramifications for them
personally. Conscientization or critical consciousness focuses on achieving understanding of the
world through the perception and exposure of social and political contradictions and taking
action against all that is illuminated by the new understanding (Freire, 1982). Raising and
addressing issues of resources, power, racism, inequalities, and white privilege throughout our
discussions called on these teachers to practice and adopt new forms of being and relating to
others to the extent that they recognized the identities they enjoyed existed and were defined
in their relationships to others.

As all of the teachers in this study were white, they were privileged to various degrees.
Allen (2004) contends that whites must grow in their understanding of whiteness as a system
and in their own white identity development (Allen, 2004). White privilege is structural world-
wide, and it can’t be erased unless the structure that creates it is razed (Allen, 2004). The
teachers’ identities were invested in the system of white privilege, so shifting or recreating their
identities was a serious task. The teachers’ identities had been formed among centuries of
creating “us” and “them” as a part of their identity DNA.

Discussion Related to Tensions

The “outing” of tensions in our discussions of global citizenship/education was key to reforming teachers’ identities. My findings contribute to the development of knowledge through the provision of original evidence illustrating secondary social studies teachers’ tensions with global citizenship (loss of identity, culturally relevant versus universal rights, creation of a one-world government and redistribution of resources). I believe this contributes to the literature as I found that the field largely, although not entirely, glosses over the precise grounds by which individuals reject global citizenship and thus global citizenship education. I also never found a study that illustrated how tensions such as those articulated by the teachers, might be negotiated. I imply here a critique of the fields of global education and global citizenship education in that our fields must study, not assume, teachers’ tensions with GCE.

The importance of tension in breaking with the status quo is well-documented (Hooks, 1995; Pratt, 1992), and global citizenship education requires some break with traditional citizenship education. As this study was conducted through participatory action research and critical theory was applied in the analysis of data, it impacted the data I collected (I sought problems) and the way I re-presented our reconstructions (I used a lot of raw data to painstakingly illustrate change (the focus of action research). This study, nonetheless, affirmed the importance that conflict is essential to change (Fullan, 1993).

The tensions regarding loss of identity, distribution of resources, universal versus culturally relevant rights and one-world government all shared one common theme. Within each tension the teachers felt that decisions being made regarding global citizenship education
would impact their status as citizens. For instance, global citizenship was equated with equal
distribution of resources; Vick calculated, in essence, that he would be robbed in order to
provide for the world’s poor. Another way to read this is Vick feared loss of privileged status.
Identity is indeed teachers arguing for themselves (Maclure, 1993) as we saw in the re-
presentation of the tensions. My findings confirmed that individuals are agented beings that
resist identities that position them in unfavorable ways (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004).
Throughout the tensions, the teachers had something to lose at every turn. The pattern
confirmed Clarke’s (2207) notion that all education, in its deepest sense, is about opening up
identities. Power and privilege are often granted based on identity and our focus on our
identifications served to surface broader social and political issues (Cahill, 2007) perhaps not
previously considered.

Implications and Recommendations

Teachers shape and are shaped by the mode of their being, thus thinking about the
formation or re-formation of their identities is essential (Clarke, 2007). The un-final nature of
identity reminds us of the threat to the integrity of our identity (Clarke, 2007), thus I contend it
is important to address the tensions presented in a global citizenship identity so that the threat
might become an opportunity.

This implies that teacher educators need to support teachers in understanding how they
construct their identities, and illuminate the potential for teachers to teach for global citizenship
in ways that sync with their identities. The resulting dimension of citizenship-as-relation was
graped by Ed, even in his steadfast “American” identity, because he could honor his identity in
allowing students to grapple with the question of global citizenship. Ed indicated he would use his civic republican and liberal discourses (concomitant with his identity) to help students to think about global citizenship for themselves. I suspect that the results of this study might help teacher educators to realize that ignoring the tensions inherent in proposing global citizenship education—and thus global citizenship—cannot be ignored.

Based on this study, I recommend that teacher educators who embrace global citizenship education make teacher “identity work” a staple of the curriculum. I suggest that time committed to content knowledge development and methods may be more productive if the teachers themselves first understand how their ‘citizen’ identity and their pedagogy are related. This recommendation is supported by Vick’s stance that the teacher has to understand their own identity and how they fit into global citizenship as the first step in teaching citizenship-as-identity.

This study indicated that practicing teachers are steeped in a very traditional discourse on citizenship education. My findings affirm that the origins and tenacity of teachers’ own identities must be understood by the teachers themselves—in particular how they have shaped their thinking in regards to citizenship and globalization (Barty, 2004). The implication is that teachers already in the field need support to jar them from their normal realities. Typical forms of social studies professional development would likely not be sufficient to provide this spark.

I recommend to teachers that they seek or create forums for their own development that rely on their increased and substantive participation in developing their own understandings of TCGW and the re-formation of their own identities in ways that support new practices. However, teachers cannot allow themselves to succumb to a simple postmodernism
of voice (Allen, 2004). Allen is clear that the mere sharing of experiences will not lead to self-directed transformation. Creating an environment of dissonance that brings us to a point of identity crisis is essential (Allen, 2004). Teachers need to be actively involved in grappling with global citizenship and difference is a catalyst as Vick confirmed in his end-of-study reflection:

*When I feel empowered to do something, my mind begins to run with it and I begin to experiment with things. And I think that’s what brought me on board more than anything. I can be on board with this and it’s not a cookie cutter—nobody’s telling me this is what it is, because nobody knows. It’s like this is still open to interpretation. So how can I interpret it? Can I interpret it as a working class leftist? And the answer was yeah. I can do that.*

At the onset of this study, I declared that what was missing from the field was critical attention to teachers’ knowledge. Much of what we knew about GCE was generated by university researchers through observations, questionnaires and interviews, with limited substantive participation on the part of teachers themselves. My recommendation that teachers find ways to assume critical participation in their own professional development is supported by the results of this study whereby the teachers successfully drew on their own capabilities—their own power—to shift their identities and generate new ways of thinking about educating young people for a changing world.

Discussion of Evolving Dimensions

The teachers’ evolving dimensions of a re-conceptualized citizenship education contribute to the development of knowledge through the provision of evidence that affirms these approaches or notions of citizenship education as they already exist in the literature: citizenship-as-identity and belonging (Abu El-Haj, 2007; Osler and Starkey, 2003); citizenship-as-
connection (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005); and citizenship-as-empowerment (Davies, 2006; Lawy and Biesta, 2006; Lister, 2008)

Citizenship-as-relation may offer a new lens for approaching global citizenship education in that it is exercised through constant, reflexive dialogue and choices about who we are, what’s important to us, and the kind of world we want to live in. Central to this dimension in my findings is the very personal, on-going search for how the individual sees herself as a citizen, and in particular how she chooses to see herself in relation to others.

The mainstay throughout the evolving dimensions was the teachers’ exploration of new ways of being that lay beyond their current state (Clarke, 2007). Each dimension blends into another, yet are distinct to the teachers, mirroring the teachers’ many selves at different points in time. The construction of the dimensions—all of the new possibilities created by the teachers—support this study’s major finding that identity is a location of agency. While not all of the teachers changed or changed back in the same ways at the same time is inconsequential. This study affirms Cahill’s (2007) notion that we are always in the process of becoming (Cahill, 2007) and that individuals are naturally fragmented and made of multiple selves (Brown and Jones, 2001).

The postmodern stance allowed us to see, for instance, Mary’s many constructions of ‘citizen’ rather than tidy them up or present a generalized ending. Recall that Mary entered the study thinking she might be both a national and a global citizen, and then immediately declared she wasn’t sure. She later claimed she was a global citizen, then she questioned if she needed to be a national citizen first. By the end of the study, she declared herself to be a global citizen. Frankly, I don’t know if Mary thinks she is a global citizen today. We were limited in our abilities
to clarify our own identifications as citizens (Brown and Jones, 2001). By grasping and ‘letting go’ of our newly constructed, fluid, and plural dimensions of citizenship education as we did, we were able to locate-relocate ourselves as citizens, diversely, as we exist. In the postmodern tradition we rejected one grand narrative about citizenship education and constructed four, personal, more temporal narratives that we could embrace and doubt, as anything else would prove unsatisfactory in speaking about this complex, globalized world (Agger, 1991).

Implications and Recommendations

If the formation and re-formation of our identities is an ethical imperative (particularly in regards to global citizenship and the pursuit of the common good), and there is a possibility of ethical self-formation (Clarke, 2007) as this study suggests, teacher education may need to focus less on transmission of global education or global citizenship education content and pedagogy and instead empower teachers-in-training to conceive of their own global citizenship education.

My findings assert that teachers want to be knowers, and that they need space to shift or re-form their identities. This work needs to be done in relation to other teachers:

Vick: I’ve been involved with professional learning communities in Futura City Schools, and the bad thing about all of them is there’s always an agenda. There’s an agenda here, but the agenda is-

Ed: Openness.

Vick: Is openness. We get to speak, we get to learn from one another. That’s what teachers want to do, we want to learn from one another.
Teacher educators may need to reconsider the ways they educate teachers-in-training about global citizenship education. My findings reveal that teachers’ identities are a site of agency for GCE, and that means teachers can adopt or resist GCE variously. Positioning teachers with each other as experts in the development of dimensions of TCGW may prove more productive than teaching GCE content and pedagogy—as teachers are most certainly experts in their own identities.

The defining aspect of the progressives in the early 20th century was the formation of experts. We aren’t experts. (Vick) (Sarcastically)

People get in a group and they got to have an expert. Someone’s got to talk and they got to make sure someone’s listening. (Ed) (Again, sarcastically)

Recall that in defining the problem for this study, I didn’t find that there was a lack of research outlining methods, curricula, etc. for global citizenship education. In fact, there was a growing base of research related to various aspects of GCE but it still wasn’t being enacted in most classrooms in meaningful ways. I recommend that teacher educators provide the conditions by which teachers become experts in global citizenship education from their multiple perspectives. I recommend programming that supports teachers’ critical and reflexive explorations of a non-universal concept of global citizenship, which is also likely a better fit for teachers’ own diverse students. Along similar lines, I recommend practicing teachers claim their expertise, and create the conditions by which they can approach global citizenship education through an on-going search for how they see themselves as citizens, and in particular how they choose to see themselves in relation to others, through a dialogue of dissonance with their peers. Multiple non-universal conceptualizations of global citizenship education can still challenge the traditional conceptualization and hence, the status quo.
Critique and Suggestions for Further Research

This study constitutes a starting place from which to understand a range of relationships between three particular teachers’ identities and TCGW. Those who work in the area of social studies, citizenship, or global education may find this critique helpful insofar as it points to suggestions for further research.

While I was satisfied with the conduct of this study overall, and I believe the findings to be significant, I have doubts about the depth of my “critical” analysis. I say this upon reflection, and rediscovering the notion that approaches deemed critical often leave the issue of race, for instance, to inhabit a subordinate position (Ladson-Billings, 1997; Allen, 2004). When I saw racism in the study, why didn’t I call it by its name (see Citizen-as-Relation)?

I am concerned that our application of critical theory occurred amidst the limited consciousness of all whites, and perhaps we needed the spark of knowledge that could only come from people of color (Allen, 2004). Could the teachers really understand how their whiteness functions within their citizen identity? Perhaps, even as no teachers of color were retained for this study, race specifically should have been the focus of analysis given its importance in the construction of citizenship (Allen, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2004). I framed the inquiry within a relational epistemology, asserting that all knowledge is socially constructed. As we interacted with each other in critical group discussions, we essentially participated in the minds of each other and saw into the how and why of our meaning making around citizenship (Krauss, 2005). But, who was at the table to do the knowing?

Similar studies that focus on our racial identities as citizens would benefit the field; such inquiries could focus on white race/ism and white privilege. I would also suggest further
research is needed to understand the ways that intersections of race, class, gender and/or sexuality operate within citizen identities. This work could consider those whose identities put them in a double bind or inquire as to precisely how intersections of race, class, gender and/or sexuality form axes within the citizen identity. In short, I would ask, is ‘citizen’ the identification that matters most in conceptualizing teaching for citizenship in a globalized world?

I privileged agency in my analysis as perhaps only a person of privilege could; my own identity as a citizen is tightly knit with an appreciation for the American meritocracy which I have so successfully navigated from a position of poverty. My findings speak to how our identities are locations of agency, but perhaps I am blinded by my privilege? Perhaps as Allen (2004) suggests, I blindly assert all of humanity is connected without really understanding issues of power or resources? I suggest that replicating this study outside of the United States would be worthwhile as I found it very difficult to escape my own privileged American-western worldview. More and new knowledge arrived at through the inquiry-to-social action process (Greenwood and Levin, 2000) which poses a challenge to white/western privilege’s investment in maintaining the status quo (Cahill, 2007a) has the potential to lead to a real questioning of our most basic values (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000) and the realization of social improvement: in this case the evolution of citizenship in a globalized world.

The most interesting replication by far would be a reflexive PAR project that embraced our borderless world, bringing together “knowers” from across the globe. Should the call for improved citizenship exist elsewhere as it does here (and I suspect it does)—perhaps this moment in time might be seized and international education reconceived—to create new and multiple visions about teaching for citizenship in our globalized world.
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Of course, PAR may not be culturally appropriate in all places; not every teacher would be comfortable working in this setting. In this case I might suggest that similar studies of the relationship between teachers’ identities and global citizenship education be framed within online interaction, teacher exchanges or student teaching abroad, Peace Corps experiences or any kind of extended learning with/about others as they hold the potential to raise teacher consciousness (Merryfield and Kasai, 2004). Experiences that create a tension between previously held beliefs and new realities can lead to puzzlement and the kind of reflection that leads to change (Merryfield, 2000).
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APPENDIX A: Mary’s Letter to the Reader

Dear Fellow Teacher:

Each school year begins with a kick off rally. The entire staff, k-12 is brought together to be inspired and motivated to reach start a new year. These convocations follow the same predictable pattern and frankly, I’m often more exhausted after leaving than when I walked in the door. I look at the latest guru who is dispensing advice meant to make my classroom innovative, differentiated, engaging or more relevant of the 21st century and wonder when they were last in a classroom. These “experts” don’t know me, or my students. Who are they to offer me advice, to tell me what to do? As I write this letter I am well aware that many out there will see me in this same light. I am fearful that what I have to say will be cast aside as just another of one of “those messages,” but hopeful that as a fellow teacher you may connect with what I have to say.

In one of our recent group sessions I was asked why teaching global citizenship mattered. It is important for you to understand my definition of global citizenship before I implore you to make teaching it a priority. To me, a global citizen:

• Actively engages with other cultures
• Appreciates the perspectives of others
• Realizes that the world and its systems are interconnected
• Is civically responsible
• Serves his/her fellow man to better all humanity

I’m sure there is better language, a more precise definition and that I’m probably leaving things out, but this is the core of what I believe, and what I hope we will all teach our students.

We have all heard about how our students are falling behind. How our students are no longer number one in the world. We are losing in the educational and economic race with China and India. To me, the importance of global education is not about this race. I see this as the selling point, and know that this is what drives the government, school boards, communities and many parents. But, for me it is much more personal, it’s a moral issue.

I recently heard a missionary speak who has traveled around the world many times. He no longer has anywhere that he calls home, but many places and people who will welcome him when he comes. His words helped me to put things in a clear perspective. He simply said,
“You’re going to die, and it’s all going to burn.” Now, I realize that he has a certain religious perspective that not all may agree with in terms of the burning. However, no one can dispute that fact that we are all going to die. The question that we need to consider, the point that he was making was that we need to focus on how we want to live. What kind of people we want to be. In terms of global education we must consider humanity and think about the students that we are preparing to send out into the world. The responsibility we have to prepare them for the world that they will inherit? The responsibility they have for their fellow man? At the deepest level they cannot be driven simply by competition. As an educator I cannot allow my students to turn a blind eye to the problems that face humanity. Ultimately for me it is a heart issue; a passion for mankind and instilling this passion in my students that drives me to make global education a priority.
APPENDIX B: Vick’s Letter to the Reader

To Whom It May Concern:

Global Citizenship, a concept that is at once simple and complex, familiar and as foreign as the most distant country you can imagine. As part of a team of teachers being used as research pieces for a doctoral thesis this is what has occupied my time, my thoughts, and my imagination for the last four months or so.

As a high school social studies teacher who’s focus is on United States History, Global Citizenship seemed like an interesting topic. Interesting is most definitely an understatement. My background and interests lie in labor history and in the study of the lives of common working Americans. Globalization is not a topic that I like to think of as a good thing. Globalization puts American workers out of a job. Globalization destroyed the American shoe industry. Globalization is destroying the American steel industry. Globalization is destroying the American automobile industry. Globalization even destroyed the American pottery industry; and that’s personal; my father worked in that industry making sanitary ware.

But, there’s more to it than my beliefs, misguided as they were. I pride myself on being open minded, a pragmatic idealist (try wrapping your brain around that). My historical hero is Eugene V. Debs, revolutionary American labor leader, four-time Socialist candidate for U. S. President, and founding member of my favorite historical organization, the I. W. W. Wait a minute, what’s the name of that radical, let’s change the world labor union? The Industrial Workers of the World; that means that my American hero was an early proponent of Global Citizenship!

With this epiphany I began to research Debs, my muse. Eugene Debs was a premature Global Citizen who fought all his life for the rights and betterment of working men and women; people like me and like my family before me. Three of his quotations opened my eyes. First was, “Those who produce should have, but we know that those who produce the most – that is, those who work hardest, and at the most difficult and most menial tasks, have the least.” Debs was talking about those who toil in sweatshops, and in cottage industries, and on subsistence farms in today’s “third world.” Second was, “When great changes occur in history, when great principles are involved, as a rule the majority are wrong.” Here Debs was telling me not to join the mass of educators and curriculum writers who are insisting that we must teach America First. But, the final quote spun my brain around one hundred eighty degrees. “I have no country to fight for; my country is the earth, and I am a citizen of the world.”
We live in a global world; look at our cars, our clothes, our food, our language, our entertainment. Look at our problems, can you name even one which is truly an American problem. Look at our classrooms; my students alone represent some fifteen different nations, four different races, and three of the world’s major religions. To not teach my students that they are, like Debs, citizens of the world is to be derelict in my responsibilities as an educator. My job, as is the job of all educators, is to teach the truth. I must teach a truth that is measurable and objective; not just the truth as I see it. My students are facing a future whose commerce will be increasingly global. The problems their generation must solve are global problems. They will face problems that may dwarf past problems like the Great Depression and World War II. If I don’t begin now to inform them that they are citizens of the world, not just America, I will have left no legacy behind. I will have failed them.

Eugene V. Debs thank you, again you have reached out of the past, called me to action, and pointed me toward a more perfect future.
APPENDIX C: Ed’s Email

You will be glad to hear I was tutoring that student I told you about that broke his right leg and left ankle, well he is doing all his work at home. He needs to somehow pass language and his teacher is giving him an assignment to write a persuasive paper. She gave her ideas and I thought it would be best for him to write about something he knows personally, like soccer which he is good at. He gave her a suggestion to do that and I used the idea that soccer could help global citizenship as it is something that transcends boundaries and allows people to learn from others and other localities and other cultures which would make us want to consider their lives when we want to do something that might effect other countries.