

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Dissertations - ALL

SURFACE

December 2015

How "global" are global history teachers? Secondary social studies teachers' understandings of global awareness and global education

Ardyth L. Watson
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Watson, Ardyth L., "How "global" are global history teachers? Secondary social studies teachers' understandings of global awareness and global education" (2015). *Dissertations - ALL*. 411.
<https://surface.syr.edu/etd/411>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the SURFACE at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations - ALL by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

Abstract

Although global history has been a part of the discipline of social studies in New York State for a number of years, the inclusion of global education and skills has been less prevalent in the discipline. This lack of global perspectives in education has proven to be detrimental to the global awareness of American students. (Roper for National Geographic Foundation, 2006; Harvard University, 2004; Holm and Farber, 2002; Clarke, 2004). Global history teachers play a key role in the dissemination of global content that may contribute to increasing global awareness of students. Yet teachers, themselves, may have limited global awareness and intercultural experiences that impact the ways in which they teach global history. Therefore, this dissertation examined how global history teachers in upstate New York construct their global awareness and the content they teach, and how their understandings of global education impact their teaching.

Eight global history teachers in five school districts took part in this study. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews and observations, and was informed by theoretical work around colonialism and post-colonialism/post-nationalism. Results of this study revealed that these teachers saw their worldviews as evolving constructs, shaped by upbringing, cross-cultural interactions, travel experiences, media influences, and professional responsibilities. Certain global education elements infused their teaching, such as local/global connections, perspectives consciousness, and cultural sensitivity, but the inclusion of such elements was uneven. Furthermore, their language in many cases revealed an incomplete understanding of global education and cultural awareness. Elements of colonialism, essentialism, and American exceptionalism were both challenged and reinforced in the ways in which these teachers spoke about their global understandings, and the history content and students they taught.

HOW “GLOBAL” ARE GLOBAL HISTORY TEACHERS?
SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS’ UNDERSTANDINGS OF GLOBAL
AWARENESS AND GLOBAL EDUCATION

by

Ardyth L. Watson

B.A., State University College at Geneseo, 1992
M.S., State University College at New Paltz, 1999

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Curriculum

Syracuse University
December 2015

Copyright © Ardyth L. Watson 2015
All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank the teachers who generously donated their time, expertise, and perspectives that form the basis of this work. I am forever grateful for their enthusiasm and willingness to take part in this research.

My tremendous thanks and immense gratitude go to Dr. Jeffrey Mangram, who was with me from the beginning and served as coach, therapist, friend, critic, and cheerleader throughout this entire process.

My deepest thanks also to my committee members, Dr. George Theoharis and Dr. Marcelle Haddix, whose unfailing support, helpful advice, perspicacity, and intelligence broadened my perspectives and enabled me to craft a better dissertation.

Also, thanks to my sister, Dr. April Watson, who gave me inspiration and advice over the course of this endeavor. Santa Fe awaits us.

And finally, most of all, thank you to my family, Rob, Ella, and Ewan, who saw me with patience, understanding, love, and laughter to the finish.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents,

Alvin and Sheila Watson,

who would have been proud.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 3 |
| Background: The Discipline of Social Studies and Global Education | 5 |
| Background in Global Education..... | 7 |
| Recent Initiatives in Global Education | 9 |
| Global Education Resources | 11 |
| A Note on State Mandates | 14 |
| Overview of Dissertation Chapters..... | 17 |
| Summary..... | 19 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review | 21 |
| Theoretical Lens: Colonialism and Imperialism..... | 22 |
| Discourses and Essentialism..... | 25 |
| Neocolonialism and American Hegemony | 28 |
| Legacies of Colonialism and Neocolonialism in Education | 32 |
| What is Global Education? Defining the Phrase..... | 33 |
| The Purposes of Global Education | 34 |
| Research on Global Education and Teachers..... | 36 |
| Scholarship on Teachers and Multiculturalism..... | 41 |
| Challenges to Implementation of Global Education..... | 43 |
| Gaps and Limitations of the Literature | 47 |
| Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods | 49 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Methodology..... | 50 |
| Why Qualitative Research?..... | 50 |
| Symbolic Interactionism..... | 51 |
| Methods..... | 52 |
| Why Observation? | 52 |
| Why Interviewing?..... | 53 |
| Data Collection and Analysis..... | 55 |
| Data Collection | 55 |
| Data Analysis | 58 |
| Participants and Setting..... | 61 |
| Participant Selection | 61 |
| Description of Participants..... | 62 |
| Table of Participants | 65 |
| Setting..... | 65 |
| A Note About Reflexivity, Bias, and Situating the Researcher..... | 66 |
| Situating Myself in the Research | 67 |
| Issues of Bias and Subjectivity | 69 |
| Chapter 4: “There’s a whole other world out there:” Constructing Global Awareness and Perspectives..... | 74 |
| Impact of Diversity in Teachers’ Backgrounds | 75 |
| Diversity in Teachers’ Upbringings..... | 75 |
| Using Color-Blind Discourse..... | 82 |
| Experiences with Multicultural Diversity in College | 85 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Teachers’ Development of Global Awareness | 88 |
| From “Growing” to “Very Aware:” Teachers’ Descriptions of Global Awareness | 89 |
| Global Awareness as Professional Responsibility | 92 |
| Global Awareness Through Life Experiences | 94 |
| Impact of Travel on Global Awareness: The “Traveler” versus the “Tourist” | 97 |
| Teachers’ Understandings of the World | 107 |
| Media Representations and Influence on Global Thinking | 107 |
| Challenging or Reinforcing Colonialism?: Teachers’ Perceptions of other Places | 111 |
| Challenging Notions of American Exceptionalism | 119 |
| The Role of the United States in the Twenty-First Century | 123 |
| Summary | 128 |
| Chapter 5: “The rest of the world matters:” Implementing Global Perspectives in Teaching..... | 133 |
| The Meaning of “Global Education”: Just a Buzzword?..... | 135 |
| Definitions of Global Education | 135 |
| The Purpose of Global Education: Cooperation or Competition?..... | 139 |
| Skills and Opportunities of Globally Aware Students..... | 145 |
| Teaching with Global Perspectives..... | 150 |
| Local/Global Connections | 151 |
| Prejudice Reduction and Attention to Inequalities | 154 |
| Perspectives Consciousness | 159 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Cross-Cultural Competence | 166 |
| The cultural festival: Promoting tourism, not competence | 167 |
| Fostering cross-cultural awareness in the classroom: | |
| Transnational students | 171 |
| Cross-cultural awareness in the classroom: | |
| Teaching about Islam | 173 |
| Additional cross-cultural learning opportunities in the classroom | 179 |
| Challenges to Global Education in the Classroom | 182 |
| The Regents Exam and Annual Professional Performance Review | 182 |
| The Challenge of Time | 187 |
| Summary | 192 |
| Chapter 6: Conclusion..... | 196 |
| Summary of Findings and Further Connections to Literature | 198 |
| Limitations and Next Steps in the Field..... | 206 |
| Implications and Recommendations: Decolonizing Social Studies and | |
| Global Education | 208 |
| Appendix A: School District Information..... | 214 |
| Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Questions | 215 |
| Appendix C: Email Recruitment Message..... | 216 |
| Appendix D: Informed Consent Form: Interview..... | 217 |
| Appendix E: Informed Consent Form: Observation..... | 218 |
| Appendix F: Principal Notification Letter | 219 |
| References..... | 220 |

Chapter 1:

Introduction

When I was about twenty-three years old, I had an opportunity to live in Scotland and travel throughout Europe for about a year, before returning to the United States and embarking on a teaching career. I remember one occasion in which my Scottish friend and I, while staying in a youth hostel somewhere in central France, befriended the young man who ran the hostel. He was English, but had been living in France for a number of years. We were speaking together in a local cafe about what I am sure we thought were very important topics of conversation at the time, such as politics, history, and culture. In the course of this conversation, I remember the discussion turned to the history of McCarthyism in the United States and the perceived American¹-aversion to socialism in all of its manifestations. Yet as the conversation unfolded, I recall being somewhat sidelined by it; my Scottish friend and English acquaintance essentially rejected my input in favor of their own interpretations of United States history. I remember feeling irked because, while I was the only person from the United States in the room, I was not asked about my opinions and views of my own country's history on this topic.

Some years later, as a new social studies teacher working in a relatively affluent downstate suburban public school district, I had a student in class from a Mexican migrant family. She had only been in the country a few years and was in the process of learning English. I remember thinking about her quite often as I was teaching United States history. Having some background in Second Language Education, I understood the principles of language acquisition. But my coursework had not prepared me for the cultural aspects of teaching transnational students. Yet

¹ I use the term "American" to refer to citizens of the United States of America, with the understanding that the term may be used elsewhere in reference to other places in the Western Hemisphere.

my experiences living abroad raised my awareness to such issues and I often wondered how this student understood the history content that was being taught to her from an American perspective. For example, I was acutely aware of my own lack of understanding about the Mexican War from a Mexican perspective when the topic arose. Furthermore, how did the curriculum I was teaching impact all of the students in the classroom? To what extent was I perpetuating the metanarrative of United States history in my teaching?

I recount these stories as personal examples to illustrate how the United States and “the West” historically create the discourses to which others are subjected. In the conversation between my European friends, I felt personally irritated by people not from the United States directing the conversation, but soon realized that, both historically and presently, the United States’ government, media, and society inflict the same treatment on other countries regularly. The legacies of American exceptionalism, colonialism, and neo-imperialism likely impact the ways in which Americans view the world and devalue the perspectives of other countries. Even the term “American,” referring exclusively to people from the United States and not from other areas within the Americas, for example, represents these entrenched attitudes. Thus, these ideas about colonialism, neoimperialism, and American exceptionalism frame this research in relation to global education and history teaching, and will be defined at more length later in the dissertation.

My interest in such ideas, combined with my reflections from living and traveling abroad and my background with international students, led me to this dissertation. In particular, I wanted to investigate how global history teachers, given the nature of the content that they teach, frame their understanding of the world and its peoples, and how their understandings impact their pedagogy. The field of global education, as will be discussed, aims to challenge and

overcome persistent paradigms within education that situate the world in an Us/Them and/or North/South dichotomy (Pike, 2008; Merryfield, 2005; Burack, 2003; Nyambe & Shipena, 1998). Such binaries arose from decades-old discourses of colonialism, neoimperialism, and American exceptionalism that position the United States as the global hegemon and privilege “the West,” politically, culturally, and economically (Rizvi, Lingard, & Lavia, 2006). Therefore, I wanted to understand the extent to which those ideas continue to persist with, or are challenged by, social studies teachers who teach global history content and how they understand global education.

Statement of the Problem

Although global history has been a part of the discipline of social studies in many states for a number of years, the inclusion of global education and global awareness skills has been less prevalent in the discipline. These limitations of incorporating global perspectives in education have proven to be detrimental to the global awareness of American students. The results of a 2006 National Geographic – Roper Survey, for example, illustrate a critical lack of global knowledge among 18-24 year-olds in the United States, suggesting that, "young people in the United States...are unprepared for an increasingly global future. Far too many lack even the most basic skills for ...understanding the relationships among people and places that provide critical context for world events" (Roper for National Geographic Foundation, 2006, p. 7). Other recent studies have shown a similar lack of global awareness among American students. In 2001, the National Commission on Asia in the Schools released a report stating that young Americans are "dangerously uninformed about international matters" and that "this knowledge deficit is particularly glaring in the case of Asia," a region populated with over 60 percent of the world's people (National Commission on Asia in the Schools, 2001, p. 6-7). Similarly, additional studies

have shown that American students urgently need more knowledge of international affairs and demonstrate a great degree of inattention and insularity to world issues (Harvard University, 2004; Holm and Farber, 2002; Clarke, 2004). Thus, I wondered how and why the teaching of global history and global issues, despite being mandated content in New York State, may or may not contribute to students' global awareness.

Furthermore, according to a 2003 Pew Research Center survey of global attitudes, 60% of surveyed Americans agree with the statement: “Our people are not perfect, but our culture is superior to others” (Noddings, 2005), substantiating perceived ethnocentric views and ideas of American exceptionalism. Similarly, a 2012 World Savvy survey of high school graduates aged 18-24 revealed that only about 12 percent of respondents “agreed completely” that their 6-12 grade education helped them to understand the roots of global issues that affect their lives today (World Savvy, 2012). In fact, 48 percent of those surveyed disagreed with the statement, with some noting that the instruction they received was very centered on the United States. In a different article, Avery observed that students are generally unfamiliar with other countries’ governments as well as intergovernmental organizations, commenting that, “this parochialism is likely to inhibit their ability to adopt a global perspective” (Avery, 2004, p. 50). Thus, global awareness and education remains vital for both students *and* teachers if we hope to disrupt these insular and ethnocentric attitudes.

Global perspectives in education gain further importance given the fact that transnational students are entering American public schools in large numbers, to the extent that English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest growing population in public schools (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2002). By “transnational” students, I mean both immigrant and refugee students, born and raised in countries or regions outside of the

United States, many of whom are part of ELL programs in United States public schools. Global interactions, therefore, are becoming routine in education and society, making global awareness a necessity, not merely a desire. Indeed, Thornton (2005) observes, "global interdependence *requires* that Americans acquire relevant knowledge and a receptive attitude about internationalism" (2005, p. 82). As international populations migrate, and as patterns of global interdependence persist, global and cross-cultural understandings are more important than ever for our students, our teachers, our schools, and our communities.

Given the results of such surveys, why might many of our students in New York State, armed with at least two years' worth of mandated global history content, fail to graduate from high school with adequate global knowledge? How is the Global History and Geography course offered in grades nine and ten taught to them? In other words, how "global" is the Global History that is being taught? With these questions in mind, I aimed to explore the ways in which thinking globally enters into the secondary social studies classroom via teachers' epistemological and pedagogical understandings, students they teach, curriculum they follow, and resources they use. Specifically, I sought to understand how secondary social studies teachers construct global awareness and the global content they teach, and how their global understandings impact their teaching practices.

Background: The Discipline of Social Studies and Global Education

Since its inception as a separate educational discipline in the early twentieth century, social studies has served to promote nationalism, patriotism, and citizenship in an effort to assimilate and unify Americans (Banks, 2007; Thornton, 2005). Reforms in recent decades reexamined the purpose of social studies education in the United States to make it more inclusive and multicultural, noting the achievements and contributions of various ethnic groups that comprise

American society. The movement toward "global education," largely begun in the 1970s, attempts to widen the perspective of multiculturalism even further by promoting knowledge and conceptualizations of the world as an interconnected system in which individuals examine their positions and participation as citizens of both nations and the world (Alger & Harf, 1985; Case, 1993; Merryfield & Wilson, 2005).

In New York State, the most recent curricular reform in social studies occurred in 1999 when the state phased out the less demanding Regents Competency Tests in favor of arguably more rigorous Regents Exams for all students. Accompanying these assessment changes was a curricular shift in grades nine and ten. The current curriculum, Global History and Geography, replaced the former Global Studies course, taught in grades nine and ten as well, which followed a regional and cultural emphasis, rather than the chronological/thematic approach followed by the current curriculum (Grant, 2002). This curriculum change occurred, in part, as a result of new administration at the state level that implemented new standards in all content areas, as well as via the influence of a report entitled "One Nation, Many People" written by the New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee. The "One Nation, Many People" report recommended revisions to the earlier Global Studies curriculum that would provide more opportunities for students to learn from multiple perspectives and to "remove language that [was] insensitive or that may be interpreted as racist or sexist" (New York State Education Department, 1991).

Even more recently, New York state social studies standards are undergoing revisions aiming to graduate students with college, career, and civic life skills. This C3 Framework incorporates an inquiry-based approach to the teaching of social studies, in which students develop questions and plan inquiries, apply disciplinary tools and concepts, evaluate sources and

use evidence, and communicate conclusions and take informed action (NCSS, 2015). It should be noted, however, that despite this adjustment in social studies education, New York State did not adopt formal guidelines or standards explicitly including global education or perspectives in its state standards, nor did the chronological scope and sequence of the global history curriculum fundamentally change.

Yet even with these reforms, social studies remains a highly politicized discipline (Banks, 2001). With an anti-immigrant sentiment among some political conservatives posed against a push toward global perspectives and multiculturalism in education, social studies education serves an ambiguous purpose. Historically, social studies has been the subject of assimilation and acculturation in public schools, expressing an United States-centric metanarrative that perpetuates as the students who learn social studies this way become teachers (Banks, 2001). Thus teachers, many originating from the white American-born middle class population (Boser, 2014), may well have a limited understanding of global awareness that can influence how the curriculum is taught and communicated to an increasingly diverse student population. At a time when non-native English speaking students are becoming the fastest growing segment of the public school population and the effects of globalization increasingly impact economic, political, and social landscapes (Friedman, 2007; Zakaria, 2008), the discipline of social studies needs to be reexamined. It must become more accessible to an increasingly international student body as well as more globally relevant to native-born United States students.

Background of Global Education

The push toward more global perspectives in education arose in the late 1970s, partly as an extension of the movement toward multiculturalism in education as well as in response to increased economic globalization and the perceived decline of American hegemony (Anderson,

1982; Merryfield & Wilson, 2005; Alger & Harf, 1986). Anthropologist Robert Hanvey, concerned that Americans develop cultural understandings in a global context, proposed five basic elements for a global perspective in his seminal work published in 1976 entitled *An Attainable Global Perspective*. These elements include: perspectives consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and awareness of human choices (Hanvey, 1976). These aspects of a global perspective were adapted and modified over time, but remain a core of global education.

This earlier global education paradigm begun in the 1970s continues to be expanded upon and reframed as effects of globalization, both positive and negative, reverberate throughout the world. A 2001 published piece authored by Merry Merryfield urges educators to look beyond the "us" and "them" global divide conceived during the Cold War. According to Merryfield, "we need to globalize global education through literature, theories and diverse perspectives that reflect the complexity of the planet in the early twenty-first century" (Merryfield, 2001). She offers a number of ways educators can "decolonize social studies content" to better prepare students for a global future. These pedagogical processes include critically examining the traditional pedagogy of imperialism that has served to limit understanding of the world's peoples and conflicts, illuminating the perspectives and voices of people who have been marginalized in mainstream discourse, and offering real-life cross-cultural experiences within different contexts of power and privilege. Unless such pedagogical changes are made, American students will continue to be taught with imperial and Cold War frameworks that misrepresent global experiences and complexities (Merryfield, 2001). Despite continuing redefinitions and framing of global education, its core elements have regained particular importance as national and state educational leaders have responded to the need for a curriculum that is more "global" in its

outlook.

Recent Initiatives in Global Education

A formal mention of global perspectives in social studies education occurred in 1994 when the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) incorporated global connections into its curriculum standards for social studies. As part of the ten thematic strands that form the basis of the social studies standards issued by NCSS, Strand Nine: Global Connections states that, "social studies programs should include experiences that provide for the study of global connections and interdependence" (NCSS, 1994). In 2001, the National Council for Social Studies issued a revised position statement on Preparing Citizens for a Global Community which included an analysis of global education, urging social studies programs to better prepare students for awareness of global perspectives, issues, and citizenship (NCSS, 2001; Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). In their policy statement, the National Council for Social Studies stated, "an effective social studies program must include global and international education. Global and international education are important because the day-to-day lives of average citizens around the world are influenced by burgeoning international connections" (NCSS, 2001).

Since 2009, the move toward more global perspectives in education is gaining ground given the growing movement toward Common Core Standards in Education and emphasis on "21st Century Learning." The Common Core Standards, currently adopted by all but five states, emphasize that they are, "informed by other top performing countries, so that all students are prepared to succeed in a global economy and society" (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2015). In addition to the Common Core Standards Initiative, and perhaps in an effort to meet them, many states and school districts have begun adopting "21st Century Skills," a framework designed to prepare students for the information and skills they will need to "master the

multidimensional abilities required of them in the 21st century" (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2012). One of the key aspects of 21st century learning involves global understanding and awareness. According to its website, the Partnership for 21st Century Skills outlines elements of global awareness as:

Using 21st century skills to understand and address global issues, learning from and working collaboratively with individuals representing diverse cultures, religions and lifestyles in a spirit of mutual respect and open dialogue in personal, work, and community contexts, [and] understanding other nations and cultures, including the use of non-English languages (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2012).

Fifteen states have signed on as "P21 Leadership States;" New York State is not one of them, although individual school districts within New York state have included 21st century skills in their educational goals and philosophy statements.

Some states have begun mandating or including global education in their education policies. In Massachusetts, for example, legislation was passed in 2006, entitled *The International Education Initiative* (Chapter 123 of the Acts of 2006), that recognized the importance of global education, creating the Education and Foreign Language Fund to support school districts (Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, 2008). In their position paper, *Global Education: A Call to Action*, the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents urged school districts and policymakers to continue efforts to infuse global education into instruction, reminding them that, "what matters is that public schools adequately prepare our students to live in a global society...we must educate students for their future, not our past" (Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, 2008). In response to these actions, the Massachusetts Department of Education established a Global Education Advisory Council that advises the Board of Education, "on matters relating to the instruction, curriculum and assessment of global studies in Massachusetts K-12 public schools" (Global Education

Advisory Council, 2012).

Similarly, the Ohio Department of Education released a booklet in 2009 in response to the 21st Century Skills initiative and its focus on global education components with recommendations from its International Education Advisory Committee (IEAC), which defines international education through global context, global content, global thinkers, and global systems. The booklet contains practical suggestions to implement global and international perspectives into the curriculum. In fact, the policy work done by the IEAC and the Ohio State Department of Education was noteworthy enough to earn the Goldman Sachs Foundation prize for international education in 2008 (Ohio Department of Education, 2009).

In addition to Massachusetts and Ohio, other states, such as North Carolina and Wisconsin include explicit global education goals in their mission statements. Wisconsin, in fact, recently implemented a Global Education Certificate program for participating public high schools in an attempt to encourage more students to become global citizens. According to its website, the Global Education Certificate:

focuses and validates the excellent global education learning opportunities already in place in most school districts, encourages students to enroll in classes with global content in the arts, sciences, and humanities, and prepares globally competent students who are career ready in Wisconsin and beyond (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction).

Thus, some states encourage global education either through state mandates or formal initiatives that focus on the implementation of global perspectives in public education, revealing that education leaders at the highest levels are recognizing the need for more formal inclusion of global education elements into public education in the United States.

Global Education Resources

Because of the recognized need for global awareness and global education practices, these initiatives are gaining momentum. As such, there are increasingly a number of publications,

organizations, and online resources that serve as guides for educators wishing to foster more global awareness among students and include global perspectives in their districts. Various groups, such as the World History Association, provide resources and leadership for teaching history from global, rather than Eurocentric, perspectives (Merryfield and Wilson, 2005). Additionally, with the advent of the internet and world wide web, information about global education is plentiful. Numerous global education organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and university groups utilize websites to share resources, curricula, lesson plans, cross-cultural communication, and information about global issues, disseminating information to educators worldwide.

In 2002, the American Forum for Global Education, an organization self-described as, "[promoting] the education of American youth for responsible citizenship in an increasingly interconnected and rapidly changing world," published a Global Education Checklist for teachers, schools, school systems, and state education agencies (American Forum for Global Education, 2002). This checklist, based upon a set of guidelines published in 1998 by H. Thomas Collins, Frederick Czarra, and Andrew F. Smith, was designed as a practical tool that teachers and other educators could use to measure their work within global education (American Forum, 2002). Measures from the micro-level (textbooks, student body, internet access, curriculum, hiring of teachers) to the macro-level (state education policy, certification requirements for teachers, state standards) were gauged and assessed in a self-evaluation format. In addition, the American Forum for Global Education maintains a website with globally relevant teaching ideas, articles, and references.

As the core curriculum initiative emerged, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head

departments of elementary and secondary education in the states and U.S. jurisdictions, released a Global Education Policy Statement in 2006 that outlined its goals and rationale for the more widespread inclusion of global elements within education. In this statement, the CCSSO cites five major challenges education faces in the 21st century including global skill deficits among American students, standards and curricula that do not emphasize the mastery of world languages, lack of training and support of teachers in global content, and weaknesses in educational practices (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2006). The policy statement subsequently makes specific recommendations to address these challenges in order to, "[increase] the rigor of our academic standards and, thereby [ensure] that all students are prepared to succeed in the global society" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2006).

At the state level, Ohio has been at the forefront of global education. The Ohio Department of Education, for example, released a handbook for educators entitled, "Ohio Teachers Going Global". This handbook includes examples and suggestions for instructional strategies that create global awareness, recommendations for transitioning to a more global classroom, curriculum information from other countries, and resources for teachers and educators who wish to incorporate more global perspectives and opportunities in their teaching (Ohio Department of Education, 2009). Additionally, leaders from Ohio P-12 schools, colleges, businesses, and non-profit organizations formed ThinkGlobalOhio.org, a multimedia toolkit of resources to help Ohio schools prepare students to become more globally competent. In addition to listing practical resources for educators, the group promotes global learning by heading such efforts as organizing International Education Week, offering \$2000 grants to schools pursuing international projects, and convening the Ohio International Summit for Education, among others (Think Global Ohio, 2012). I mention the initiatives that Ohio and other states have adopted in

the field of global education to illustrate how global education can be incorporated at the state level and as a point of comparison with New York State which does not have such formally adopted initiatives.

Other organizations, such as the Asia Society, Longview Foundation, Global Education Advisory Council, iEARN, and Taking It Global promote global education by offering online resources, webinars, professional development, publications, and funding for educators. These organizations, along with many others, are critical for the dissemination of information about global education that will hopefully continue to enlighten and affect change within American education. In fact, implementing global education initiatives is arguably facilitated by the increasingly manifold resources offered online. As global education resources become more ubiquitous, and as an increasing number of states and school districts adopt global education initiatives, global perspectives enter into the discourses of public education in general.

A Note on State Mandates

I began my education career in 1995 teaching “Regents” and “Non-Regents” ninth grade Global Studies at a downstate high school in which students were grouped by ability. Students earned a Regents diploma by taking a Regents-level course and passing the Regents exam. Students enrolled in the “non-Regents” level class often sat for the Regents Competency Test (RCT) in order to earn local graduation credit rather than a Regents diploma. Then, in 1999 New York State phased out the less demanding Regents Competency Tests in favor of arguably more rigorous Regents exams for all students. Accompanying these assessment changes was a curricular shift in grades nine and ten. The current curriculum, Global History and Geography, replaces the former Global Studies course, taught in grades nine and ten as well. The former Global Studies course followed a regional and cultural emphasis, rather than the

chronological/thematic approach followed by the current curriculum (Grant, 2002). This curriculum change occurred, in part, as a result of new administration at the state level that implemented new standards in all content areas, as well as via the influence of a report entitled "One Nation, Many People" written by the New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee (New York State Education Department, 1991).

The current Global History and Geography course, taught in grades nine and ten, takes a chronological and thematic approach, beginning with the development of human civilization in grade nine and ending with an exploration of current global issues by the end of grade ten. New York State frames "global history" as the history of the world virtually exclusive of the United States. To give an example of the scope of the course content, a sample unit on Ancient World Civilizations and Religions (4000 B.C. to 500 A.D.) includes the following topics: migration of early peoples, Neolithic Revolution and early river civilizations, Chinese civilizations, Greek civilization, Roman civilization, the Maurya Empire, global trade routes, and belief systems from animism to Jainism and major monotheistic religions. Needless to say, the content of the course is arguably massive. Understanding the enormity of the curriculum and the Regents exam helps to frame these teachers' statements and concerns regarding the challenge of including global elements into their teaching as will be discussed later in the chapter.

As mentioned previously, students in New York state are assessed on their global history and geography knowledge from grades nine and ten on a state Regents exam administered upon completion of the two-year course at the end of tenth grade. Students cannot graduate from high school unless they pass this assessment, among others. The exam consists of fifty multiple-choice questions, one thematic essay, and one Document-Based essay question (DBQ) that includes constructed response questions (CRQs) accompanying the documents. Students have

three hours to complete the exam, unless allowed extended time as part of an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Unlike on Regents exams prior to 1999, students do not have a choice of thematic or DBQ essay topics. Yet the multiple choice portion of the exam carries much more weight than the essay portions, suggesting an emphasis on this type of test-taking skill over those required for essay writing, such as critical thinking, analysis, and argumentation. In fact, it is technically possible to pass the exam without writing either of the essays. Yet it is precisely those higher level skills that comprise much of the rhetoric surrounding Common Core initiatives which currently dominate much of the educational discourse, illustrating a disconnect between Common Core standards and the current Global History and Geography Regents exam in New York State.

While the current curriculum and Regents exam have been part of New York state social studies standards since the 1990's, Common Core and APPR initiatives are relatively new having only entered the educational conversation in New York since 2010 when the state was awarded Race to the Top funding from the Obama administration. This funding was contingent upon the state adopting a teacher evaluation system tied, in part, to student performance on standardized exams (McNeil, 2014). As this chapter discusses, these changes have affected teachers and the ways in which they teach.

The Common Core standards for social studies adopted by New York state, while too extensive to describe in detail here, essentially reflect the Common Core literacy standards in reading, writing, research, and critical analysis created for English Language Arts with social studies content-specific details (New York State Education Department, 2013). In an attempt to meet these requirements, New York State is undergoing another curricular revision, entitled the College, Career, and Civic Life C3 Framework for Social Studies Standards. A key element in

this revision entails the use of an “Inquiry Arc” that includes four dimensions: developing questions and planning inquiries, applying disciplinary concepts and tools, evaluating sources and using evidence, and communicating conclusions and taking informed action (NCSS, 2013). While the inquiry-based model of learning is not new, and has always been a part of global education, it now holds an important place in mandated New York state social studies standards, although it should be noted that at the time of my interviews with these teachers, the C3 Frameworks were being drafted. Therefore, teachers did not necessarily have knowledge of these revisions at that time. Nevertheless, social studies educators statewide wonder how these new frameworks will be reflected in future Regents exams and the role standardized tests will play in teacher evaluation scores.

As mentioned previously, New York State was awarded \$700 million in federal Race to the Top funding in 2010. This funding required the state to devise a statewide teacher evaluation plan linked, in part, to student performance on standardized tests (McNeil, 2014). As a result, currently twenty to forty percent of a teacher’s evaluation score of their Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) is determined by student performance on state assessments. Furthermore, citing a discrepancy between high teacher performance ratings and low student test performance throughout the state, New York Governor Andrew Cuomo recently announced that he wants teacher evaluations to be based at least fifty percent on student performance in the future, although whether that provision will be mandated remains unclear (Harris, 2015). Nevertheless, teacher evaluations remain tied to student performance on standardized tests in some capacity for the foreseeable future.

Overview of Dissertation Chapters

Because social studies education and its teachers may remain subjected to the dominant

narratives of colonialism/neocolonialism and American hegemony and exceptionalism, I begin this dissertation with a survey of the current theoretical literature and research on colonialism/neocolonialism and its legacy within education. Chapter Two also addresses scholarship that defines and frames global education, including its key elements and purposes, followed by a discussion of the literature surrounding teaching and global education including teacher attitudes and preparation in incorporating global perspectives, teacher identity and background in relation to development of global mindedness, and challenges to implementation of global education.

Chapter Three discusses qualitative research methodology and methods, explaining the rationale for using qualitative research for a study of this type, and briefly exploring symbolic interactionism as a theoretical and methodological approach to my research. In addition, I explain the use of interviewing and observation as research methods, addressing issues of subjectivity and bias given my positionality as a practicing global history teacher in New York State myself.

Chapter Four addresses the findings from my initial research question regarding teachers' development of global awareness and their understandings of global education. I discuss teachers' backgrounds including their varying exposures to diverse communities growing up, cross-cultural opportunities and, for some, the use of color-blind discourse in describing racial and/or ethnic diversity. I also describe how these teachers perceive their own global awareness, detailing the language they use to describe it, their thoughts on where it originates, and what they feel has most contributed to their worldviews including travel and professional responsibilities.

Chapter Five details findings related to my second research question about how these teachers explain the meaning and purposes of global education and how their understandings

impact their teaching practice. Specifically, I discuss findings related to the elements of global education they include in their teaching, the skills and opportunities they think globally aware students should have, and the challenges they perceive to the inclusion of global elements in the teaching of global history.

The final chapter of this dissertation includes a discussion of key findings from the research and their connections to the literature, as well as limitations and next steps in the field of social studies and global education. I also offer recommendations for educators at all levels to consider ways to incorporate global perspectives into education and to decolonize the ways in which social studies education is taught.

Summary

Despite global education being a prevalent discourse in the field of social studies education for many years, only recently has a concerted effort been made to incorporate global education elements into schools. With the 21st Century Skills and Common Core Initiatives, global education has gained significant ground. Indeed, given prevalent studies showing American students' lack of global preparedness, the need for global education remains critical. This dissertation aims to contribute to the field of social studies and global education by exploring the ways in which thinking globally enters into the secondary social studies classroom via teachers' epistemological and pedagogical understandings, students they teach, curriculum they follow, and resources they use. Specifically, I seek to understand how secondary social studies teachers construct global awareness and the global content they teach, and how their global understandings impact their teaching practices. In this way, scholars, practitioners, and administrators may better understand how adequately global awareness is being taught to students in New York state and explore ways to increase its inclusion. Only by understanding

the phenomenon can we implement change and move toward addressing these concerns, so that all students become the globally aware and engaged citizens we hope for them to be.

Chapter 2:

Literature Review

Historically, the majority of global education included in social studies programs, and which largely continues to frame "official" bodies such as the World Bank and the United Nations, follows what Nyambe and Shipena (1998) describe as the "modernization paradigm", in which the world is oriented around a North/South divide. The North, characterized by development, industrialization, and advancement, is portrayed as superior to the underdeveloped, "Third World" South. Little attention is paid in social studies classes as to why such a division exists or how detrimental such a paradigm may be to understanding the world (Nyambe and Shipena, 1998).

Despite contemporary discourses around globalization, intercultural sensitivity, and postcolonial societies, the modernization paradigm continues to exist, both within social studies education and American society at large. Because social studies education and its teachers may remain subjected to the dominant narratives of colonialism/neocolonialism and American hegemony and exceptionalism, in this chapter I present a survey of the current theoretical literature and research on colonialism/neocolonialism from which the modernization paradigm arose and its legacy within education. I also include a brief discussion of post-colonial theory to elaborate upon my own theoretical orientation, with the understanding that there is never a pure positionality regarding my worldview, as I continue to be shaped by competing and evolving discourses of post/colonialism, post/nationalism, and transnationalism.

I then address scholarship that defines and frames global education, including its key elements and purposes, followed by a discussion of the literature surrounding teaching and global education including teacher attitudes and preparation in incorporating global perspectives.

Lastly, I review some of the literature that reveals key challenges to the implementation of global education practices as well as a discussion of best practices and limitations or gaps in the literature.

Theoretical Lens: Colonialism and Imperialism

The North/South divide referenced by Nyambe and Shipena arose from complex historical periods defined by European expansion and dominance over other parts of the world. Common social studies textbooks refer to these periods as the Age of Imperialism, generally encompassing (in Eurocentric terms) the time from the 15th century Colombian explorations in the Western hemisphere to the demise of European colonialism in the post-World War II era. Yet this designated "Age of Imperialism," over-simplified and condensed in contemporary social studies textbooks, generated deep-seated cultural, political, and economic effects that transformed the world and led to pervasive inequalities, discourses, and binaries that shape the ways in which people of the world see themselves and each other.

While the terms imperialism and colonialism are often assumed to be synonymous, they are not. Edward Said (1993) describes imperialism as, "thinking about, settling on, controlling land that you do not possess, that is distant, that is lived on, and owned by others" (p. 7). Yet imperialism can exist without formal colonies, as when we talk about the "cultural imperialism" of the United States, for example. Colonialism refers to the conquest and direct control of other people's land; it is a particular phase in the history of imperialism that aimed to control people's wealth through military and political conquest (Williams & Chrisman, 1994; Ngugi, 1986). Colonialism cannot function without colonies, which are subject to power and control by the imperial country (Loomba, 2005). In economic terms, colonialism was the means through which capitalism achieved its global expansion, exploiting colonized people and the labor they

provided. Its subsequent purpose was more nefarious, however. Subjugation was justified through racism and the "othering" of vast numbers of people perceived as backward and therefore "suited" to serve the imperial country (Loomba, 2005).

The ideas of Eurocentrism that emerged from colonialism and imperialism characterized European hegemony. Blaut (1993) defines Eurocentrism as, "a unique set of beliefs, [that are] uniquely powerful, because it is the intellectual and scholarly rationale for one of the most powerful social interests of the European elite...colonialism. Eurocentrism is, quite simply, the colonizer's model of the world" (p.10). According to Grossberg (1993) the idea of Eurocentrism is both local and universalizing. It is local in the sense that it envisions Europe as a unique, isolatable, autonomous culture that, through the exceptionalism of superiority and modernization that could not arise anywhere else, was decisive for its evolution. At the same time, Eurocentrism and ideas of the "modern" evolved into a generalized and universalized rhetoric of homogenization that legitimized conquest. Yet homogenization did not occur. Rather, a polarizing socioeconomic condition and unequal distribution of wealth emerged instead, often referred to as "the West and the Rest" (Grossberg, 1993).

Eurocentrism crafted the world into an Inside and an Outside, according to James Blaut (1993). Europeans viewed the Outside as playing no crucial role in history, while the Inside was credited with everything important and efficacious (p. 8). This binary assumed that the farther Europeans traveled geographically, the farther backward they went in terms of cultural evolution. Europeans saw non-Europe as lacking intellectual and spiritual factors that lead to progress. This "myth of emptiness," Blaut contends, rationalized colonization; colonial powers did not displace native peoples because those lands were empty of rational, civilized, settled people (p. 15). Since colonialism gave more than it received (e.g., science, capitalism, education),

Europeans felt, their dominance was morally justified.

Colonialism, and its subsequent Eurocentrism, established a marked European paternalism over the colonized. As Said (1978) describes, colonized powers, such as Egypt, were not allowed to speak for themselves. The British, as the colonial power, assumed that Egyptians appreciated the "good" that was being done by colonial occupiers. The British, in essence, felt that they knew the Egyptians better than Egyptians knew themselves (Said, 1978). The hegemonic power of the colonizer was reinforced through civil and political society (e.g., schools, churches, community groups, police, bureaucratic institutions) that ultimately, through indoctrination, resulted in consensual notions of superiority and inferiority. Schools and universities assimilated colonized youth to identify with the social and cultural authority of the colonizer, in part to quash rebellion (Nealon & Giroux, 2012; Willinsky, 1998) but also to create a false consciousness among the colonized that convinced them that proper knowledge could only be acquired via the colonial rulers (Joseph, et al, 1990).

Eurocentrism was likewise reinforced through cultural and aesthetic forms during this period. Edward Said (1993) notes that culture is a concept that includes a "refining and elevating element, the best that a society has known and thought" (p.xiii). As such, European imperialists, through novels, arts, and other forms of cultural communication, created the narratives that elevated European society above that of the colonized. Since high culture is defined in relation to primitive or low culture, Europeans reinforced their perceived superiority through the canonization of their arts (Nealon & Giroux, 2012). At the same time, Europeans used their power to block other narratives from emerging thereby asserting their dominance beyond economic and political realms (Said, 1993). Kenyan postcolonial novelist Ngugi Wa Thiongo'o (1986) describes the insidious effects of this phenomenon more bluntly. He wrote:

The biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism... is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland... amidst this wasteland which it has created, imperialism presents itself as the cure (p. 4).

This damaging legacy of imperialism and colonialism reverberates in the contemporary world via neocolonial practices and structures, as will be discussed later.

Of further concern within the discussion of colonialism is the concept of “settler colonialism,” when foreign people, overseen by an imperial power, move into a region and agree to government by that authority (Wolfe, 2006). Settler colonialism is a global and transnational phenomenon, and, unlike aims of colonialism, may result in the elimination of indigenous people (Cavanaugh & Veracini, 2013; Wolfe, 2006). Indeed, Wolfe (2006) asserted that settler colonialism often results in genocide as settlers compete with indigenous populations over resources and land. And while settlers may or may not be originating from the imperial country, the assumption remains that the settlers are fundamentally superior to the people already inhabiting the country or region, thereby perpetuating colonialism ideas about racial and cultural superiority/inferiority (Wolfe, 2006).

Discourses and Essentialism

The Eurocentrism fundamental to the Inside/Outside binary referenced by Blaut is one of many similar notions relative to colonialism and imperialism. In his 1992 book, *Formations of Modernity*, Stuart Hall discusses the notions of "the West and the Rest" and the discourses of power that emerged from colonialism and imperialism. "The West," like "The Orient" described by Edward Said in his seminal 1978 work *Orientalism*, is not an idea about place and geography (Hall, 1992). Rather, it is an idea, marked by notions of "civilization," "modernization,"

"achievement," and "progress." While the idea originated in reference primarily to Europe, Eastern Europe, for example, does not belong to "the West" in the same way that the United States does. The West, like Said's Orient, is an historical, not a geographical construct, functioning as an ideology that produces a certain kind of knowledge and specific attitudes towards it (Hall, 1992; Said, 1978; Nealon & Giroux, 2012).

Another important aspect of this dichotomous thinking about the world is its essentialization of "the Other." By essentialization, I mean the reduction of different characteristics into one image that oversimplifies and evaluates simultaneously. For example, the image of "the West" equals that which is good, desirable, developed, urban, civilized, pious. By contrast, that which is not "the West" (i.e., "the Rest") equals that which is bad, undesirable, undeveloped, rural, uncivilized, pagan (Hall, 1992; Loomba, 2005; Hickling-Hudson, 2004). Thus, the West serves as the standard to which everyone else is compared and measured. To that extent, such a discourse is destructive in that it draws, "crude and simplistic distinctions and constructs an oversimplified conception of difference" (Hall, 1992, p. 279). It automatically conceptualizes the "other" and establishes an Us/Them mentality, with little room for ambiguity, complexity, or understanding.

Yet the underlying ideology of "the West" subsumes larger notions of power. In *Power/Knowledge* (1980), philosopher Michel Foucault explores the way discourse can position power. Foucault argues that discourse determines what are "facts." In essence, "facts" can be construed and disseminated in different ways depending on ideology. True natural facts are almost nonexistent because people's values enter into language and descriptions of the social world. Therefore, most of people's statements have an ideological dimension (Hall, 1992). But as Foucault suggests, discourse is power in the sense that it can manipulate "the facts," thus

making them "true;" it is one of the systems through which power circulates (Foucault, 1980). In his words, "each society has its regime of truth...that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true...the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (Foucault, 1980, p. 131). Over time, facts become ossified as dominant ideologies appropriate them. They stop being interpreted and merely "become." In the discourse of "the West," the relations of power are organized and regulated into a "regime of power" that becomes internalized as "true." By constructing essentialist binaries, Europeans thus legitimized ideas of privilege, exploitation, and power (Hickling-Hudson, 2004).

Edward Said (1978), drawing on similar ideas, describes Orientalism as a product that serves the interest of Western rule. By propagating self-serving and distorted knowledge and images of "the Orient," Europeans created a "truth" about the non-European world, which in some ways persists to this day. Said defines the Orient as "a place of European invention" marked by romance, exotic beings, haunting landscapes, and remarkable experiences (p. 2). It is an entity, a field of learned study that turned into a practice of political and cultural domination. As Said notes, the "deep and recurring images of the Other...[have] helped to define the West as its contrasting image, idea, personality, and experience" (p. 2). To Europeans, the Orient was canonical; Europeans "knew" the Orientals and took for granted European notions of superiority and inferiority. It was a "fact," for example, that Egyptians lacked history and an understanding of self-government. Thus, Europeans' "knowing" gave them power and authority over the colonized. (Said, 1978). Said notes, "Orientals were rarely seen or looked at; they were seen through, analyzed not as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved or confined over" (p. 207). This discourse of the "mysterious East," however, ignored widespread cultural resistance on the part of the colonized via cultural associations, assertions of nationalist

identities, self-determination, and independence movements, in order to indoctrinate everyone into believing that colonization was welcomed and beneficial (Said, 1993).

In his interesting book, *Learning to Divide the World*, Willinsky (1998) recounted the means by which Europeans constructed and generated these "factual" differences. During the so-called Age of Imperialism, the nineteenth century fascination of categorizing, differentiating, and classifying led to a logical ordering of the world. Based upon the race science and classification systems of the day, cultural differences were emphasized through travel writing, magazines (such as *National Geographic*), and the "exhibition of empire" – museums and expositions that displayed the "primitive" and "exotic" East as affirmation of the "superiority" of the West (Willinsky, 1998). These practices engendered a supposed universal and innate quality of the West's cultural superiority, legitimizing dominance. Thus, the knowledge, discourses, and ideologies of colonialism were as powerful as the material effects of conquest. These colonial forms of representation and discourse continue to shape most of our contemporary institutions, including education.

Neocolonialism and American Hegemony

The aim of this chapter is not to recount in entirety the debate over neocolonialism and/or American hegemony, but rather to discuss in general what those views are and how they fit into social studies and global education. Many of our institutions and beliefs, no matter how modern they may seem, are still characterized by aspects of colonialism. The new global economy that emerged after World War II, framing the idea of neocolonialism, has been built on the foundations of former international economies that enriched Europe and the United States in the heyday of colonialism (Rizvi, et al, 2006; Hickling-Hudson, 1999; Wiggan & Hutchinson, 2009; Williams & Chrisman, 1994). Economic and political foundations of colonialism keep in place a

global hierarchy of power, benefitting some countries and disenfranchising, if not devastating, others (Hickling-Hudson, 2004; Smith, 1999). Western countries and Western-dominated institutions, such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, provide aid to regimes in exchange for neoliberal free trade policies, which limit government interference in the operation of free markets for the benefit of the corporate marketplace. As such, the "West" continues to hold power over both complicit regimes while browbeating the resistant "Rest." Either way, Western powers continue attempts at modern-day imperial control.

The Western, particularly United States, media plays a major role in the ways neocolonial and neoliberal discourses are shaped. By normalizing consumer culture, glorifying corporate and cultural imperialism, and conflating capitalism with democracy, the media, like schools, have become tools for socializing a global populace into consumerism (Gorski, 2007). Discourses of difference continue to pervade modern media outlets, many of them controlled by transnational corporations that control the manufacture, distribution, and selection of news relied upon by most of the world (Said, 1993). The media likewise reinforces ideas of American hegemony and exceptionalism, continuing to foster notions of the North/South divide. For example, calls by American newspapers to send aid or troops to African nations to "sort out the messes" indicate that attitudes and strategies of the colonial period remain in place (Williams & Chrisman, 1994). In essence, the media determines the narrative of history in the contemporary world. Like the colonial "exhibitions of empire" a century ago, the modern media represents strange and threatening foreign cultures to Western audiences while simultaneously creating hostility and fear towards cultural "others." One need only listen to major news outlets and stories from the Middle East (a colonial geopolitical term) to begin to equate "Islam" and "terrorist," for example. Despite calls for moving beyond simplistic representations of difference, the media continues to

shape how Americans and other "Westerners" see the world, situating not merely an Us and Them mentality, but at times an Us *versus* Them mentality.

Indeed, the media has long been scrutinized for the ways in which they report about global issues and foreign countries, wielding tremendous influence in shaping public perceptions about different countries. Many research studies have examined media portrayals of foreign countries or regions and their impact on public attitudes. Brewer, Graf, and Willnat (2003), for example, found that news stories presenting issues about foreign nations in ways that suggest a particular evaluation impacts judgments made about those nations. Another study examined the ways in which the media portrays "the rise of the Rest" as either something to be ignored, represented as a threat, or celebrated in business media as a triumph of the marketplace (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009). Numerous other studies have explored the ways in which the media reports about China (Zhang, 2010; Wu, 2010), the Middle East (Evans, 2010; Jackson, 2010; el-Aswad, 2013), Africa (Scott, 2009; Myers, G., 1996), India (Bandyopadhyay & Morais, 2005) and Latin America (Johnson, 2013) in ways that propagate negative cultural stereotypes, emphasize mainly conflict and disaster, or perpetuate colonialist and/or neocolonialist perspectives. While a detailed exploration of the influence of media sources on teachers' perceptions of other countries is not a primary focus of this dissertation, I argue that teachers are routinely exposed to American media representations of global issues, cultures, and events which therefore partly shape their views and understandings of other countries.

Americans' perceptions of the world, in part shaped by the media, and their larger impact, are addressed by Said (1993). In his introduction to *Culture and Imperialism*, Said (1993) writes the following:

More important than the past itself...is its bearing upon cultural attitudes in the present. For reasons that are partly embedded in the imperial experience, the old divisions

between colonizer and colonized have re-emerged in what is often referred to as the North-South relationship, which has entailed defensiveness, various kinds of rhetorical and ideological combat and a simmering hostility that is quite likely to trigger devastating wars (p. 17).

Said's critique is primarily directed toward the foreign policy actions and rhetoric of the United States. It is a rhetoric that Americans and other Westerners have used to justify contemporary political, military, and cultural intervention in what amounts to neocolonialism and neoimperialism. Said suggests that much of the rhetoric of the American New World Order, with its emphasis on self-congratulation, triumphalism, and proclamations of global responsibility, echoes rhetoric used in the past by other imperialist powers. The first Gulf War, for example, was fought amidst talk of "principles, morality, and right". Yet, according to Said, despite major news coverage of the war, no major cultural group was and is still as little known about or understood by Americans as Iraqis. "Americans are buttressed by a high degree of insulation from and ignorance of the rest of the world...[During TV coverage] Americans thought they were watching the reality...What they saw was the most covered and the least reported war in history" (Said, 1993, p. 302).

Said asserts that no American has been immune from this structure of discourse, getting to decide who is a good or bad native, or which are the good or bad countries in the world today (Said, 1993). According to Said, the American New World Order cannot conceive of lives and cultures, "with integrities not totally controlled by imperialists and reformers...This is in effect what Americans have felt about their southern neighbors: that independence is to be wished for them, so long as it is the kind of independence we approve of" (p. xviii). Said continues by noting that in the American view of the past, the United States is not a classical imperialist power, but rather the "righter of wrongs" around the world, pursuing tyranny and defending

freedom (p. 5). Yet he observes that every global power in the past has said and done the same things, appealing to power and national interest, while decrying and responding with destructive zeal when natives rise up and reject leaders supported by Western interests. These myths of American exceptionalism merely amount to neoimperialist practices that continue to be propagated through American foreign policy and within educational systems. These pro-American, neocolonial and neoliberal discourses may very well shape the ways the large majority of American social studies teachers understand the curriculum they teach.

Legacies of Colonialism and Neocolonialism in Education

Despite some inclusion of multicultural, intercultural, and global perspectives within social studies education over the past four decades, much of the social studies curriculum in the United States retains a focus on Euro/American-centric history and experience (Banks, 2001; Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2004). Colonial domination and ideological frameworks operate and are reproduced in and through the curricular content and design, instructional practices, and social organization of learning (Tejeda & Espinoza, 2003; Blaut, 1993). The essentialist binaries that were constructed centuries ago – white/nonwhite, east/west, North/South – continue in neocolonial societies that legitimize privilege, exploitation, military intervention, and success (Hickling-Hudson, 2004) and are "recurringly replicated in the education of generation after generation" (Said, 1993). Moreover, in their discussion of culture and power within global education, Quashigah and Wilson (2001) note the lack of cultural reciprocity between the United States and the rest of the world, and the role of United States imperialism as a form of power that often frames these discourses and global understandings on the part of Americans.

These vestiges of colonial discourse pervade society and, by extension, education. As Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist (2004) write, "Many teachers, socialized into Eurocentric

assumptions of superiority, see no need to engage seriously with non-Western cultures and knowledge systems in their study or teaching" (p. 41). In fact, this socialization to colonial and neocolonial assumptions may be the most difficult challenge global education faces.

What Is Global Education? Defining the Phrase

Given the discussion of colonial and neocolonial theory that contributes to the persistence of the modernization paradigm within education, what then does the term "global education" exactly mean? A review of the literature suggests that there is no one agreed-upon definition of the term, thereby creating some confusion among scholars in the field (Le Roux, 2001; Gaudelli, 2003). Yet in a seminal article first published in 1976, anthropologist Robert Hanvey outlined five dimensions of global perspectives in which he believed students should engage that serve as a basis for defining global education: (1.) perspective consciousness; (2.) state of the planet awareness; (3.) cross-cultural awareness; (4.) knowledge of global dynamics; and (5.) awareness of human choices. Hanvey's dimensions of global perspectives established the key framework upon which numerous social education scholars have critiqued and expanded (Case, 1993; Leroux, 2001; Hicks, 2003; Kirkwood, 2001; Kniep, 1986; Gaudelli, 2001; Merryfield, 1998; Merryfield & Wilson, 2005).

In an early article about global education, *The Key Elements of a Global Perspective*, Case (1993) expanded upon Hanvey's definition by identifying two dimensions necessary for global competency, the substantive and the perceptual. By the substantive dimension, he means, "those world events, states of affairs, places, and things that global educators want students to understand." For example, knowledge of interconnected global systems, international events, world cultures, global geography, and global history comprise the substantive dimension of global education. In addition, Case defines the perceptual dimension as, "the points of view - the

matrix of concepts, orientations, values, sensibilities, and attitude - from which we want students to perceive the world.” These concepts, sensibilities, and attitudes involve nurturing perspectives such as open-mindedness and tolerant attitudes that are free of stereotypes, not predicated on simplistic assumptions, and not colored by prejudicial sentiments.

More recently, Merryfield (2002), expanded upon these prior definitions of global education to delineate certain elements necessary in global education. She notes the following elements that characterize globally-oriented education today: local/global connections, perspective consciousness and multiple perspectives, the world as a system, global issues, power in a global context, non-state actors, attention to prejudice reduction, cross-cultural competence, research and thinking skills, participation in local and global communities, and the use of electronic technologies. Furthermore, Merryfield urges educators to “move to the center” of American social studies to give voice and agency to people from other cultures and parts of the world, thereby “decolonizing” American social studies and making it more accessible to increasingly culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse classroom populations (Merryfield & Wilson, 2005).

The Purposes of Global Education

In addition to exploring a definition of global education, social education researchers have invoked practical, ethical and moral rationales for teaching global perspectives in schools (Anderson, L., 1990; Alger & Harf, 1985; Kirkwood, 1990). Citing the practical, Anderson (1982, 1990) suggest that global education became more necessary as the socioeconomic structure of the world shifted, in part due to the gradual demise of Western/U.S. global power and influence. Other researchers (LeRoux, 2001; Alger & Harf, 1985) substantiate this argument, explaining that existing education about the world and U.S. involvement in it is inadequate.

Moreover, Reimers (2009) asserts that students need global competency which he defines as, “the knowledge and skills that help them cross disciplinary domains to comprehend global events and respond to them effectively.” Reimers identifies three interdependent dimensions necessary to achieve global competency. These dimensions are 1.) having a positive approach toward cultural differences and a willingness to engage those differences, 2.) having the ability to speak and understand a foreign language, and 3.) possessing broad knowledge of world history, geography, and global issues, including an understanding of globalization itself and thinking critically about complex international challenges (Reimers, 2009).

Furthermore, the rise of globalization, broadly defined by Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (1999), “as a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and power,” creates a greater need for a more globally aware citizenry that can effectively compete with labor forces around the world and communicate within the global market (Reimers, 2009). In response to increased globalization, nations, particularly the United States, are being forced to reconsider their nationalist goals in education (Spring, 2004). Thus, while definitions and purposes for global education have evolved over time, fundamentally “global education” refers to any sort of educational activities that encourage international comparisons (historical and contemporary), exchanges, cooperation, and communication among groups (Cushner & Mahon, 2007).

This earlier global education paradigm begun in the 1970s, therefore, continues to be expanded upon and reframed as effects of globalization, both positive and negative, reverberate throughout the world. In response, Merryfield (2001) urges educators to look beyond the "us" and "them" global divide conceived during the Cold War. According to Merryfield, "we need to

globalize global education through literature, theories and diverse perspectives that reflect the complexity of the planet in the early twenty-first century.” She offers a number of ways educators can "decolonize social studies content" to better prepare students for a global future. These pedagogical processes include critically examining the traditional pedagogy of imperialism that has served to limit understanding of the world's peoples and conflicts, illuminating the perspectives and voices of people who have been marginalized in mainstream discourse, and offering real-life cross-cultural experiences within different contexts of power and privilege. Unless such pedagogical changes are made, American students will continue to be taught with imperial and Cold War frameworks that misrepresent global experiences and complexities (Merryfield, 2001).

Research on Global Education and Teachers

Despite arguments about the global economic, political, social, and cultural shifts occurring in the world, some social education theorists (Gaudelli, 2003; Quashigah & Wilson, 2001; Blaney, 2002) assert that curricular, teaching practices and teacher perceptions regarding global history and/or global education continue to reinforce an “us/them” binary, positioning citizens of the United States in relation to the rest of the world. For example, Gaudelli (2003) noted that social studies curricula continue to promote the ideas of American exceptionalism. Moreover, Blaney (2002) argued that social studies teachers need to challenge their students to reexamine their own positions of privilege and cultural superiority, to focus on their role as global actors, and to test the claims that global issues and problems exist. Until students are challenged to do so, the metanarrative of the United States as the beneficent, privileged hegemon will continue to perpetuate.

Yet Merryfield (2000) found that teachers who have experienced "otherness," either

because of marginalized status in American culture or as expatriates, are more astute about issues of power and social justice inherent in teaching global education. By “otherness,” I mean the position of being outside of or different from the dominant group. Her concern was that most social studies teachers did not have these experiences. In an earlier study, Merryfield (1991) analyzed teacher preparation programs and found that pre-service teachers are unprepared for teaching from a global perspective given traditional teacher-training programs. Indeed, Gaudelli (2003) and Pike (2000) asserted that teachers’ actions in the classroom regarding the teaching of global education centered on how they constructed nationalism and national identity in their own lives. Teachers who held highly patriotic views and adhered to ideas of American exceptionalism, for example, challenged global education’s notions of interconnectedness in favor of examining the world as a “constellation of discrete countries and cultures” with an (unrealistic) homogenous American culture as the “yardstick by which other cultures are measured” (Pike, 2000).

Some scholars have addressed the impact of overseas experiences for preservice teachers. Pence and Macgillivray (2008), for example, found that college students who participated in a short-term study abroad teaching internship in England gained self-confidence and exhibited adaptability, flexibility, and a positive outlook on their futures as teachers. Their reflections on their experiences acknowledged the challenges of negotiating a new culture but also demonstrated growth and resilience in addressing new situations. These results are similar to those of Cushner and Mahon (2002) whose study of the overseas experiences of preservice teachers found that students returned more globally minded with increased cultural awareness. Similarly, Sahin (2008) studied preservice teachers from Turkey who participated in a two-month internship in the Midwestern United States. Sahin concluded that the Turkish students

gained cross-cultural awareness that contributed to their professional knowledge, while their presence in the American schools helped students in the United States have a better understanding of Turkey and its culture.

Other research studies of social studies teachers' knowledge focus on teachers' perceptions of citizenship and democratic understanding. In her cross-national studies of citizenship education in five western democracies including the United States, using case studies, questionnaires, surveys, and interviews, Hahn (2001) concludes that teachers in the United States regard citizenship education as a main purpose of schooling, with students learning a history of progress and American exceptionalism. Similarly, in a longitudinal case study of a high school social studies teacher, Fickel (2000) found that personal factors, such as the teacher's working class background and Native American ancestry, served as an important lens for understanding his curricular decisions, reaffirming Banks' (2001) assertions regarding teacher background and its connection to curriculum.

A more recent study of social studies teachers and global citizenship education, however, reveals that, because the discourse of global citizenship is becoming more prevalent in educational texts and curricula, teachers regularly use the conceptual framework of global citizenship in the social studies classroom (Rapoport, 2013). The study found that social studies teachers frequently incorporate the study of international issues in their classrooms, and use global and international perspectives into citizenship education, despite the fact that teachers studied rarely use the term "global citizenship" in their instruction.

Teacher background is one factor in the curricular decisions teachers make. Yet Merryfield (1992) found in her qualitative study of twelve public school teachers committed to global education that some instructional decisions were made because of the particular characteristics

such as race, ethnicity, religion, class, experiences, or interests of the students in the classroom. Teachers in this study shared a number of attributes and attitudes that demonstrated their responsiveness to the students. Merryfield found that these teachers were sensitive to "differences," linked content to students' local environment or experiences, understood what students had not experienced, altered content or activities because of student or parent views, and utilized students and parents as resources in providing content or perspectives that would not be presented otherwise.

Moreover, my own qualitative study of three social studies teachers in central New York state, co-authored with Dr. Jeffrey Mangram (2011), examined how teachers made meaning of global education and how their perspectives informed their pedagogy. Teachers in the study employed utilitarian language at a macro-micro level in relation to global education and rhetoric of Hanvey's dimensions of global education. Yet teachers' language at times contradicted their actions, especially in relation to teaching the transnational students in their classes. While some teachers spoke of the need for cross-cultural understanding and tolerance, for example, they did not always act in culturally understanding or tolerant ways with the transnational ELLs in their classrooms (Mangram & Watson, 2011).

In addition to articles addressing global education and teacher background as an influence on curricular and pedagogical decisions, some studies have examined teacher attitudes toward English Language Learners (ELLs) in their classrooms. Because of the growing number of ELL students in United States public schools, many of who are transnational students, I want to briefly review the literature involving teachers and English Language Learners. Cho and Reich (2008), for example, found a broad spectrum of how social studies teachers perceive the needs of their ELLs citing students' language barriers and lack of background knowledge of social studies

content as significant challenges they face teaching ELLs. Furthermore, few teachers adapted or modified instruction or content for ELLs, perceiving the job of the English as a Second Language teacher to do so. These findings are consistent with those of other studies done with social studies and other mainstream content area teachers in relation to teaching ELLs (O'Brien, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Clair, 1995). Furthermore, teacher attitudes often affected interactions with ELLs, with cultural or linguistic deficit models influencing teacher attitudes (O'Brien, 2009; Harper & DeJong, 2004; Reeves, 2006; Harklau, 2000; Verplaetse, 1998). Few, if any, studies, however, have examined the impact of global education on immigrant or refugee transnational students or how teachers use global perspectives in social studies to such students.

Other studies examined the effectiveness of teacher training programs in relation to global education and preparedness. In her study of six teacher education programs in global education, Merryfield found the following factors as critical for program effectiveness: scope of program offerings, collaboration and communication, program leadership, and opportunities for professional growth and leadership for both teachers and administrators (Merryfield, 1992). In a more recent quantitative study of program effectiveness, Abdullahi (2003) examined ninety secondary school teachers' global knowledge. He found that social studies teachers who had graduated from the Florida International University's global education teacher preparation program were significantly more globally knowledgeable and mindful than teachers who did not receive global education preparedness.

Thus, articles and studies surrounding global education, teacher preparedness and content knowledge, attitudes toward English Language Learners, and global education preparation for pre-service teachers help to inform the background of current initiatives in global education. In fact, these initiatives are strengthening at all levels of education – local, state, and national –

illustrating the increased realization that such initiatives are critical to creating a more globally aware citizenry.

Scholarship on Teachers and Multiculturalism

While not directly related to teachers and global education, extensive articles and books have been written regarding teacher identity and epistemology, which may impact how teachers make sense of cultural awareness in relation to global education. I include a brief discussion of the literature around multicultural education because global education and multicultural education share similar goals, such as teaching about social and structural inequalities in societies, reducing stereotyping and prejudice, teaching about cultural identities, universals, and differences, and developing an understanding of power and its role in the process of knowledge construction (Merryfield & Wilson, 2005).

James Banks (2001), for example, strongly advocates for pre-service teachers to challenge and critically examine their cultural and national identifications in order to disrupt the seemingly continuous metanarrative of U.S. history that has dominated traditional social studies curriculum. He argues that, because of the monocultural educational and communal experiences and privileged socioeconomic class status of most white pre-service teachers, they often view themselves as "just American" and not a part of a distinct race or culture (Banks, 2001). His conclusions point to the importance of teachers' background in relation to the curriculum they teach. Banks' ideas extend to teachers and global education in the sense that national identifications also impact the ways teachers understand their positionality as citizens of the United States within the larger global context. This positionality, in addition to that of race and ethnicity, can likewise inform the ways in which teachers understand the curriculum they teach and the students to whom they teach it.

Indeed, there is extensive literature on teachers in relation to multicultural education and critical whiteness. Tatum (1997), for example, explores how racism and White privilege operates in American society and the impact of racial identity on both teachers and students. She urges that teachers critically examine their own whiteness and the systemic advantages afforded to them because of their race as they likewise consider the identity development of children of color in their classrooms. Similarly, Delpit (2006) examines how power imbalances and cultural conflicts in classrooms occur within the larger society. Specifically, Delpit highlights the “othering” of students of color on the part of white teachers, who fail to understand their own cultural and racial positionality because of their “culturally clouded vision” (Delpit, 2006). And Howard (2006) posits that white Americans need to recognize their position of privilege and contribute to social change by acknowledging the reality of white racism, engage in active resistance to it, and develop an authentic, non-racist connection to a white cultural identity within a multicultural society.

Other scholars have examined the persistence of color-blind ideology and discourse within American society. Bonilla-Silva (2003), noting that racial domination is a collective process, explores the problematic nature of color-blind discourse as one facet of such covert racism in society, revealing many studies that show the persistence of race as a key factor in how human beings view and judge experiences. Omi (2011) recounts the “color-blind” declarations of the Reagan era that tried to dismantle race-conscious policies such as affirmative action that, in reality, sought to eliminate the perceived “new racism” against whites. The implications of “color-blindness,” by extension, impacted schools and other educational institutions as admirable ideals that only served to quench meaningful and realistic discussions of race. Rather, “color-blind racism” has become a dominant, but erroneous, social belief in which racial inequalities

and discrimination no longer influence social or civic life in the United States.

Within the discussion of cross-cultural awareness, Ladson-Billings (1994) shows the importance of culturally relevant teaching that emphasizes children's strengths and draws from students' lived experiences. Similarly, Gay (2002), noting that many teachers are unprepared for teaching ethnically diverse students, advocates for culturally responsive teaching that fosters classroom community, the inclusion of culturally diverse perspectives in the curriculum, and responding to ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction.

Roberts (2007) extends the argument that white privilege in a multicultural United States equates to "first world privilege" in relation to the internationalization of teacher education. In her work with pre-service teachers, Roberts notes the reluctance of her students to acknowledge their over-privileged status as citizens of the United States. She argues that within the political arena, silence and denial of privilege protects hidden systems of unearned global advantages. Thus, colleges must prepare future educators to challenge their identity as citizens of the United States and gain an awareness of global citizenship in order to be competent teachers of global issues.

Therefore, research in relation to multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, teacher identity, and privilege is critical to understanding the ways in which teachers make sense of the world and their cultures, both nationally and globally, particularly as more transnational students and students of color become a larger part of the demographics in American public schools.

Challenges to Implementation of Global Education

While many initiatives to implement global education initiatives exist, a review of the literature suggests that fundamental ideological, logistical, and/or economic challenges

contribute to the desultory inclusion of global perspectives within the discipline of social studies. Recent dissertation studies examine some of the concerns regarding implementation of global education in public schools. In her dissertation study of school principals and their articulation of global education in curriculum development, design, and implementation, Robinson (2011) found that, while principals believed global education and competency to be worthwhile inclusions into the curriculum, actual practice and training are not supported at district or state levels. Furthermore, budget limitations and limited articulation of global competency in the curriculum are significant factors that have hindered implementation of global education in many high schools (Robinson, 2011).

Similarly, in her study of two Massachusetts high schools, Kilpatrick (2010) found that obstacles to global education, particularly in the urban school studied, included the challenges and pressures associated with state-mandated testing, equity of access and cost issues for students wishing to engage in international travel experiences, and lack of funding for teachers to pursue professional development in the area of global education. Likewise, McCarthy (2011) notes that in her study of three Massachusetts superintendents committed to implementing global education initiatives in their districts, the pressures of time constraints, state-mandated testing, and funding for professional development presented challenges in the districts she studied.

In an earlier study, Grant, Derme-Insinna, Gradwell, Lauricella, Pullano, and Tzetzio (2002) researched the issue of state-mandated testing as a challenge to ambitious and creative teaching methods in a case study of one tenth grade global history teacher in New York state. This study reveals that, although the rhetoric of state policies suggest that new assessments will drive more ambitious and creative teaching, this particular teacher pursued such teaching in spite of, rather than because of those policies. In fact, the teacher felt frustrated by the mismatched

rhetoric of state policies and the new global history standardized assessment.

Similarly, in another study of state assessments and curricula, DeWitt, Patterson, Blankenship, Blevins, DiCamillo, Gerwin, Gradwell, Gunn, Maddox, Salinas, Saye, Stoddard, and Sullivan (2013) examined the state content standards for social studies in four states, Ohio, Virginia, Texas, and New York, comparing the alignment of state standards with standardized state assessments in an attempt to answer the question, “To what extent do high-stakes tests hold students accountable for demonstrating the cognitive skills required in the corresponding state academic standards in social studies (p. 394)?” In this study, researchers found that seventy percent of the questions on the Global History and Geography Regents Exam were classified as “lower-order” questions using Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives and required little critical analysis or higher level thinking skills. Furthermore this research reveals that, given a scaled passing score of 65, students can pass the Global History and Geography Regents exam without demonstrating any higher-order cognitive ability, despite the fact that state standards contain a high degree of such skills.

In addition to the practical and logistical challenges to implementing global education initiatives, as mentioned previously, teachers, themselves, have been shown to accentuate the prevailing nationalistic narrative within social studies education and to possess such attitudes about American hegemony, North/South binaries, and ethnocentric and colonialist ideas, thereby limiting global awareness in classrooms (Hahn, 2001; Banks, 2001; Nyambe & Shipena, 1998). Many schools and teachers continue to practice a Eurocentric approach to the curriculum, representing strong legacies of a colonial past in their distorted or insufficient rendering of "other" cultural traditions and histories (Hickling-Hudson, 2003; Zevin, 1993).

Other studies have shown that teachers may simply be inadequately prepared or

knowledgeable about global content or cross-cultural understandings (Yamashita, 2006; LeRoux, 2002; Asia Society, 2001; Holm & Farber, 2002; Osunde & Tlou, 1996; Olson & Kroeger, 2001). In fact, Thornton (2005) asserts that teachers' lack of adequate preparation of global content knowledge is a major obstacle to the incorporation of internationalism in the social studies curriculum. A qualitative study of pre-service and professional social studies teachers' knowledge of Africa, for example, illustrates the lack of accurate knowledge teachers bring to the classroom (Osunde & Tlou, 1996). Through the use of questionnaires and interviews, researchers conclude that common stereotypes and misconceptions persist in the portrayal of Africa as primitive and backward to high school and college students in social studies classes. And in their study of American upper-level undergraduate students in a teacher education program, Holm and Farber (2002) found that university pre-service education students possessed a high degree of inattention, insularity, and lack of awareness about geopolitical knowledge based upon results in an exploratory survey of such topics.

Another reason for the limited inclusion of global perspectives in social studies education stems from the political and nationalistic concerns of past state education departments and conservative leaders who argue that global education is "unpatriotic", "redistributionist", "utopian", and/or "de-exceptionalizing" of American history (Buehrer, 1990; Burack, 2003; Cunningham, 1986; Schlafly, 1986). These political concerns about global content have historically resulted in state curriculum changes, discontinuation of global education funding, and/or self-censorship of materials and content by educators (Merryfield & Wilson, 2005; Schukar, 1993). In fact, one only needs to examine the current movement in Oklahoma's legislature to ban the revised Advanced Placement United States History course on the grounds that it is "unpatriotic" and "fails to realize the concept of American exceptionalism," as an

example of conservative revivalism within social studies education (Klein, 2015).

Furthermore, in a comparative study of two high schools that incorporate global perspectives in their educational approaches and philosophies, Myers (2006) found that, “rather than preparing youth for the challenges of an interdependent, globalizing, and still starkly unequal world, the U.S. education system has not overcome the political and cultural stigma of globalism as anti-American (p. 389).” Furthermore, the reliance on a traditional world studies approach in social studies classes revealed persistent ethnocentric perspectives. In short, despite the efforts of these schools to include multiple perspectives, cross-cultural awareness, and other elements of global education into their curricula, concepts of global citizenship, human rights, and discussions of neocolonial aspects of globalization were largely insufficient.

Fortunately, because of current initiatives, like the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, most states are increasingly realizing the practical need for globally competent students. Yet because of political, logistical, economic, and ideological challenges, much of the literature reveals that global education practices within districts, schools, and classrooms remain weak or nonexistent, further creating a lack of global awareness and competence among students in the United States.

Gaps and Limitations of the Literature

Although the social education literature regarding global education revolves around an array of topics cited above, there is a paucity of scholarship in relation to how social studies teachers themselves make sense of this idea. Besides the scholarship of Merryfield (1991; 1998; 2000) and Gaudelli (2003), few other researchers have directly engaged social studies teachers around this question. Some studies are beginning to emerge regarding how school leaders have implemented global education initiatives in their districts (Robinson, 2011; Kilpatrick, 2010;

McCarthy, 2011; Myers, 2006), but more studies need to be done in relation to teachers themselves and their global understandings. As Pike (2000) asserts, teachers are central to global education because “they, not textbooks, appear to be the primary carriers of the global education culture” (Pike, 2000, p. 64).

In summary, despite global education being a prevalent discourse in the field of social studies education for many years, only recently has a concerted effort been made to incorporate global education elements into schools. With the 21st Century Skills and Common Core Initiatives, global education has gained significant ground, largely overcoming initial counter-initiatives stemming from nationalistic sentiments. Indeed, given prevalent studies showing American students' shameful lack of global preparedness, the need for global education remains critical. This study, therefore, aims to contribute to the field of social studies and global education by investigating the ways in which some global history teachers make sense of the world and how their worldviews inform their teaching. In this way, scholars, practitioners, and administrators may better understand how adequately global awareness is being taught to American students and explore ways to increase its inclusion.

Chapter 3:

Methodology and Methods

The term “global education” first came to my attention when I was attending the New York State Council of Social Studies annual convention in Albany, New York about eight years ago. During a presentation from the State Education Department about the mandated Global History and Geography course, the speaker casually mentioned the need for more global education elements within social studies education as a whole. From this brief statement, I became curious to know more about global education - what it was, how it was taught, and why it was deemed necessary. From my own experiences traveling and living overseas, I was keenly aware of my own developing global awareness and its impact on my role as a social studies teacher. Yet over the course of learning more about global education, I wondered if other educators, themselves, were aware of this term or whether or not global education was influencing current teaching practice. And in order to understand global education, I began to think about the forces that shape teachers’ worldviews and how those views affect the ways in which they teach global history. Therefore, this dissertation sought to answer the following questions:

- i. How do secondary social studies teachers construct global awareness and the global content they teach?
- ii. How do secondary social studies teachers' global understandings impact their teaching practices?

This chapter explains the perspectives and procedures with which I researched these questions. First, I discuss the relevance of qualitative research for a study of this kind, briefly explaining symbolic interactionism as a theoretical and methodological approach to my research. Next, I explain the importance of interviewing and observation as methods of data collection,

referencing the research behind such methods in qualitative research. This discussion of methods is followed by an overview of my research process, detailing the participants and setting, data collection, and analysis procedures. Lastly, I locate myself as a researcher in the context of this study, paying particular attention to issues of bias and subjectivity given my own background as a practicing global history teacher.

Methodology

Why Qualitative Research?

In this dissertation, I use qualitative research to explore teachers' constructions of global awareness and the global content they teach and how their understandings impact their teaching practice. Qualitative research aims to provide information about the contexts and meanings of behavior and stems from curiosity about our social worlds (Mishler, 1979; Warren and Karner, 2010). Positivist methods, because they strip away the contexts of meaning, may offer many results but their contributions to *understanding* remain limited. Educational research in the positivist tradition does not "fit the realities of talk in the classroom" (Mishler, 1979), or as Seidman (2006) asserts, "people cannot be coded with numbers" (p. 9). Instead, a qualitative research approach allows the researcher to learn about a person's, "lived experiences, behaviors, emotions, and feelings as well as about organizational functioning, [and] social movements" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Thus, to truly explore the complexities of the social world of education, qualitative methods, particularly interviews and participant observation, were the best means to achieve my research goals.

As complex social institutions, schools are apt laboratories in which to perform qualitative studies. As early as the 1930s, sociologist Willard Waller used interviews, life histories, participant observation, and document analysis to describe the social world of teachers and their

students in an effort to help teachers develop understandings of the social realities of schools (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Therefore, in order to explore how teachers make meaning of global education within the complex social structures of education, qualitative research methods, rather than positivist methods, were used in the study.

Symbolic Interactionism

Teachers are “actors involved in a constant process of interpreting the world around them” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 12). Although they act within an organization, culture, or group, they constantly interpret their surroundings and determine their actions based upon the meanings they are making. This assumption about human experience being mediated by interpretation is central to the ideas of symbolic interactionism (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Symbolic interactionism as a sociological perspective arose during the early twentieth-century, gaining significance with the work of George Herbert Mead in the 1930s. Mead’s student, Herbert Blumer, detailed the characteristics of symbolic interactionism that created this theoretical framework.

Symbolic interactionism, according to Blumer (1969), is based upon three premises.

According to Blumer:

The first premise is that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them...The second premise is that the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one’s fellows. The third premise is that these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters (p. 2).

Blumer asserts that the meanings of things are not objectively or intrinsically derived. Rather, meaning is conferred on objects by humans based upon an essential and constitutive process of interpretation (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Furthermore, meanings may change because of varying interactions with and interpretations of objects, events, or situations (Karp, 1996). Meanings are,

“social products, as creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact” (Blumer, 1969, p. 5). Therefore, in order to understand how teachers make meaning about the global history they teach, one needs to explore how they, themselves, view the world and global education, and how they talk about such ideas in the context of schooling and instruction.

Of particular interest for this research is the process of interpretation that teachers undergo in creating meanings of their worlds. Individuals form interpretations from their interactions with other people. Humans are socialized through objects or “symbols,” learning the rules, ideas, values, and actions of society based upon interpretation and experiences (Charon, 2007). Thus, through a constant negotiation of interpretations, meanings are constructed and acted upon. In the context of this study, therefore, the discourses these teachers are subjected to as they make meanings of the world and global education are part of the “symbols” of society. Teachers continuously negotiate and interpret meanings as they interact with the many objects and symbols of their worlds. Only by understanding what the actors, themselves, believe about their world, can we understand what is going on (Charon, 2007).

Methods

Why Observation?

In order to better understand the ways in which teachers’ worldviews and understandings of global education impacted their pedagogical practices, I used observation as one of my methods. Observation, particularly participant observation, is often viewed as the “gold standard” of qualitative research (Atkinson & Coffey 2002). It was first widely used by social anthropologists and sociological researchers from the Chicago School and places meaning on everyday life seen from the standpoint of insiders (Jorgensen, 1989). Participant observation

gives researchers firsthand experience and helps them to understand the context within which schools and teachers operate. It likewise allows researchers to gain information that subjects may not be willing to talk about in interviews (Becker & Geer, 1957; Patton, 1980). As teachers teach global history to students, the meanings that they make of the content and their students may affect their curricular and pedagogical choices. Observation, therefore, is appropriate to use in order to study the ways people define and interact with their ordinary environment (Jorgensen, 1989). By observing global history teachers in their natural work environment, I examined firsthand how content was taught to students and how teachers responded to certain students in the classroom.

However, observation as a research method has certain limits. Researchers cannot observe feelings, thoughts, or intentions, for example. Nor does observation yield information about events that happened at a previous point in time or how people make meaning of events that happened (Patton, 1980; Jorgensen, 1989). Furthermore, there are limits to understanding observations. The observer's understandings of an observation may not be consistent with what the observed person means. Thus, as a researcher I needed to gain access to the person's "subjective understanding" (Seidman, 2006) by combining observation with interview. As Tierney and Dilley (2002) state, "without interview data gathered directly from the participants/actors, observation is akin to watching silent movies" (p. 454).

Why Interviewing?

While observation was one method I used in this study, much of my data were obtained by interviewing participants in order to discern the ways in which they viewed the world and global education. Interviewing, as a basic form of inquiry, allows researchers to access how people understand their lived experiences and the meaning they make of those experiences – their

perceptions, reflections, thoughts and feelings (Weiss, 1994; DeVault & McCoy, 2002; Seidman, 2006). Actions and words do not stand in opposition to one another. Rather, "actions are understandable because they can be talked about" (Atkinson & Coffey, 2002, p. 416). Thus, in this study of how social studies teachers make meaning of global education, interviews allowed me to get closer to understanding teachers' experiences and how they think about the work that they do than by observation alone.

Many interviews tend to yield narratives and elicit stories from informants (DeVault & McCoy, 2002; Atkinson & Coffey, 2002; Gubrium & Holstein, 2003; Warren & Karner, 2010). In this study, teachers shared a variety of anecdotes, stories, and narratives to illustrate many of their key thoughts and ideas. Yet through these narratives, teachers revealed both their individual thoughts, feelings, and perceptions, but also those of the institutions they work in and the "relations of ruling" that shaped their individual experiences (DeVault & McCoy, 2002). In my interviews with social studies teachers and the meanings they make about global education, many narratives emerged that utilized institutional language. By "institutional language" I mean the words, phrases, and/or jargon associated with a particular industry or institution, in this case the institution of public education in the United States.

Education as an institution, in particular, shapes its actors (teachers, students, administrators). The recent emphasis placed on global perspectives in education as an institution impacted how teachers at the local level think about its meaning and manifestations in the everyday work that they do. It also shaped their discourses by infusing their narratives with institutional language. Not surprisingly, education as an institution is rife with institutional jargon, language, rhetoric and discourse. Teachers, as an integral part of the institution, are undoubtedly subject to and, in some ways shaped, by these discursive formations and

organizational structures. Even within groups there is a variation of perspectives, preferences, and behaviors. As a researcher, therefore, it was important for me to recognize when the informant used institutional language so that it did not conceal the fundamental aims of research, namely describing and discovering teachers' conceptualizations of global education in their work (DeVault & McCoy, 2002). Learning the native language likewise reduced errors of misinterpretation of words and meanings that may have prevented me from exploring further leads (Becker & Geer, 1957). As a teacher myself, subject to institutional language and educational discourses, I am in a position as an "insider" to understand the native language and the institution, which I explore at greater length later in this chapter.

In addition to the problem of institutional language in interviews, interviews can be problematic if the researcher is gathering information about events that have occurred elsewhere and are described by informants, as memory and experience are notoriously inaccurate (Becker & Geer, 1957; Alvesson, 2011). Interviewees may also be reluctant to discuss certain things, to distort their narratives to present themselves in a more positive light, or to be "knowing" but incapable of "telling" (Alvesson, 2011; Becker & Geer, 1957; Atkinson & Coffey, 2002). Therefore, it is important for the researcher to repeat interviews over time and establish relationships with informants to minimize misleading accounts (Alvesson, 2011). Using a combination of participant observation and interview further illuminated social contexts of meaning making and helped to produce a "thick description" of social phenomena that qualitative research strives to achieve (Warren, 2002; Mishler, 1979).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection

In order to discern the ways social studies teachers make meaning of global education, I

used multiple qualitative methods for collecting data, particularly semi-structured interviews of teachers and participant observation of global history classes. Thus, by observing participants in their lived everyday experiences as global history teachers over a period of time, I obtained multiple sources of data that revealed a more complete perspective than interviewing alone might in order to discover if there was an alignment between what teachers say versus what they do in their classrooms.

I interviewed each participant twice over the course of a nine-month period with each interview lasting approximately one hour. Interviews were audio-recorded with written permission from each participant. The voice recorder used for interviews was kept in a secure location in my house. I transcribed all interviews, with two exceptions, using my personal computer which is password protected for security. I hired a transcription agency to transcribe the last two interviews because of time constraints, indicating that data should be erased upon completion of the transcriptions.

Interviews with teachers followed a semi-structured format, in which guiding questions were asked around general themes or concepts I wished to explore but also allowed the teachers' responses to guide the interview as it unfolded. Additional follow-up questions and probes such as "what do you mean by that?" or "tell me more about that" served to clarify language, elaborate on ideas, and further illuminated teachers' words and meanings. In doing so, I hoped to understand how these global history teachers made sense of global education, "from their own frames of reference and experience reality as they experience it" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 7).

I approached each interview with a set of questions I planned to ask (Appendix B). These initial questions were generated using elements of global education research and scholarship, information yielded from preliminary studies, and from colonial/postcolonial

theoretical underpinnings. For example, some of the questions I asked in the first interview related to my first research question, how do secondary social studies teachers make meaning of global education and the global history curriculum they teach, included:

1. Describe your family background.
2. Describe any cross-cultural experiences you have had.
3. Explain what the term "global education" means to you.
4. Describe how you learn or have learned the content that is taught in the Global History and Geography course.
5. What are your thoughts on the term "American exceptionalism"?
6. In your view, what is the purpose of global education?
7. Discuss your own global awareness.
8. What sources of information do you consult to learn more about global issues?
9. Describe your thoughts about the current Global History and Geography course.

As the initial interviews were completed, I noticed a number of important patterns in the teachers' talk, which I constructed as emerging themes. For example, one of the questions I initially asked, "Describe your thoughts on American exceptionalism," led to new lines of questioning that included, "What do you see as the role of the United States in the twenty-first century?" This question aimed to explore ways teachers employed colonialist/neocolonialist or postcolonialist language and/or ideologies in their responses. Furthermore, as teachers discussed their views on the current global history and geography course, they talked about the challenges to global understanding and implementation, leading to further questioning in relation to this theme.

Once the first round of interviews was completed, I began a second round of interviews

with participants with three goals in mind: 1.) obtaining new data that reflected my second research question, how do teachers implement global perspectives in their classrooms?, 2.) clarifying or elaborating upon responses from the first round of interviews, and 3.) following up with new questions in response to emerging themes as I compared participants' responses. Some interview questions I used to address the second research question, how do secondary social studies teachers' understandings of global education impact their teaching practices, included:

1. Describe your philosophy in teaching social studies.
2. What are your goals in teaching global history to your students?
3. Describe how you choose which resources to use in your global history classroom.
4. To what extent do you use multiple perspectives in teaching students global history?
5. To what extent do you use cross-cultural opportunities in teaching students global history?
6. Describe your experiences with immigrant students.

In addition to interviewing, I also observed each teacher at least once for an entire class period, with the two exceptions of participants I was not allowed to observe, keeping handwritten field notes to document what I observed in each classroom. Additionally, I obtained informed assent from students in each class I observed according to IRB protocol guidelines. During these observations, my focus remained on each teacher's words, actions, and curricular choices in order to collect data on how each participant implements global education elements in his/her classroom. However, as mentioned previously, because I was refused IRB permission from the urban school district, I was unable to observe the two teachers who teach in an urban setting.

Data Analysis

Because my research questions deal with how teachers made meaning of global education, I employed principles of a constant-comparative approach as a means of collecting and analyzing data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Becker, 1963; Denzin, 1978). The constant-comparative method begins formal analysis early in the study. Data collection begins first, looking for key issues or recurrent events in the data that become categories of focus. Data continues to be collected that provides many incidents of the categories of focus, concentrating on the diversity of dimensions under the categories (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Sampling, coding, and writing happen all at once throughout the research process, rather than in a linear, step-by-step progression, and analysis continuously doubles back to more data collection and coding (Glaser, 1978). By constantly comparing new data with the preliminary categories being constructed, I was able to better determine whether my observations and hunches were accurate. In short, the constant comparative method allows for a working hypothesis to emerge for the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

Data analysis began almost immediately upon data collection from interviews. By using principles of the constant-comparative method, I continuously developed and refined my existing understandings of teachers' perspectives of global education as data emerged. During my analysis, I was looking for language that supported my theoretical lens. That is, I noticed language that reified or resisted colonialism/neocolonialism, essentialism, and/or American exceptionalism. In my initial interviews, I coded the data, constructed new categories of focus, and collected additional data that provided more incidents of the categories of focus (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). I choose this approach because I wanted to compare similar participants' viewpoints with other participants' viewpoints to examine consistencies and inconsistencies in the data, and to develop emerging theories on how teachers make meaning of global education

and how their understandings impact their teaching practices.

From initial interview data, I began to identify various codes that emerged from the data, creating lists of codes and identifying key passages in the transcripts that illustrated the codes. As more interviews were completed and transcribed, I generated new codes or supported previous ones by locating examples in the newer data. For coding purposes, I used HyperResearch, an analytic software program. I uploaded transcribed interview data into the computer program and coded each sentence and/or narrative strand, resulting in 117 codes. I constructed the codes used in the coding process based on the interviewees' comments, repetitiveness of those comments, and from my own interpretations of what I believed the teachers said. For instance, based on an analysis of the data, I constructed codes for some of the following concepts: (1.) cross cultural understanding; (2.) perspectives consciousness and understanding diverse cultures; (3.) understanding the world as a dynamic, interdependent system; (4.) understanding global issues; (5.) prejudice reduction; (6.) pedagogy; and (7.) teacher's perspectives on global education. Sample codes included, "Travel experiences," "diversity in upbringing," "perspectives consciousness in classroom," and "immigrant students as resource." I was then able to search by specific code to access exact words and phrases from the data.

I used the coded data from the different interviews to broaden my emerging theory. That is, as I noticed different teachers' perspectives on global education, I constructed themes and then asked the other teachers their thoughts on that perspective. Once data were coded, I analyzed the data again for themes that emerged, such as "Challenges to implementing global education," "Global elements in the classroom," and "Thoughts on American exceptionalism." Within these larger themes, I organized the coded data, including sub-themes where relevant,

into outlines to organize the data further, with findings emerging from final analyses of the data.

Participants and Setting

Participant Selection

Participants for this study included eight in-service teachers who teach the Global History and Geography course in public high schools in upstate New York. The relatively small sample size reflects the experiences and perspectives of specific global history teachers and how they make meaning of global education.

Participants were selected using purposeful sampling, in which particular participants were selected because they helped to "facilitate the expansion of the developing theory" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 73) and because they represent a particular subgroup of interest (Hatch, 2002). In particular, I chose these participants because of their specific expertise and familiarity with teaching the ninth and tenth grade Global History and Geography course as mandated by New York State. Moreover, I wanted to know how they made sense of the specific content they teach with its focus on global history and global issues and, therefore, could not merely rely on other sampling procedures, such as random sampling or convenience sampling. Moreover, I wanted to have a variety of participants in relation to age, gender, race, ethnicity, and years of teaching experience. In doing so, I hoped to gain a diverse range of participants' backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives.

My initial approach involved using my personal connections as a practicing social studies teacher to contact principals and/or social studies department heads to suggest global history teachers who may be interested in participating in my study. This approach resulted in my gaining access to three participants, two from one of the suburban districts and one from a rural district. I then reached out to social studies teachers I knew in the region to recommend other

global history teachers, resulting in my gaining access to three more participants, two in suburban districts and one in an urban district. The remaining two participants, one in a suburban district and one in the urban district, were recruited using snowball sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). That is, two of the teachers suggested colleagues who may be interested in participating. Therefore, I contacted those two teachers and they agreed to take part in the study.

I initially contacted participants via an email message in which I described the purpose of the study and the estimated time interviews and observations would entail, assuring participants of confidentiality and attaching copies of the informed consent form for them to read before committing to the study. I also contacted each school principal before beginning research to gain permission to observe teachers in each school building. Where necessary I also gained IRB approval from individual districts. One school district, however, refused to grant me IRB approval to observe the participants teaching classes, stating that the district could see no direct benefit of this study on their students and the district. Therefore, I was unable to complete observations for those two particular teachers.

Description of Participants

The teachers in this study have a variety of experience and backgrounds (Figure 1). Some became teachers after working in other professions. Furthermore, not all teachers majored in history as college students. Some were trained in sociology, anthropology, or economics while in college. Nevertheless, a brief description of each participant is as follows:

Charlie - Charlie is a veteran social studies teacher who has been teaching for seventeen years in the same suburban school district. He has always taught Global History and Geography and currently teaches only the first part of the course to ninth graders. As an undergraduate in college, Charlie pursued a dual degree in sociology and anthropology, gaining his social studies

teaching certification via a Masters Degree program at a regional university. Additionally, Charlie recently completed his PhD in Education from the same regional university. In addition to teaching, he continues to write for professional publications and present at local conferences.

Kelly - Kelly, who works in the same district as Charlie, began her teaching career after working for a number of years in the marketing field. Prior to that, she stayed home to raise two children. Kelly, therefore, earned her teaching certification as a non-traditional student while working full-time. She has been teaching for fourteen years, thirteen of which have been in the same district. She has always taught the Global History and Geography course, though she has experience teaching both ninth and tenth grade as well as other courses in the discipline of social studies.

Elizabeth - Elizabeth also came to the education field after living abroad in Italy for a number of years. When I interviewed her, she was in her eighteenth year of teaching high school Global History in a suburban district, although prior to full time teaching, she worked as a substitute at the middle school level. She also teaches Advanced Placement World History and sociology. Elizabeth earned her teaching certification at a local college through a Master's degree program in social studies education. As an undergraduate she majored in history and anthropology.

Cheryl - Cheryl is a seventeen-year veteran teacher who has been teaching global history her entire career. She initially pursued an undergraduate degree in history and worked briefly as a legal secretary at one time, but gained social studies certification through a Master's degree program. In addition to teaching tenth grade global history, Cheryl teaches AP World History.

Mike - Mike, who works in the same suburban district as Cheryl, initially pursued a degree in teaching physical education before switching to social studies education at a local college. He has been teaching global history in both ninth and tenth grades for fifteen years. Prior to his current position, Mike was a long term and daily substitute teacher in various districts in the

region. In addition to teaching, Mike has been coaching soccer for the past twenty-two years.

Doug - Doug is in his fifth year teaching in a small rural school district. Doug became a teacher after a long successful career in the business world. Due to downsizing and restructuring, Doug left the private sector, gained teaching certification through a Master's degree program, and became a substitute teacher before he began working full time in his current position. Doug teaches tenth grade global history as well as twelfth grade Participation in Government and an elective on the Vietnam War.

Andrea - Andrea has been teaching for nine years, six in a rural district and three in an urban setting. She currently teaches tenth grade global history, college-level Economics, and college-level Psychology at a local urban high school. Andrea initially planned on becoming an economist and worked briefly in the private sector before pursuing her teaching certification through a Master's Degree program.

Selina - Selina is the only participant in this study who was not born and/or raised in the local area. With a white American mother and a Pakistani father, Selina was born in the United States, lived from the ages of eight to eighteen in Pakistan, and returned to the United States for college. She pursued a history degree at the University of Chicago, taught United States history for a few years in both Chicago and Atlanta, and moved to upstate New York where she taught a variety of social studies classes at a local suburban district for a few years. She interrupted her teaching career briefly to work part-time as she raised her two children, but returned to teaching in an urban high school where she teaches grades nine and ten global history.

The following chart (Figure 1) identifies the participants and their ages, years teaching, race/ethnicity, and school district:

| Name | Age | Race/Ethnicity | Years Teaching | School |
|-------------|------------|--|-----------------------|---|
| Andrea | 31 | White - Southern European heritage | 9 | Miller High School |
| Charlie | 39 | White - Northern European heritage | 17 | North Upstate Junior High School |
| Cheryl | 45 | White - Northern European heritage | 17 | East Upstate High School |
| Doug | 53 | White - Northern European heritage | 5 | South Upstate Junior/Senior High School |
| Elizabeth | 47 | White - Southern European heritage | 18 | West Upstate High School |
| Kelly | 52 | White - Northern European heritage | 14 | North Upstate Junior High School |
| Mike | 37 | White - Northern European heritage | 15 | East Upstate High School |
| Selina | 41 | Mixed - Northern European heritage and Pakistani | 7 | Miller High School |

Figure 1

Setting

I define setting as a set of spaces where global history is situated, rather than merely the physical space in which teaching takes place. Thus, the setting for this study was in ninth and tenth grade social studies classrooms in five high schools in upstate New York. This particular setting was chosen because of the mandated global history curriculum taught in grades nine and ten in New York state and because of the varying degrees of ethnic diversity within schools in this area. Furthermore, this area of New York State is experiencing a large influx of immigrant and refugee students to its schools. Therefore, social studies teachers are likely experiencing increased international diversity among their student populations, an aspect I wondered had any

impact on the ways teachers understood and taught global elements in their global history classes.

I wanted to interview and observe participants from each of three different school contexts (Appendix A). By studying social studies teachers in different school communities, I was able to explore a broader spectrum of teachers' experiences and perspectives. Ideally, I hoped to interview and observe teachers in urban high schools, suburban high schools, and rural high schools. I wanted to study teachers from three different contexts in order to hopefully determine to what extent, if any, school environment plays a role in how teachers make meaning of global education and how their understanding of global education impacts their teaching practice. While I initially hoped to study an equal number of teachers in each setting, I was only able to recruit one participant from a rural school setting and two from an urban school setting. The remaining five participants teach in three different suburban districts.

A Note About Reflexivity, Bias, and Situating the Researcher

Perhaps my most significant concern in this study involved my personal closeness with the topic. As a practicing social studies teacher myself with five years of experience teaching tenth grade Global History and Geography, I am well aware of content, curriculum, and issues surrounding social studies and education in general. Therefore, in the course of my research, I needed to be constantly aware of my subjectivity and bias, particularly how they may have potentially influenced my perceptions and awareness of classroom interactions between teacher and student, pedagogical practices, curricular choices, and the language and meanings teachers used in this study.

Yet interviews and observations should be understood not as objective sources of "truth", but rather as socially and linguistically complex situations in which narratives are co-constructed

between the researcher and the informant (Alvesson, 2011; Warren, 2002; Atkinson & Coffey, 2002; Riessman, 2008). Unlike the positivist tradition in which the observer is outside and independent of the observed phenomenon, in phenomenology, the observer's perspective is intertwined with the phenomenon (Mishler, 1979). Interviews, in particular, are a form of social interaction in which the interviewer should play a participatory role. Furthermore, interviews are themselves "embedded in temporal, geographical, political, cultural, and social fields" (Warren & Karner, 2010). As a part of the social world being studied, researchers cannot completely erase themselves from the research itself. They are part of the process, injecting their own experiences, biases, perspectives, and subjectivities in the situation. Meanings, representations, and narratives are co-constructed by the researcher and the informant. This interaction between informant and researcher is inherent in the nature of qualitative research (Emerson, Frenzt, & Shaw, 1995; Seidman, 2006; Alvesson, 2011; Riessman, 2008; Gubrium & Holstein, 2003; Atkinson & Coffey, 2002). As Warren describes, "each participant looks at the world through the other's eyes, incorporating both self and other into the process of interpretation" (2002, p. 98). As the researcher and the subject share meanings over the course of the study, the researcher is, in the terms of Emerson, Frenzt, and Shaw, "re-presenting" members' meanings, creating "meanings of meanings" and "interpretations of interpretations" (1995, p. 215). With the co-construction of research and findings, therefore, issues of bias, subjectivity, interpretation, and researcher position invariably arise and bear further discussion.

Situating Myself in the Research

I am a practicing high school social studies teacher with almost twenty years of experience in education. I teach global and U.S. history in a suburban public school and am well versed in the institutional language and discourses surrounding education, social studies, and global

education. I attend professional conferences, serve on school and district level curriculum committees, and have been coordinator of the social studies program in my former school. As such, I have my own opinions and biases about teaching, curriculum, and public education. In short, I am the consummate insider.

As much of the literature discusses, having an "insider perspective" is highly advantageous. As Spradley (1989) notes, "it is not possible to acquire more than a very crude notion of the insiders' world until you comprehend the culture and language that is used to communicate its meaning" (p. 14). Insiders' interpretations and collected data may be more valid because the researcher is more likely to understand what informants are saying (e.g., knowing the institutional language). They may more easily build rapport with informants and be seen as someone who "knows what it's like" to be a teacher (Jorgensen, 1989; Dowling, 2005). Furthermore, insiders can formulate questions in the shared language. They understand the general work of teaching in that they can research hunches, probe more deeply, and share insiders' reactions, gaining access to emotions and feelings that are very difficult to investigate otherwise (Bogdan, 1972; Spradley, 1989; Jorgensen, 1989; Bogdan & Biklen; 2007).

At the same time, I am troubled by being an insider. I worry about being too much of an insider that, as Adler and Adler (1987) describe, "the researcher [may be prevented from] gaining access to the perspectives of other groups in the scene...[and] bias the researcher's own perspectives, leading them to accept uncritically the views of the members...as their own" (quoted in Warren & Karner, 2011, p. 17). Researchers, therefore, need to have enough distance to enable them to ask probing questions and to explore, not share, assumptions. They need to interpret observations critically, not judgmentally (Seidman, 2006; Jorgensen, 1989). In fact, outsiders may have the advantage of getting respondents to talk more openly or to explain and

clarify meanings because the researcher does not share values or language that may condemn or judge behavior.

Furthermore, occupational insiders may have issues of competition or confidentiality that may interfere with data collection and representation (Weiss, 1994). As a teacher in a well-regarded local school district, issues of competition could have arisen. At first I was hesitant to disclose my professional status, including the name of the district in which I currently teach, thinking this information would taint the researcher-participant relationship. Ironically, however, I feel that my insider positionality bequeathed a sort of legitimacy on my behalf in the eyes of the participants. Once participants knew that I was a practicing teacher myself, rather than purely a researcher, they adopted a collegial tone, eagerly sharing their thoughts and feelings with me as someone they felt understood the realities of public education.

Ultimately, every person is both an insider and an outsider. Even within groups there is a variation of perspectives, preferences, and behaviors. Researchers and informants share many overlapping similarities and differences (Merton, 1972; Dowling, 2005). By capitalizing on the advantages of being an insider and being cognizant of my social location within the research, I hopefully minimized the issues and biases that could arise from perhaps being too much of an insider.

Issues of Bias and Subjectivity

Qualitative research is a social interaction in which knowledge is gained via talking and listening, performing and observing, and harboring personal interests on both sides (Dowling, 2005; Seidman, 2006; Warren & Karner, 2011). Researchers invariably bring personal histories and perspectives to their studies; subjectivity and bias cannot be eliminated and are, in fact, vital to the research (Dowling, 2005; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). As Bogdan states, "to try to

understand the social life by standing back and being emotionless in the interest of objectivity and refusing to assume others' roles is to risk the worst form of subjectivism" (1972, p. 45).

Because biases are unavoidable, it is imperative that I acknowledge them and explain how they play a role in the research and how they might be minimized (Jansen & Peshkin, 1994; Johnson, 1997; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Warren & Karner, 2011). The notion of reflexivity in research, and its importance in analysis, is an ongoing process throughout the research. Data collection, the researcher, and analysis are not separate entities removed from one another. Rather, reflexivity is an ongoing process that begins with the initial examination of data (Mauther & Doucet, 2003). But reflexivity amounts to much more than reflecting on one's biases and the relationship between the researcher and the observed. Mauther and Doucet (2003) endorse something they call epistemological accountability. That is, research performed with a high degree of reflexivity and accountability about the epistemological, theoretical and ontological conceptions of subjects and their subjectivities (p. 425). Throughout the course of this study, I attempted to embrace this idea.

In addition to having a high degree of reflexivity in the research to reduce the negative effects of bias and to minimize it, qualitative researchers often use grounded theory in the analysis and interpretation of data. Researchers need to have their thinking informed by the data and to make a clear link between interpretation and the data themselves lest personal biases influence data that is supportive of a predetermined thesis (Maxwell, 1992; Weiss, 1994; Hatch, 2002; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). It is likewise imperative that the research deal fully and fairly with all evidence, especially cases that do not fit theories (Weiss, 1994; Johnson, 1997). Thus, interpretive validity is enhanced when the researcher's subjectivities, prejudices, and biases are recognized, fully acknowledged, and viewed critically. The more complex and detailed the data

that is collected and analyzed, the more superficial personal opinions and prejudices on the part of the researcher seem (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

In light of the idea that validity is enhanced when researcher's subjectivities, prejudices, and biases are fully acknowledged and viewed critically, throughout this dissertation process, I often reflected upon how my own race, class, gender, and nationality affected the ways in which I understood the study. As a white, female, middle class, American citizen raised in a homogeneous suburban community, the subjectivities, biases, prejudices, and discourses in my upbringing and current life undoubtedly frame the ways in which I view the world, like those of many of my participants. At one point, for example, in reviewing drafts of my dissertation data chapters, some members of my committee reacted much more pointedly and critically than I did to some of the data related to diversity and cross-cultural awareness. Because of this reaction, I realized I needed to engage these ideas more critically as I edited these chapters. Furthermore, my identity as a citizen of the United States may also impact the ways in which I view other countries and cultures. But by being cognizant and critical of my subjectivities, I hoped to minimize any biases and prejudices that might cloud analysis and interpretation of the data.

I also knew that my personal experiences as a global history teacher would be a factor in how I approached this study. In thinking about the questions I posed to participants, I often thought about how I would answer those questions as a global history teacher if they were asked of me. But rather than engage that topic, as I reflect on the ways I approached potential participants, I realize that I did, in fact, disclose my experience as a practicing teacher quite readily. At times, I was asked directly by participants if I taught school. At other times, I volunteered this information in order to elicit a degree of camaraderie and approachability. The idea of sharing an experience of "being in the trenches," I believe, lent me a degree of credibility

and sympathy with these participants. I felt that if I presented myself as merely an academic researcher, participants may have been more reticent and/or dismissive of my interest and experience. The notion of the Ivory Tower of academia and its disconnect with the “real world” of teaching is pervasive in public education. Interestingly, I feel that my credibility in the eyes of participants came from my role as a public school teacher rather than my role as a researcher.

Almost all of my participants asked what district I taught in, as well. I am not entirely sure how this information was perceived by them, except perhaps as a point of comparison as they discussed certain topics or as a frame of reference to understand the nature of the school population with which I was familiar. For example, some participants asked me how my district was dealing with current issues in education, such as APPR and Common Core. Others alluded to the similarities and differences between my district and theirs in relation to class sizes, school demographics, or student populations. One of my participants was a graduate of the school I teach in and often relayed her own stories of going to school in a highly competitive culture and how that influenced her as a teacher. She did not have to overly explain the culture of the school because it was assumed I knew it given my experience working there. Overall, I feel these participants wanted to know where and what I teach in order to respond in ways they thought I would best understand. In other words, I think they *wanted* to know my location in this study.

In addition to having curiosity about my background as a teacher, some participants asked me directly what I thought about various topics or themes that emerged during interviews. At the risk of turning interviews into two-way conversations in such cases, I deliberately kept my responses short and vague or resorted to phrases such as, “Someday I’d love to talk more about my thoughts with you.” I wanted to hear what they thought of these ideas, not to share my own. It was difficult to do; as stated previously, I have my own strong thoughts, opinions, and

experiences as a teacher. I had to be careful that what I said did not influence responses or re-direct the interview toward myself.

By disclosing and reflecting upon my positionality and subjectivities, I hope to reduce any biases that might arise. Having an insider perspective as a professional educator granted me access to the participants and helped me to understand the institutional language that surrounded the study. The next chapter explores the ways in which these eight teachers discuss the development of their own global awareness and their views of the world in relation to global education and the teaching of global history.

Chapter 4:

“There’s a whole other world out there:” Constructing Global Awareness and Perspectives

This chapter explores the ways in which these eight global history teachers understand and construct their own global awareness and perspectives. In the first section, I discuss teachers’ backgrounds including their varying exposures to diverse communities growing up, cross-cultural opportunities and, for some, the use of color-blind discourse in describing racial and/or ethnic diversity. I also explore teachers’ exposure to diversity in college, which many of them frame as “eye-opening” experiences. Consequently, I include information about teachers’ backgrounds in order to explore what factors in their upbringing, if any, shape these teachers’ global awareness.

Second, I describe how these teachers perceived their own global awareness, detailing the language they used to describe it, their thoughts on where it originates, and what they felt had most contributed to their worldviews including travel and professional responsibilities. I investigate these aspects in order to examine the words and ideas these teachers associated with global awareness and how they analyzed their own conceptualizations of it.

Next, given that these teachers have been subjected to discourses around American exceptionalism and American hegemony, particularly within the media, I explore the ways the teachers perceived other countries/cultures and their thoughts on American exceptionalism and the role the United States should play in the 21st century. Moreover, because global awareness involves broader understandings of global and cross-cultural perspectives, global issues, and the interrogation of American hegemony and global inequalities, I analyze to what extent, if any, teachers reinforced and/or challenged these ideas that circulate within American media and discourses. Overall, therefore, this chapter aims to explore the global understandings of these

global history teachers and how their views and perceptions were constructed.

Impact of Diversity in Teachers' Backgrounds

“It was pretty much a white community. There were only two kids, two Filipino kids in my whole high school. So, as far as the diversity aspect and those types of things I just, I wasn't exposed to it. And maybe some of my thinking is a little closed as well.” - Mike

I begin this chapter with a discussion of how these teachers describe the diversity of their communities growing up, given Merryfield's (2000) prior study that revealed the impact of diversity in teachers' upbringing and its impact on cross-cultural awareness and tolerance. Merryfield found that teachers who experienced “otherness,” came from multicultural communities, and/or spent time abroad exhibited more cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity than those who did not. Therefore, for this study I was interested in what experience, if any, these teachers had with diversity growing up, how they framed their understanding of diversity, and how teachers' reflected upon their exposure to diversity and its impact on their views of tolerance and/or cross-cultural understanding, key components of global education.

Diversity in Teachers' Upbringings

Teachers described the diversity in their communities in a number of ways, including racial/ethnic diversity, socioeconomic diversity, or religious diversity. Those teachers who did not experience much, if any, racial/ethnic diversity growing up, framed diversity within socioeconomic or religious differences, suggesting that they may not read their own Whiteness as part of diversity within the United States (Perry, 2002). Yet, time perhaps has made them more reflective regarding their backgrounds, with some recognizing their lack of exposure to diversity of any kind as a limiting factor to their development of open-mindedness. Thus, from my interviews, I perceived that the teachers who were not raised in multicultural communities in particular wished that they had been. Looking back, most of the teachers recognized that more

exposure to racial and ethnic diversity growing up would likely have helped them develop open-mindedness and cross-cultural awareness more readily, but their language suggested an “othering” of different groups nevertheless.

Five of the teachers interviewed described a lack of racial and/or ethnic diversity in their upbringings. For Mike, the lack of exposure to racial or ethnic diversity impacted his perceived sense of open-mindedness growing up. As the above quote illustrates, Mike felt, “maybe some of [his] thinking is a little closed” as a result of his limited, monocultural upbringing. He continued by describing his community growing up as one that had “more cows than people. Not diverse at all” with “a lot of backward thinking...some of the racial thinking.” Mike acknowledged that the lack of diversity in his background limited his ability to be open-minded in relation to racial and ethnic difference. It was not until attending college that Mike felt he was exposed to more diversity that allowed him to challenge his self-described “closed thinking” and become more tolerant, as will be discussed later.

Similarly, other teachers described the lack of ethnic and racial diversity in their communities growing up. Elizabeth, for example, stated, “I’ve lived in the city, I’ve lived in rural areas, I’ve lived in suburbia and they’ve all been predominantly white, the demographics. I wouldn’t say I’ve had any multicultural awareness when I was growing up.” Cheryl said, “There wasn’t diversity really...Very minimal diversity even when [the district] was combined with [a neighboring district] and we had a graduating class of over 700 kids. The majority were white.” And Kelly described her community growing up as “closed knit. Not very diverse. Our foreign exchange student was the biggest diversity that we had there at the time.” For these teachers, therefore, the lack of ethnic diversity in their upbringing was something they viewed negatively because it engendered a feeling of “sameness” that inhibited global and multicultural awareness

at that time in their lives. Most of the teachers discussed experiences later in life, such as college, travel, or making friends from different backgrounds that contributed more to their development of global awareness as will be discussed later.

Andrea, also, noted the lack of multicultural diversity in her community and school growing up. She stated, “The area when I grew up there was not as diverse as it is now... There were three students who may not have been Caucasian in my graduating class... So it was literally a fully Caucasian school. And the majority of kids were kind of similar.” Andrea’s most significant cross-cultural opportunities involved visiting New York City as a child, exploring museums, and witnessing street cultural festivals. “It was a totally different world to me. And it was always something to look forward to because it was so much more fun down there.” This exposure to cultural diversity in New York City helped to generate Andrea’s interest in different cultures, tapping into her curiosity and broadening her worldview as she experienced this “different world” that was “always something to look forward to.” Nevertheless, her daily interactions with people from different cultural backgrounds remained limited growing up.

Because they did not have much experience with racial or ethnic diversity in their upbringing, some of these teachers framed diversity in socio-economic or religious terms. Kelly, for example, described her community growing up as one comprised of “farmers and workers that would commute to the city... mostly middle class and then some really, free lunch program type depending on what area you came from. But as far as ethnicity? No. Not at all.” In fact, other teachers also described the socioeconomic diversity of their communities, perhaps because they did not have much multicultural exposure. Cheryl described her suburban community growing up as “mostly a mix of blue collar and white collar at the time.” Charlie

stated, “for me it was a working class community. Middle class, working class community...Police officers. To some degree teachers. Um, people who worked in factories. And a lot of military people.” And Andrea talked about having Jewish friends in her “fully Caucasian” high school, illustrating her initial exposure to diversity within a religious framework. Thus, some teachers understood “diversity” more broadly than racial or ethnic diversity given their limited experiences with multiculturalism growing up.

For Charlie and Doug, however, racial diversity was a part of their communities and schools growing up which they feel impacted their views on race and cross-cultural awareness. Although Doug described his immediate neighborhood as “a fairly homogeneous neighborhood from the standpoint of everyone was white,” he noted that, “as I got to high school, I got more friends of color through sports teams and stuff like that.” From living in a city neighborhood, “the schools were obviously well integrated...I had friends of all backgrounds...I never had any real problems with it.” As a student growing up in the 1960s, while neighborhoods tended to be divided along racial lines, the schools were more diverse particularly as a result of government policies that implemented racial integration (Kucsera, 2014). Doug referred to this integration policy when he said, “Probably my graduating class was maybe not 50-50, but definitely 60-40 [white to black populations]...They were bussing kids from the city to up where we were. So you had a pretty diverse background.”

And yet Doug noted that, despite the diversity in the school and his getting to know more people of color through sports teams, because he was in the more advanced classes, “you didn’t see as many [black] people.” Furthermore, the friends he remains in touch with today were those from his neighborhood which “were all pretty much white Catholic kids or white Protestant kids ‘cause that was just the neighborhood.” Therefore, although Doug had more experiences with

racial and ethnic diversity growing up than some of the other teachers in this study, his words illustrated the institutional segregation of his school and de-facto segregation within a diverse community. Although he attended a racially diverse high school, his interracial friendships did not extend beyond sports. Furthermore, he described the continued segregation within the school itself, despite the government's efforts to integrate schools. With fewer black students taking advanced classes, Doug's exposure to diversity within the school remained limited and perhaps reinforced stereotypes of "schools within schools," with black students being visible on sports teams but not in advanced academic classes. Thus, although Doug attended a more racially diverse high school overall, de facto segregation in and out of school may have prevented him from achieving any substantive cross-cultural awareness growing up.

Charlie more critically examined his suburban high school's experiences with racial and ethnic diversity. He stated:

At that time [in the 1980s] it was becoming more diverse. And I think there was some trouble. There were some struggles there for the school itself because there were issues of racism or situations they had to deal with. At one point there was actually a fight between a couple of white kids and black kids in the parking lot. And the newspaper got a hold of it and the superintendent moved on after that and they really did a lot to try to foster a kind of better climate. But I don't think they prepared for that as a school district. In the 60s, [the district] was probably by far the majority were white, middle class, upper class people. But as they got more apartments and rental properties going up, I think things changed and they weren't, I don't think they were ready to handle students coming from a different socioeconomic background or even students from different races, how to face that.

Charlie recognized that the increasing diversity of the district came about because of common desires for better opportunities, regardless of race. "I had African-Americans who are friends of mine and they were also there because they wanted to be in a school district where there were opportunities to go to college and get a strong education and play sports and things like that. So it was kind of a critical point."

While the district struggled with racial tensions, Charlie's own working class background situated him into multiethnic neighborhoods and communities that fostered within him a sense of community and cultural sensitivity:

We lived in apartments and townhouses. So there was a lot of people around us. And our parents cooked together, celebrated birthdays together, drank together. So I think I had a different perspective than a lot of kids who were white. Because you would go and [the black neighbors] would treat us like anybody else and there was a much stronger sense of community than I found with a lot of kids who were more like me...It was a lot more open. And then when you went to school it was very different. There was almost this kind of, it just felt like there was different forces at work when you went to school than at home in the neighborhood. Everybody was more friendly. Then you'd see your same friends in school and gosh! It just seemed different."

Charlie's daily experiences living within a multiethnic community gave him "a different perspective." He related to his African-American friends and neighbors because of shared experiences and daily interactions. This sense of community and experience relating to people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds allowed Charlie to see beyond stereotypes and the essentialization of the black community. In fact, he admitted that he felt a stronger sense of community and "openness" in that environment than he did with "a lot of kids who were more like [him]." Thus, by living in such a close-knit, open, and multiracial community, Charlie gained a degree of empathy, tolerance, and perspectives consciousness that contribute to the lens with which he perceived the larger world.

Yet Charlie also came to realize that the experiences and perspectives for his African-American friends *were* different once the environment changed from home to school. As he mentioned, "there were different forces at work when you went to school than at home in the neighborhood." His African-American friends were more "friendly" to him at home than at school, perhaps experiencing a degree of institutional segregation which promoted their disassociation with Charlie at school (Tatum, 1997; Perry, 2002). Charlie's early exposure to

such segregation, therefore, caused him to think about race, difference, and the societal forces that create division and different perspectives, fostering within him a sense of social justice with which he views society. In a sense, he reinforced Perry's (2002) more current findings that white students at a multiracial school were both more able to articulate what made them different from other racial groups and better equipped to discuss race in general.

And now, although Charlie still has "quite a few friends who are African-American," they live "in different parts" and he does not see them "as much as [he] would probably like to." Furthermore, he reflectively mentioned, "I think about my own choice where I live. And I don't live in a diverse area. I live in an area where everyone is pretty much like me. And more conservative than I actually am...I'm probably the most progressive by far in my neighborhood. So that's an interesting thing." Given the pervasive de-facto segregation in the area, his choice to live in a suburban, middle class community with little ethnic diversity is not surprising or unusual. With lower crime rates, higher performing schools, and better housing, such communities are more attractive to many people than urban areas (Kucsera & Orfield, 2014).

Yet he acknowledged the importance of exposing his own children to more diversity via various experiences. "We go to Cathedral in the city so when our kids go to religious ed classes there are a little more mixed groups of kids which I like and I think it's a good experience for them." However, he noted the incongruity of his choice of where he lives by saying, "but it's interesting that I don't live [in the city]. And I've wrestled with that a little bit sometimes, because you gain one thing and you lose another." For Charlie, who appreciated the opportunities for learning about cross-cultural understanding from growing up in a multicultural environment, his choice to live in a more insular suburban community was a troubled one for him. He would like his own children to be raised in a multicultural environment to develop their

own cross-cultural sensitivity and appreciation, but recognized that, at least in this region of upstate New York, he must sacrifice this desire for his children in favor of the arguably better schools and neighborhoods of the suburbs.

Overall, therefore, the teachers in this study spoke about diversity in their backgrounds in a number of ways - racial/ethnic, socioeconomic, or religious. Most of them were not exposed to racial or ethnic diversity growing up but wish they had been, believing that a racially/ethnically diverse upbringing would have helped them develop open-mindedness and cultural sensitivity more readily, as it did for Charlie. However, despite their valuation of cross-cultural sensitivity and appreciation, some teachers employed color-blind discourse in discussing their views on racial and ethnic difference.

Using Color-Blind Discourse

A few participants framed their understandings of diversity around a discourse of difference or color-blindness as a positive attribute that has contributed to their self-described tolerance and understanding of diversity. Moreover, these teachers described a normalization process that people of color yielded to thereby contributing to such color blindness. I use the term “color-blindness” because that was the language the participants used in their responses, with the understanding of the problematic nature of the term “blindness” in relation to the disability metaphor. By “color-blindness,” I mean the concept of race neutrality and/or the erasure of racial differences as a way of viewing society, not as a term that implicates disability (i.e., blindness). As their words suggested, participants who used color blind discourse did not seem to recognize that it is understood by scholars as a way to explain, “contemporary racial inequality as the outcome of nonracial dynamics,” (Bonilla-Silva, 2003, p. 2).

Andrea, for example, who taught in a diverse, urban high school, reflected on her

upbringing saying, “I was never raised seeing color or really difference in people so I never understood...I think to my parents, adversity never came based on the color of your skin or the way you looked or the way you spoke or whatever.” She described this sentiment in her discussion of having Jewish friends in high school:

Going to [high school] I always had a close knit group of friends and all my friends were Jewish but me... I never made the association back to my friends who are Jewish that um, Judaism was a different culture per se. I just always thought, "Well it's just a different portion of the religion. We share half a book." I would go to Temple with my – you know my parents were always very open about, "Yeah, try it. Whatever."

In Andrea’s case, “color-blindness” stems from an upbringing in which difference was not emphasized (“I was never raised seeing color or really difference.”). Jewishness was normalized in her view and, therefore, part of her ontology. Thus, she felt this experience of exposure to religious diversity while in school engendered attributes of tolerance and cultural understanding.

Two other teachers used color-blind discourses to describe diversity. Cheryl used the language of “color-blindness” to describe her attitude towards difference in her upbringing. Cheryl recalled a student in her private Catholic elementary school growing up: “I was best friends with a girl who was black. Looking back she was ridiculed but she was my friend so I didn’t see it. I didn’t see color or race. But she, and I think another student, were the only black children in that school district.” While Cheryl noticed the ridicule of her friend, she could not justify it because of her color blindness. Cheryl’s response illustrates the discourse of color blindness in that while her friend was ridiculed, as a child Cheryl could not understand that she may have been ridiculed *because* of her race. In other words, Cheryl’s younger self believed, as many whites continue to do, that she lives in a society in which Martin Luther King’s vision of people being judged “not by the color of their skin” rings true (Bonilla-Silva, 2003).

Similarly, Doug described himself as “being color blind to some extent.” He attributed

his experience attending a fairly diverse high school growing up as having impacted his views of race. He said, “I mean I don’t really make a lot of, I don’t make judgments on that and I’ll correct people who do...I consider myself fairly, as color-blind as you can be. I’ll put it that way.” He further discussed the assimilation of one of his best friends growing up who was from India:

He was Hindu. Well, his mother practiced but Ganesh came to our house to have burgers. He was kind of like Raj from The Big Bang. He came over and ate his beef at my house and went home and had, “ugh! My mother’s serving this tonight. I’d better stock up before I go home.” (laughs) And seeing the transition of him from when he first came to the country...And just became Americanized through hanging around with us more than anything.

Doug witnessed the “normalization” of his friend via assimilation. And while Doug likely experienced some cross-cultural awareness through his interactions with Ganesh (“He was Hindu.”), Doug perceived Ganesh become less Indian and more “American” thereby reducing any sense of cultural difference or discomfort with his friend. In the case of all three of these teachers, therefore, difference and/or color-blindness occurs because the Other has become assimilated to the mainstream and has been normalized.

Yet by refusing to “see color,” by not acknowledging that race and difference *does* play a covert role in experiences of privilege and opportunity, these teachers seemed not to understand that “color-blindness” is a problematic idea. They seemed to suggest that being “color-blind” is a positive attribute, but do not realize its potential of allowing the dominant in society to ignore racial privilege and the disadvantages of the non-dominant population (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Omi, 2011; DeMott, 2011). In the context of global education, therefore, color or difference blindness extends to the potential reinforcement of global inequalities and/or reinforcement of viewing the world through the colonizer’s lens in that imperialist views of race persist, using essentialist

arguments to explain global disparities and rooting ethnic differences in cultural practices (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Neville, 2008).

Many teachers in this study, therefore, experienced limited exposure to racial or ethnic diversity growing up that impacted their views on difference. For those teachers who were raised in communities with little racial diversity, ideas of diversity became framed by religious or socioeconomic differences. They situated diversity as something outside of themselves, “othering” those who are not part of the White dominant culture. Furthermore, a few of the teachers described themselves as being raised “color-blind,” understanding this trait as a positive attribute that may impact their views of global diversity. In doing so, they may have failed to recognize or acknowledge the role that race has played in propagating domestic and global inequalities, revealing their privileged position as White American (Banks, 2007). Nevertheless, these same teachers raised in less diverse communities evaluated their lack of exposure to racial or ethnic difference as a limiting factor in their upbringing and place value on multicultural experiences. They seemed to admit that they did not have a clear understanding of diversity based upon their upbringing. In fact, for many of the teachers in this study, attending college offered them their first substantive exposure to multicultural diversity.

Experiences with Multicultural Diversity in College

Many teachers spoke of college experiences as their first exposure to multicultural diversity. Almost all of these teachers described some sort of “eye-opening” event or experience in college that impacted them and contributed to their own understanding of diversity, allowing them to expand their multicultural and global awareness beyond the environments in which they were raised.

Three of the teachers spoke about some of their experiences at college as major cross-

cultural experiences that changed the ways in which they understood culture. Charlie felt that college afforded him the best opportunities to have cross-cultural experiences by, “meeting friends and visiting their homes and their families and seeing that there is a whole other world out there.” Mike also made friends with people from different backgrounds while in college. For him, college sports allowed him to meet and form friendships with people from different cultures and countries. He stated, “I was able to, through soccer and other things, become really good friends with a lot of people from different countries and that became a big interest for me.” These friendships and interactions likely fostered in these teachers a curiosity about the world and cultures that contributed to their global awareness and understanding of diversity later in life.

For Charlie and Doug, the exposure to people of different religions, particularly Judaism, was a cross-cultural experience that helped them make sense of their world. Charlie recalled one of his college roommates as helping him understand and make meaning of Judaism:

There weren't a lot of Jewish people [in the nearby community]. So when you went through college, I think that made me more aware. And I actually built friendships with people who had different backgrounds...My roommate was Jewish and so he kind of taught me a lot about the holidays. I kind of had a superficial understanding but he kind of, he practiced them and that kind of helped me understand and appreciate it. And, you know, we were good friends but he was somebody who for him being Jew was something that he did everyday and was proud of and he wasn't afraid to talk about it. He was very open about it. So that kind of opened my eyes to, this is a way of living. Seeing the world and practicing it or what have you.

Doug, too, remembered his exposure to diversity by attending college. He recalled being taken aback by the anti-Semitism he witnessed at college in the 1970s:

When I got to [college] it was a little more of an eye-opener because of the diversity there and ran into, it was more of an eye opener meeting people that were dramatically prejudiced against other people. That's just not the way I was raised. There were some kids who really had problems with kids of Jewish backgrounds. I was like, I have and had friends who were Jewish people that my brothers had brought home from school and it was like 'no big whoop.' You knew they were Jewish but it was no big deal.

Having been raised in a culturally sensitive household and attending a racially integrated high school, Doug found it difficult to understand why some people would “have problems” with Jewish students on campus. But he still found the experience of attending college, and being exposed to an even more diverse environment than the one in which he grew up, as a formative moment for him.

Mike also viewed his years attending an urban college and living in a city as important contributions to his cross-cultural awareness. As a young man with an admittedly sheltered upbringing (he described his rural home community as having “more cows than people”), Mike was definitely transformed by attending college in a city. He stated, “Going to school in the city and living out there for about fifteen years really opens your eyes and makes you see the world a lot differently.” For Mike, attending college in a city “out there” created a dual opportunity to develop cross-cultural awareness via urban culture and the multicultural diversity of the college.

Like some of the other teachers in this study, college also provided Andrea with new opportunities to explore different cultures. She remembered one professor, in particular, who exposed her to African-American church culture:

The one class I actually liked...was this class I took from a deacon from Washington, D.C. She was the first female African-American deacon in Washington, D.C...And she brought us to church on a Sunday and we were there for twelve hours... I thought to myself, “I can’t believe this goes on.” It was just really interesting and really different but it was really the same message. It was just construed differently and that to me was more of a cultural basis as opposed to a religious basis. So those types of things were always going through my mind especially as an undergrad because I was kind of finding myself so to speak. And that’s where I think a lot of that inculturation came from.

In her recollection, this event was exciting and interesting in that it highlighted both the similarities of cultures (going to church, hearing a Christian message), but also the ways in which it was “construed differently” along cultural, rather than religious, lines. Thus, for some of the teachers in this study, attending college afforded them experiences with diversity that

helped develop their cross-cultural awareness.

Overall, teachers in this study recognized the lingering effects that their upbringings have had on their own global awareness. For those teachers who were not raised in multicultural communities, and also for those who were, college afforded them the opportunity to make friends and interact with people from different cultural backgrounds than their own thereby “opening their eyes.” Yet it is unclear if the *exposure* to more multicultural diversity while in college truly allowed them to view themselves as cultural beings that might allow them to recognize their privileged positions as White and American within the United States and the world. But the emphasis these participants placed on meeting people from different cultures as “eye-opening” suggests that there was an impact that may have contributed to broader cultural awareness. While teacher background plays one role in the development of teachers’ global awareness, other opportunities later in life, such as through travel or work, gave these teachers cross-cultural experiences that also impacted their global awareness. Yet despite their various backgrounds, some teachers felt that they have a good sense of global awareness, while others acknowledged that theirs was still developing.

Teachers’ Development of Global Awareness

In order to understand the extent to which these teachers infused elements of global education into their teaching, I wanted to understand how they personally view their own global awareness and from where they believe it has developed. By global awareness, I refer to particular skills and attributes that define global competence, such as speaking and/or understanding a foreign language, possessing deep cross-disciplinary knowledge and understanding of global issues and topics, and having the ability, experience, and willingness to communicate and interact effectively with people from other cultures in a mutually respectful

way (Reimers, 2010; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2012). The teachers in this study described their own global awareness with a range of responses, with some teachers believing themselves to be very globally aware, while others described theirs as “developing” or “growing.” Furthermore, they acquired global awareness in formal ways, such as through coursework and curricula, and informal ways, such as via life experiences, travel, and a curiosity about the world and other cultures. They all suggested that their own sense of global awareness impacted and hopefully enriched their teaching in some way. However, few, if any, of the teachers exhibited all of the skills and attributes that contribute to global competency.

From “Growing” to “Very Aware:” Teachers’ Descriptions of Global Awareness

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2012) describes global awareness as “understanding and addressing global issues,” “learning from and working collaboratively with individuals representing diverse cultures...in a spirit of mutual respect,” and, “understanding other nations and cultures, including the use of non-English languages.” For global history and geography teachers, an awareness of current global issues and geography is a critical element of their job. In light of this topic, I was interested to know how each of the teachers in this study perceived their own global awareness. I asked them, “How would you describe your own global awareness?” Based on their responses, I found that the teachers in this study framed their own global awareness along a continuum, from “growing” and “I’m still learning” to “very aware” and “I have a feeling of global citizenry.” These results suggest that these teachers viewed their own global awareness as an evolving construct, but one that was important to their profession and, in some cases, personal identities.

In describing their sense of global awareness, some teachers believed their own global awareness was limited. Charlie, in particular, noted some of the challenges he faced in achieving

true global awareness: “I think I’m still learning, trying to connect with people more and understand more. But I think it’s limited by my life in the sense of writing, teaching, having three kids. It’s hard to do...” Even Selina, who described herself as having a “feeling of global citizenry” stated that she was “probably not as well informed about global events as [she’d] like to be” but that she was “not terribly informed either.” A busy life of teaching and family responsibilities limited her time devoted to researching global events and news.

Mike, also, only had a “growing” sense of global awareness. As mentioned previously, his isolated upbringing in a rural farming community restricted his global exposure and made him “ignorant.” He said, “I wasn’t aware of the outside world as much. I think through travel, reading, through education I’ve become much more aware, much more understanding...I think I’m constantly growing and it’s made me a better person.” For Mike, his evolving global awareness contributed to his identity as a teacher and also as a citizen of the world. While he understood that he had not yet achieved a feeling of total global citizenry, he believed that the more he learned about the world, the more understanding, tolerant, and “better” he would be as a person.

Three of the teachers, however, perceived themselves to be very globally aware. “I think I’m very aware,” Elizabeth noted, “I always try and see what’s important in other countries.” Kelly, likewise, felt that she could “hold a fairly intelligent conversation about things going on in the world.” And Selina, raised in both Pakistan and the United States, said, “I feel like I have a really good sense of the variety of diversity in class, diversity in ethnicity, diversity in religion,” illustrating her sense of global awareness as an understanding and appreciation for multicultural diversity.

Yet both Selina and Elizabeth, who each lived abroad for a number of years, possessed a

more complex understanding of global awareness. For example, because of her dual-culture upbringing, Selina described herself as “a citizen of the world.” She continued, “I have that feeling of global citizenry that I need to contribute to the world, not necessarily America or Pakistan or whatever.” Selina’s words suggest that her global awareness extended beyond simply possessing skills that foster cross-cultural awareness and communication or knowledge of global issues. Her global awareness contributed to her identity as a global citizen.

Elizabeth also displayed a sophisticated perception of what global awareness means. Although she described herself as being “very aware” and knowledgeable about “what’s important in other countries,” she noted, “It might not be, it might just be from the perspective of what *we* think is important to other countries.” Thus, Elizabeth recognized that her sense of global awareness stemmed from an American perspective and that an awareness of global issues can be limited by ethnocentrism.

Overall, therefore, teachers described their own global awareness along a continuum from “growing” to “very aware,” crediting time, ethnocentrism, and/or cultural insularity as factors that inhibited more substantive global awareness. Yet these teachers recognized the importance global awareness had on their own identity, with some believing that global awareness improved them as people and contributed to their sense of cross-cultural sensitivity and global citizenship. Yet few, if any, exhibited all of the skills and attributes that define global competency as outlined by Reimers (2010) and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2012). For example, only Selina and Elizabeth speak a language other than English fluently, had experience living overseas and being immersed in a foreign culture, and had collaborated with people from different countries. For most of these teachers, being globally aware equated merely with having an understanding of global issues and events, acquired largely via American media

as will be discussed later. Nevertheless, as global history and geography teachers, participants cited global awareness as a key factor in their teaching, believing it to be critical to their role as professional educators.

Global Awareness as Professional Responsibility

Some teachers framed global awareness as part of their professional responsibility in addition to having a personal interest in what is happening around the world. For them, teaching the global history course necessitated more content knowledge that, therefore, enabled them to become more aware of global issues. As Kelly stated,

If I see something, I'll go research it...I will immerse myself into learning what started the problem...who are the players, why they are doing it....When I see things happening, I keep up on it...I think that I could hold a fairly intelligent conversation about things going on in the world.

By immersing herself in the content and researching various global topics in this formal way, Kelly gained global awareness through her teaching.

Two other teachers mentioned that they gained more global content and awareness through their teaching. As Selina admitted, "How did I learn [global content]? Um, as I taught it." Selina also maintained a sense of global awareness by "keep[ing] up" with global news. In her words, she "feel[s] more connected and more interested in global news than...local news." She understood that her global awareness stems from an interest in consulting sources that are global in outlook. Similarly, Doug felt that his global awareness stems from his job as a global history teacher. "I'm getting more [global awareness] everyday from teaching this class," he said, "I'm learning a lot about stuff that went on elsewhere in the world because I've got to teach it."

Charlie also viewed his own global awareness as part of his professional responsibilities. He cited research and news as important sources that inform his awareness of global events. He

stated, “Do I read international news? Sure. Do I look at international events critically? Absolutely. Do I try to foster that and instill that in my students? Absolutely.” Charlie actively sought out a variety of sources in order to uncover “different perspectives that relate to my course.” Accordingly, he often consulted “a lot of different news sources” to enrich his lessons and his own global awareness.

In fact, most of the teachers cited reading and research as the best ways they learned global history content. Even Elizabeth, who specialized in global history and anthropology in college, attributed her content background and global awareness to constant reading and writing. She noted, “I always read and during the summers and during the year. Works of nonfiction or historical texts, conferences...Even now, after I’ve been teaching seventeen, eighteen years, I’m always doing research, as I think all good teachers have to.” Charlie also looked to books and “good secondary sources” for information, “like if [he] want[s] to learn more about imperialism in Africa.” He stated, “I’m always looking, always paying attention. What’s coming out? What’s a new book? What’s a new article?...So I’m always looking to do those things. To read and pay attention to the news.” Teachers viewed their outside reading and research as part of their professional responsibilities as well as for personal interest and enrichment. They described themselves as “always” doing research, reading, or “paying attention” to global news, current literature, or articles that provide them with more background information in their teaching.

Like the other teachers in this study, Doug turned to books to enrich his content understandings. He stated, “I learned a lot of [global content] from reading books...Like the one I just picked up...in the library is on the Renaissance and Reformation which I started on Wednesday. So I get a few more facts in [my lesson] on the Renaissance and Reformation.” And like Selina, Doug often relied on basic anthologies “that are history of the world kind of

things” to get basic information or to “fill in a lot of blanks for China or India and the dynasties and stuff like that.” Understandably, for busy teachers secondary sources, textbooks, and anthologies provided quick references for lesson planning purposes.

Yet most of the books teachers read to gain understandings of global content were secondary sources likely written by Western authors, such as the “basic anthologies” referenced by Doug. Nevertheless, most of the teachers in this study understood that the development of their own global awareness and content knowledge, however acquired, was a critical professional responsibility they had as teachers. In addition to the development of their global awareness through teaching, some teachers pointed to other life experiences, such as other work, travel, or age and maturity as making them more globally aware.

Global Awareness Through Life Experiences

While many teachers turned to formal ways, such as study and research, for their global awareness, for four of the teachers, informal life experiences contributed most to their global awareness, via other work, living overseas, personal connections, or age and maturity. Kelly, for example, developed global awareness through work before she became a teacher. She recalled learning about Onondaga Native American culture from working for a company that did business with the Native American community, helping her to develop cross-cultural understandings:

When I was selling cigarettes...the reservation was one of our biggest accounts. And I know that their tradition is oral. So I had to first gain their trust as somebody who sold to. And then I picked their brains for why do you do this? And what started this? And how many people still follow that?...They're not forthcoming with just somebody walking up and saying, “Tell me about being Native American”, you know? They hold that very personal and very - they have a lot of pride about it. So it was a good experience for me to be able to listen to that.

Working for the company for which she sold cigarettes also allowed Kelly the opportunity to

understand more about Arab business culture:

A lot of the stores were traditionally Arab stores and they're used to bartering and that's how they know how to do business...Because in their country when they came over, that's what they're used to...Everything is negotiable. And so you can almost not get out of the store without negotiating something. And you had to understand that. And it gives you a little bit more understanding of how they operate in a lot of things. Because they come from a different culture and that's how they deal.

For Kelly, cross-cultural and global awareness became an important element in her business dealings. She had to learn about and understand different cultural practices in order to do business. With the Native American community, she had to “earn their trust” before she could ask questions. With the Arab community, she “had to understand” the art of bartering in order to secure the best deal. Yet although it was important for conducting business, learning about these other cultures originated from Kelly's basic curiosity and interest. As she later said, “ I like the cultures. The different cultures and why the cultures are the way they are.” She clearly wanted to know more about how and why these different cultures operated than she did for purely practical reasons. As such, she developed global awareness as a professional responsibility in another capacity than teaching.

Kelly also cited time and age as contributing most to her global awareness and open-mindedness. She particularly credited growing up in the seventies because “it was all about changing the norms. It was just a time of change. Trying new things...Anything against The Man.” Although there was no one event that she could pinpoint, she said:

I think it's always been because I've always been around people that either emigrated here and it's you know, not a lot. I can't say a lot. But exposed enough that I felt like it was always a different culture I had to learn about...So I think there was not one time, but just my whole life being exposed.

Kelly's cross-cultural and global awareness stemmed from curiosity and interests in her personal life, as well. She described her lifelong interest in learning about other cultures:

I like the cultures. The different cultures and why the cultures are the way they are. Like, why does, what led to these people to act in this certain way that you would tend to say is culture? Why did they do this? And I like the story of it...Even before I was a social studies teacher I would go to all of the culture fests and just immerse myself. I'd always ask questions.

Her interest in other cultures extended to her personal life. She learned about Macedonian and Italian history and culture from her partner, whose mother was from Macedonia and whose paternal grandfather hailed from Italy. She recalled her partner's mother talking about "how they had to change their names and the struggle that they went through...and the civil unrest in their countries." She also mentioned being interested in learning the new language of Macedonian immigrants:

Like just the terms they had. Like his mother would help the 'J-O's'. And I'm like, 'What's a J-O?' 'It's the Just-Overs.' Like they had their own language, their own lingo, and their own - this person's more knowledgeable because they've been over longer. And this person knows that that's who you go see for that. Just like how people adjust to that, you know? And how they merge those cultures when they get here. Keep their own but then merge. And whenever I tell them I'm a teacher, they'll say, 'Make sure you talk about Alexander [the Great], like he's their man. It's just interesting (laughs)!

Thus, Kelly's exposure to people from other cultures she encountered throughout her life, combined with her upbringing during a decade of change and challenging of the status quo, provided her with an ingrained interest and curiosity about the world and its many cultures that contributed to her global awareness today.

Doug also credited age, maturity, and life experiences as contributing most to his global awareness. Doug attributed his interest in global events to "being a history and geography junkie [his] whole life [and] being encouraged to do it." He also noted that time and age added to his understanding of the world and global issues. He said:

I mean just think. I'm fifty-three. Thinking about what I thought at eighteen about the world and what I think about it at fifty-three. Life will change your mind. You'll have experienced people that will open your eyes to think that maybe you don't have all the answers. And so now I look at things differently, with more open eyes. And I wish that

you could impart that into your students to be able to have that at a younger age. But I think it's just the way it is, the way life is.

Doug's notion that "life will change your mind" and allow one to "look at things differently, with more open eyes" illustrated his evolving views of the world. Time, experience, and wisdom afforded him more reflection and analysis of global understandings, perspectives, and cultures.

Thus, for these participants, cross-cultural awareness began through their interactions and experiences with different groups of people in a multicultural America. Moreover, most of them maintained that travel was another important avenue by which to expand one's global understandings and cross-cultural awareness. But apart from Elizabeth and Selina, extensive foreign travel for other participants in this study was limited.

Impact of Travel on Global Awareness: The "Traveler" versus the "Tourist"

Some studies of the impact of overseas experiences for preservice teachers suggest that, as a whole, international travel positively affects education students' professional and personal confidence, cultural awareness, global mindedness, and appreciation and respect for differences of others (Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Cushner & Mahon, 2002; Cushner, 2007; Sahin, 2008). In fact, I credit my own interest in this dissertation topic from my personal experiences living and traveling abroad. Yet the teachers in this study had varying experiences with international travel with some describing their international experiences using the language of a "traveler," while others did so as a "tourist." In the words of Boorstin (2012), "The traveler [is] active; he [goes] strenuously in search of people, of adventure, of experience. The tourist is passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him. He goes 'sightseeing' (p. 121)." Therefore, in discussing the impact of overseas experiences on teachers' cross-cultural and global awareness, I employ the language of the "tourist" versus the "traveler" in which I designate the "tourist" as

one who visits the key sights within a country, stays in hotels or resorts that cater to Western² visitors, and/or views the destination country with an ethnocentric lens. Conversely, the “traveler” is one who immerses him/herself in the destination culture. S/he knows the language, customs, and people of the country to the extent that s/he begins to adapt and modify internal cultural norms.

Although many participants cited travel as an important factor in developing global awareness, for most of them, travel experiences had been limited. Only Elizabeth and Selina spent significant time living abroad, which they felt greatly impacted their global awareness. Selina credited “growing up in Pakistan and knowing that [she] came from America...probably had a big influence on [her].” And Elizabeth pointed to travel and living overseas in England and Italy as key experiences in allowing her now to “see what’s important in other countries.” Their experiences as “travelers” will be discussed more in depth later in this section.

Despite most of these teachers having limited travel experiences, all of them mentioned that travel is something they wanted to do more of someday. Andrea stated, “Travel experiences for me are not as grand as I would have liked...I hope to get there someday.” Doug noted, “I’ve been to Canada ‘cause my kids played hockey and I went to Canada a lot. But I haven’t been outside of the U.S [except on vacation to Mexico]...that’s one of my goals is to see a little bit more of the world, at least to Europe.” Like Doug, Kelly had not traveled beyond the eastern U.S. and Canada, but declared her desire to travel more on her “bucket list.” However, despite some teachers lacking extensive international travel, all of the teachers in this study possessed a keen interest in traveling and understood the impact it can have on their teaching.

Despite their varied experiences with travel, most teachers recognized the impact it can

² I use the term “Western” merely to refer to countries of Europe or those with dominant European ancestral populations, such as the United States, with the understanding that the term “Western” can be problematic given the idea of the traditional West marked by imperialism and ethnocentrism.

have in broadening their worldviews and influencing their teaching. As Cheryl noted,

Unfortunately, I haven't [traveled] and I want to travel but what I've found is really getting to know other aspects of culture through my students...I do hope to travel one of these days and I don't want to keep putting it off because I think it will add an amazing experience to my teaching...

Mike, who toured around Europe as a young man, reinforced Cheryl's point, saying, "[travel] has been especially [important] teaching global. I can bring out the stories." And Doug planned to use the pictures and brochures he collected on his visits to the Mayan ruins next year with his Global History classes. Moreover, Elizabeth described the importance of travel for both personal and professional reasons by saying:

I grew up, as we all do, looking at things in books. Our history, language learning out of books. And being able to go [abroad], I think it's one of those, I think it's a big hands-on classroom. You know, you get to, you're exposed to languages, you're exposed to a lot of cultures...I've always told my students I highly recommend it. I think it's made me a more tolerant person. I think it just exposes you to so much more than living in a suburban vacuum.

As Elizabeth aptly observed, visiting other places can be a very rewarding, enriching, and rejuvenating experience. In her words, the world is "a big hands-on classroom" that allows people to see beyond the confines of their local communities and to provide them with experiences that can broaden their worldviews.

Yet some teachers who visited countries outside of the United States sometimes framed their travel experiences through the eyes of a "tourist" rather than those of a "traveler," visiting places that catered to Western tourists and/or adopting an ethnocentric response to what they saw and experienced. Both Doug and Charlie visited Mexico, for example, but stayed at all-inclusive resorts ("which I would strongly recommend to anybody," encouraged Doug). Doug recalled a side trip he took "to the tourist trap Playa del Carmen for a day." He rolled his eyes as he described his reaction to the cultural practice of haggling. "They like to haggle down there. Just

tell me how much it costs (laughs)!” Doug’s irritation and dismissiveness of haggling reflects, to some extent, his ethnocentrism; because it is not practiced in the United States, he felt it was silly or cumbersome.

The “tourist” lens also framed the way some teachers described their perception of certain cultures or experiences in foreign countries. For instance, Doug described his son’s reaction to Kuwaiti culture when he was stationed there in the military. He recounted,

[My son] said the other thing was just the hygiene ‘cause they don’t bathe with the regularity that we bathe (laughs). Americans, we have more sensitive noses to that kind of stuff to the B-O and that kind of thing that comes along with it. A little bit of cultural shock there for him. Being a lily white boy from [a small town](laughs) and his experience of going abroad was to go to Canada.

Doug’s son, and Doug himself, responded to Kuwaiti cultural practices with a bit of disgust, reading Kuwaiti bathing habits as inferior to those of Americans, rather than criticizing Americans arguable obsession with cleanliness or trying to understand Kuwaiti cultural habits. Yet Doug also suggested that his son’s exposure to “culture shock” was not necessarily a bad thing. It forced his son, “a lily white boy from [a small town],” to have a new experience that broadened his views of the world, even if those views were couched in a degree of cultural subjectivity and ethnocentrism.

Similarly, Mike, who toured Europe with friends as a younger man, recalled some of his reactions to places he visited in the language of a tourist:

It was cheap to travel at the time. This was around 2000...[A friend] met me down in London and we bounced around the continent staying in youth hostels which was a definite experience. And we went to Amsterdam, Strasbourg. I skied in the Alps on Bastille Day. Skiing was horrible so we pulled out the map, drove over the Alps, went to Genoa. It was gross. We went to Monte Carlo...We got lost in Trento, Italy. We were trying to get gas. It’s like five o’clock at night and I’m thinking, “There’s got to be a gas station.” All closed. Nobody spoke English...Finally got out of there. And then we went to Prague but they wouldn’t let us, the rental car place wouldn’t let us take our car into the former Eastern Europe because the Russia [sic] mafia steals all their cars. So we had some scary experiences in Prague.

Like Doug, Mike's reactions to the places he visited reflected his ethnocentrism. He noted Genoa's lack of cleanliness by American standards ("It was gross") and Prague's lack of security ("we had some scary experiences in Prague"; "...the Russia mafia steals all their cars"). He also was surprised that gas stations would be closed in Italy and that few people spoke English. Mike assumed that Italy and Italian culture would be similar to that of the United States, and that more English-speakers would be there to assist him. And yet, as he recounted his experiences, he spoke fondly and wistfully. It was clear that he valued that time of his life. He repeatedly stated, "it was a pretty neat experience."

Mike also exhibited an ethnocentric and nationalist response to interactions he had in Canada and France:

We were skiing up on Whistler, up in Canada. In British Columbia. And these Danish guys were telling us how great their country is and how we suck and everything else. And I'm like, 'How much do you pay in taxes?' 'Seventy percent.' Am I'm like, 'I don't pay that much!' And then I was in France and I did not like the French that much. We were in one place and they were like, 'We're French. You must speak French.' And that just rubbed me the wrong way. I had to be a pompous American on that one. We Americans saved your ass a couple of times so go away (laughs).

Mike's reaction to the Danish and French people he encountered during his travels reflected some ideas of American exceptionalism, in which the United States is viewed as distinctly unique and by extension superior to other countries. He reacted to the Dane's criticism of the United States with irritation, quickly jumping to the American defense by hailing the comparatively low tax rates in the United States as an example of its superiority. Furthermore, he essentialized the French people as arrogant, given that they expected him to speak French while in France, as opposed to English. Yet Mike acknowledged that he fell into the stereotype of "a pompous American on that one," recognizing the irony of his response. Nevertheless, he justified his reaction through the lens of a tourist; "We Americans saved your ass a couple of

times, so go away.” In other words, because the United States assisted with the liberation of France during World War II, Americans earned the right to be dismissive of French culture, perspectives, and/or criticism over a half-century later.

As each of these teachers spoke about their travels, however, it became clear that they could see beyond the “tourist” to some extent. Even Doug, who expressed his impatience with the practice of haggling in Mexico, understood that haggling is part of a culture “where people are trying to survive and all that...You could see the differences between the resort area and then the abject poverty of the people.” He also expressed an interest to be more of a “traveler” rather than a “tourist.” He stated:

If I spoke Spanish or had someone who could, I would love to go through that part of town and really get a little bit of the local flavor or eat some of the real local food...So you saw a little bit of it what they wanted to show you more than anything, unfortunately...I’d love to be able to just go to some parts of the world and just kind of blend in.

Doug wistfully described his desire to travel rather than tour. He seemed disappointed that he only saw “a little bit of what they wanted to show you.” In other words, Doug knew that the cultural gatekeepers in the resort industry direct the narrative of Mexico, redirecting foreign visitors away from the “abject poverty of the people.” And while Doug demonstrated a real desire to cut through that narrative by stating, “I’d love to be able to just go to some parts of the world and just kind of blend in,” he felt somewhat limited by his language ability.

Charlie, in particular, shared an even more complex picture of travel: “Mexico was interesting because if you go places like Cancun, you see that it looks a lot like the United States. But if you *force yourself* to explore beyond that, you see there’s a whole other world out there. Poverty and different cultural forms...” It was interesting that he stated people need to “force themselves” to go beyond the resort setting to see the “real” Mexico suggesting, perhaps, that

most Americans are content staying among familiar surroundings, or do not want to be confronted with poverty or cultural difference. Yet the poverty he witnessed in Mexico once he left the resort impacted him and gave him a perspective on poverty in the United States:

I remember one of the things was that we wanted to go see Chichen Itza. You get off the resort and we stopped in a lot of the villages along the way. And I remember stopping and seeing a home and a family. Basically they had no windows or doors on their home and they were selling potato chips...You know the poverty is something that we look away from. We have the same poverty here but I think we manage it better in the sense that you don't see it...But I think that there it was very open and honest and it's hard. You see the world and it's very different...When you travel abroad sometimes you see it through a different lens.

Charlie acknowledged that poverty certainly exists in the United States, but Americans are uncomfortable with it. They “look away from it,” as he stated. “I think you see [poverty] is more pronounced than you can even see in your own neighborhood. But I imagine if somebody came here, they would see things I didn't see.” He understood and employed a degree of perspectives consciousness by acknowledging that people from other countries might very well see poverty in the United States more readily. For Charlie, even his limited travels reinforced his sense of global social justice. He said,

I think [travel] gives you a reference point. You can't ever escape. You look for that and you bring it home and say, “Gosh! Who are those people here? Is it these people who live inside the city...?” I have students who are homeless...I have students who come from Iran. Are those our people who are here who are struggling? So I think it gives you that reference point and allows you to connect some dots that you wouldn't have before. You see poverty is a universal, global issue. It's not a local issue.

Charlie saw the value of being a “traveler” rather than a “tourist.” By going beyond what is familiar and comfortable, one can gain a greater appreciation of the world and its issues.

Two of the teachers spoke of their time abroad as travelers. For Elizabeth, who had the opportunity to live overseas, first as a college student in England and then in Italy for four years, England and Italy became her “second homes.” She gained many valuable insights into culture

from her time living abroad that impacted both her teaching and her personal understanding of the world. In fact, while living in Italy, she immersed herself in the culture and language to the degree that most Italians did not believe she was American:

At first I looked very American when I showed up. And then as I stayed there longer, that went away. And as the fluency with the language got better, they did not see me as American. My accent was flawless...After about a year, I could go walking around, you know, go from point A to point B and nobody would question. When I first arrived, definitely. They knew I was American. They knew from my dress. I only spoke English. But that changed over time...And when I said I was American they almost didn't believe it. As a matter of fact, I was mistaken more for a Canadian or Australian.

For Elizabeth, becoming fluent in the language and living there for a significant period of time allowed her to immerse herself more deeply into the culture of Italy, adopting attitudes and dress that were not perceived as “American.” Accordingly, she reached the integration stage of Bennett’s (1993) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. That is, she became able to interact comfortably in more than one culture and to integrate cultural awareness into everyday interactions.

At that time, as she noted, “it was the nineties. It was a very different time to be traveling and living in a foreign country. Now I don’t know.” The post-9/11 world may make it more difficult or undesirable for Americans to travel as freely or to immerse themselves as readily in a foreign culture. According to a report issued by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2010), “the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 had an immediate and substantial impact on international travel worldwide. The attacks induced substitution away from air travel generally and caused a shift in the preferences of travelers for particular destinations,” with those destinations overwhelmingly Europe and the Caribbean (Office of Travel and Tourism Industries, 2014). Thus, Elizabeth’s insights about overseas travel in a pre-9/11 world seemed accurate. The events of 9/11 drastically shaped Americans’ attitudes towards overseas travel

which may ultimately impact their global awareness and interactions.

Yet Elizabeth remembered her time in both England and Italy as very “eye-opening,” by meeting many different people, traveling throughout Europe, and learning about the cultural dynamics among ethnic groups in different places which she used in her sociology and global history classes. She discussed the cultural dynamics she witnessed in England and Italy:

There’s a very big Indian population in England. A very big Pakistani population. And it was interesting watching. In this country, the ethnic and racial split is between whites, blacks, and Hispanics. In England, it’s between the English, the white English and the Indians and Pakistanis. It’s like that triangle which is very interesting and different than here. Another thing, it was the Africans coming up from northern Africa going to Italy and the Albanians. They were the ones who were discriminated against. Very eye-opening.

Elizabeth went beyond being a “tourist” to try to understand the deeper cultural and demographic issues of the countries in which she lived. Rather than reacting in a negative or judgmental way, she tried to make sense of what she witnessed, noting that discrimination happens everywhere there are marginalized communities. Her views and experiences therefore become a teaching tool in her classes. “It’s what I bring into my sociology classes,” she said, “My experiences that I was exposed to.”

There was one cultural attribute in Italy, however, that Elizabeth ultimately could not negotiate and one that caused her to return to the United States. When she lived in Italy in her early twenties, the male dominated culture caused her to rethink remaining in the country, in part because she felt it limited her career prospects there:

It was quite culturally different because they looked at women quite differently. I left because I figured out that I needed a career. You know, I couldn’t stay and do what I did there. Because women had this role. It’s changed considerably, because I go back every couple of years and it’s changed considerably. But that was really interesting. It was quite a male dominated society. The women either stayed at home or really didn’t have these aspirations for any kind of career and that was kind of bad and interesting. And I knew I couldn’t stay there for any length of time know that, without a clear plan for myself...But I became bilingual because of [my time there]. And it gave me an

independence and it was definitely eye-opening and a wonderful experience.

In discussing the misogynistic culture of Italy, Elizabeth declared it as “bad” but also “interesting” as it forced her to evaluate her education and focus. And she realized that she could not, or would not, remain in Italy at that time because of its limiting prospects for women.

Selina, too, traveled extensively, speaking of her experiences with the language of a traveler. Yet she acknowledged that she needs to travel more in order to understand places better:

Here’s what I don’t know and I really, I feel like I have a really good sense of the cultures of everywhere except Far East Asia. I don’t feel like I have a good sense of how they are as a people. And probably I’d also say that for some of the African, western African and Southern African countries. I just don’t have a good sense of it. So that’s where I’d like to travel next.

For Selina, extensive travel experiences had given her “a really good sense of the cultures everywhere” she visited. Selina recognized her knowledge of these areas remains limited, but this limited understanding motivated her desire to travel there. She wanted to travel more, particularly to places for which she “does not feel [she has] a good sense of how they are as a people,” namely the Far East and Africa. Selina hoped that travel would help her not just to see the world, but to understand other cultures and “how they are as a people.” She suggested that merely visiting a place does not yield depth of understanding about that place. Furthermore, she illustrated that visiting countries in Africa or the Far East would enable her to know them better for herself, as if she does not “have a good sense” of those regions from outside sources or media representations she has been subjected to.

Overall, therefore, teachers developed cross-cultural awareness in a variety of ways, from travel or living abroad, life experiences, professional research, or experiences and friendships gained while in college. However, as some teachers’ “tourist” language demonstrated,

colonialist or neocolonialist and exceptionalist discourse continues to circulate within American culture. Moreover, many of these discourses are reinforced by media representations of other countries that may influence how these teachers make sense of the world.

Teachers' Understandings of the World

"I'd love to go to...places like the Middle East and all that but it's so sketchy in that part of the world safety-wise...It would be a little scary." - Doug

"I'd like to appreciate what we have here so I think [I'd travel] to Africa." - Cheryl

"I found even [Russians] were more globally aware than [we are] here." - Elizabeth

As purveyors of information and guides to learning about the world, teachers make very influential choices on how content is conveyed to students, the resources used in the classroom, and the opportunities students have to engage in the subject matter. Yet their personal views and understandings of the world may impact their pedagogical choices and the language they employ in the classroom, thereby influencing future generations of students. As the above quotes illustrate, some of these teachers employed strong stereotypical, essentialist, and/or racist language in the ways they described other parts of the world. Thus, in order to discern how global history content may be conveyed to students, I wanted to explore teachers' own global understandings in terms of their perceptions of other countries and/or cultures, their views on the idea of American exceptionalism, and the role of the United States in the twenty-first century. I was curious to know to what extent teachers possess ingrained ideas of colonialism/neocolonialism and American exceptionalism and to what extent these teachers resisted and challenged such notions. To begin this discussion, I focus on the role that media may play in shaping teachers' ideas, given that teachers are subjected to wider media discourses that often influence how people make sense of the world.

Media Representations and Influence on Global Thinking

All of the teachers in this study referenced the media as sources of information they used for research or content understandings. Three teachers cited National Public Radio as a source of global news that they turned to daily and utilized in teaching current issues and events. Charlie often consulted “a lot of different news sources” such as “*Al Jazeera* versus the *New York Times* versus the *Washington Post*.” And Selina pointed to “*The New York Times* or the [other] major newspapers” as sources she routinely examined for global information, although she was, “much more interested in BBC World News than [she was] in News Channel 10.” In addition to radio and print media, they also utilized a number of online media sources, such as YouTube, CNN.com, and Google News in researching various global topics.

With a few exceptions, these teachers consulted mainly American or British media for sources of global information thereby privileging a Western view of the world. Because many media portrayals of countries that constitute “the Rest” continue to somewhat reinforce colonialist or neoliberal views about those countries (Brewer, Graf, & Willnat, 2003; Nederveen Pieterse, 2009; Zhang, 2010; Evans, 2010, Scott, 2009), teachers in this study are subjected to such portrayals. Thus, teachers’ exposure to such discourses can shape the ways in which they perceive other countries. For example, Doug’s perception of different parts of the world reflected his exposure to media reports that reiterated such views. The Middle East, in particular, held fascination for Doug because of its history, but was one of the areas of the world he was fearful of visiting. He mentioned this on more than one occasion over the course of our interviews. “I would love to go to some of the places in the Middle East but Americans aren’t real popular there,” he stated, “So do you want to go and have to worry about that?”

At another point in discussing places he’d like to visit, he said, “I’d love to go to Florence and Milan or London or Paris. There’s other places like the Middle East and all that but it is so

sketchy in that part of the world safety-wise...Taking a group to Cairo or something like that because that part of the world is so turbulent right now.” He repeatedly mentioned that he would like to visit England and Ireland “and all those places ‘cause that’s where I’m from” in reference to his heritage. But he’d also “love to go to the places [he teaches]. Love to go to India” or to take his students to Central America, “take them to the Mayan ruins. Maybe to Machu Picchu or something like that I think would be really cool.” The places Doug mentioned that he wanted to visit reflected his perceptions of those places. He differentiated regions that were “safe,” such as Europe, from those that were not, such as the Middle East, likely based upon the influence of media reports.

Doug’s perceptions of other countries somewhat limited him in terms of where he was willing to go and how he would experience countries he visits. For example, he stated:

I’d love to go to China, but I’d want to do China on a tour because you need the language. It is so different you’re gonna want an interpreter...That’s one of my goals is to see a little bit more of the world, at least to Europe. I mean unfortunately nowadays it’s chancy to go to too many places ‘cause some of the places aren’t too safe anymore. You just have to deal with so much stuff.

Doug’s exposure to discourses of difference and American exceptionalism impacted his perceptions of various places. He perceived China as so “different” he would need to be on a tour with an interpreter, perhaps not necessarily concerned that a guided tour might act as both linguistic and cultural interpreter, catering to Euro-American tastes and interests, rather than experiencing the country on his own terms.

Likewise, he made assumptions about the safety in Mexico outside of the resort areas. He explained:

You’d also see as you’re driving along the main road that connected Cancun to everything else. They have these places where you stop along the road and one time we went through one where the guys are there with the assault weapons and all that and obviously looking for people doing stuff maybe they weren’t supposed to do in that part. So you can

imagine outside the touristy areas how heavily the police presence must be outside of the more touristy areas where they probably try to keep it down at the same time keeping everybody safe.

Based on his observations and exposure to media reports of drug violence in Mexico, Doug imagined the police presence must be very heavy in areas where “people [are] doing stuff maybe they [aren’t] supposed to do.” Furthermore, he was fearful of the Middle East because he knew that “Americans aren’t real popular there.” He was savvy and educated enough to understand why that might be the case, and did not support American government and military involvement in the region as will be discussed later. But he was convinced by media discourses that it was a hostile, conflict-ridden area. He, therefore, viewed Europe as a safer alternative destination and one that he could travel to on his own. It was more comfortable, familiar, relevant, and meaningful to him on a personal level “cause it’s where [he’s] from.”

Elizabeth, however, understood the role the media plays in shaping Americans’ views on world events and other countries. She blamed the American media, in part, for propagating notions of American exceptionalism or keeping the American people ignorant of global news:

We think it’s the United States, not even Canada, you know it’s the United States and Europe and that’s what happens. You know, the things in Latin America or Asia, or Africa, the things that are broadcast are earthquakes, natural disasters. National disasters...The day-to-day stuff is harder to uncover. Harder to find. What’s important in Kenya?...I think you have to be a little bit more persistent in digging to find that stuff, to be that globally aware from here. I found when I was living overseas I was exposed to more global content than I am living here.

Because of her exposure to foreign media while living overseas, Elizabeth could compare the limits of American media which mainly report about disasters in the global South thereby shaping public perception that those countries are routinely plagued with problems. In fact, studies show that the feeling of “disaster fatigue” among Americans engendered by such media

reports, and defined as, “the sense that these events are never-ending, uncontrollable, and overwhelming,” (Tolin, 2008) impacts Americans’ views and responses to those nations. Thus, Elizabeth’s observation that American media influences Americans’ perceptions of the global South seems astute.

Overall, the media can serve to propagate stereotypes about countries and cultures, reinforce colonialist or neoliberal attitudes, and/or frame the ways in which Americans understand and perceive other countries. The teachers in this study cited primarily American or British media sources for information which may impact the ways in which they view the world. However, as critical consumers of information, most teachers in this study did not limit their views about the world solely based on media reports. While some of their perceptions were shaped by the media, most teachers possessed complex understandings about the world and the role of the United States within it regardless of media influences. While some teachers, at times, reflected stereotypes or colonialist attitudes, they also challenged notions of American exceptionalism and possessed critical views of the role of the United States in the 21st century.

Challenging or Reinforcing Colonialism?: Teachers’ Perceptions of other Places

Sociologist Milton Bennett (1993) suggests that human beings are not intuitively culturally sensitive. Through his studies of how people respond to cultural difference, Bennett developed a six-stage developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. As people are exposed to different cultures, they advance along a continuum, beginning with early stages marked by ethnocentric views and advancing toward more ethnorelative ones. While I did not use the Bennett Scale to determine teachers’ stages of intercultural sensitivities in this study, I describe Bennett’s framework in order to illustrate that views on cultural difference, and by extension global perspectives, are learned, not intuitive. Thus, despite the views of many of the participants that

global awareness and cross-cultural sensitivity is critical for twenty-first century learning and education, most of the teachers, raised among circulating discourses of neoliberalism and essentialism, ultimately described other countries or cultures using such language. They have been socialized to colonial and neocolonial assumptions that are very difficult to recognize. Yet that is not to suggest that they possessed simplistic views of other cultures. Rather, I saw a complex and continuing evolution of cultural understandings on the part of the teachers as they described and made meaning of the world.

Some of the teachers, even those that traveled to other countries, employed stereotypical language or essentialized people they encountered in describing their perceptions of other places. Mike, in particular, often used stereotypical language in explaining his travels and ways he taught about different countries. These stereotypes were particularly evident when he described Ireland and Russia:

When I teach about Russia and Ireland you can teach about the alcoholism. You know, as I tell the kids, there were fourteen pubs in this little town [in Ireland]...and the other thing is their hatred of England. I say my cousins practice their drinking songs before they go out for the evening and they are all "Screw you, England!"...And how every meal had potatoes. Every meal. And you just get sick of it. So that was a good cultural thing.

Mike's perceptions of Ireland during the few weeks he visited relatives there were couched in stereotypes about the Irish (alcoholism, hatred of England, eating potatoes, and the notion that "the Irish people are *so* nice"). He then reinforced these stereotypes in his lesson on Irish culture with his students, which thereby were, in the words of Said (1993), "recurringly replicated in the education of generation after generation." That is, as teachers reinforce such stereotypes in their classrooms, students internalize such views themselves and continue to propagate stereotypes in the future as they become teachers or parents.

Mike likewise unintentionally reinforced stereotypes about Russians when he used

articles in class that highlight Russia and alcohol. He recalled, “I found an interesting article on Russia on how they’re trying to make beer an alcoholic, officially an alcoholic beverage and having kids read, just reading the story, about how kids are drinking beer on the way to school.” He also seemed to hold a strong perception that the Russian mafia was a prevalent and dominant part of Russian culture. He recounted a time in Prague when he was touring Europe. “We dealt with some Russian people in Prague. We kind of hung out with them. My buddies were like, ‘Why are these people here?’ And we thought they were Russian mafia so we fled the country.” In fact, in his teaching Mike often used a YouTube documentary video that discussed the history of the Russian mafia:

Like when we did modern Russia, my big hook there was the mafia. And tying the Russian mafia and how nasty they are...On YouTube there’s a good [video] on the Russian mafia and it gets into the whole history of it and how Stalin led out all of these prisoners, promised them freedom if they’d fight with them during World War II...It’s a little vulgar, but they have this one prison guard talking about how they came back and when they got back - I don’t know what the Russian word is - but it is “bitches” so they call it the Bitch War and the guy keeps saying “The Bitch War” and the kids are like “Bitch War?” ...And how they came back and there’s all these riots in the prisons and how they were killing all of them and they were eating them. Cannibalism. And the [students] were all like, “Yeah!”...It got them into it... It’s stupid but you know what? They didn’t forget it...So, yeah, The Bitch War and those things are good.

Although Mike visited relatives in Ireland for a few weeks, he never visited Russia. He assumed that the Russians he encountered briefly in Prague were mafia and this caused him and his friends to “flee” the country. Mike viewed the use of exotica and/or stereotypes as “a good thing” for students to remember cultural aspects of different countries. He did not realize that, as Merryfield (2004) cautions, “This approach not only teaches students that other cultures are only of interest because they are ‘weird or exotic, but it also does little to help them understand the majority of the world's peoples (p. 270).”

In other lessons with his students, Mike’s perceptions and observations of people from

other countries were explained as simply “cultural.” For example, he recounted a time when he went to see the Olympic games in Atlanta. At one point, he went to see the Cuban baseball team and then to a soccer game:

It was interesting because of the security around the Cuban dugout. And I use that with my teaching with the kids because in the preliminary rounds their star pitcher took off to center field, jumped over the fence and ran away. And you should have seen the security around it. It was just amazing. And then I went to the gold medal soccer game and it was Nigeria and Argentina. And they had, you know I got there a couple of hours earlier and there was [sic] these African guys with drums. You couldn't even get into the game. You know it was 80,000 to 90,000 people there and they were outside dancing and singing the whole time. They're nuts! But it's just cultural. These kids don't understand how important, when you teach, you understand why soccer's so popular? Because its, you don't need anything. Poor people can play it and most of the rest of the world is poor.

In this anecdote, Mike emphasized the Cuban player who tried to defect and the security around the Cuban dugout. In doing so, he reinforced notions of American exceptionalism with his students by insinuating that the United States was somehow “better” and that was why the player wanted to defect. He assumed the security in the Cuban dugout was a way to keep players from defecting, rather than as a basic security measure at a major international event, particularly after the act of domestic terrorism that occurred during the 1996 Atlanta Olympics.

Furthermore, Mike's reaction to “African guys with drums” (note, he did not say “Nigerian”) as “nuts” because of their enthusiasm for their team demonstrated, again, Mike's essentialism of culture (“That's just cultural.”) In his view, perhaps derived from colonialist attitudes, American fans would not be as demonstrative in their actions at a soccer game. He reiterated this point in another anecdote when he discussed the incident at a Colombian soccer game in which a Colombian player was murdered because of making a goal against his own team by mistake. He related, “Did you hear how this soccer match where they chopped this guy's head off?...They're nuts! Especially being a soccer coach I'm like, they are insane down there.”

Likewise, Mike's somewhat simplistic explanation of soccer's popularity around the world (because "poor people can play it and most of the rest of the world is poor") illustrated his subjection to neoimperialist and colonial discourses that assume simplistic truths about "the Other" as poor, undeveloped, and therefore undesirable. Or alternatively, in this view, because the United States is not poor, soccer is not as popular here.

In describing the prevalence of soccer around the world, Mike illustrated what Nyambe and Shipena (1998) refer to as the "modernization paradigm," in which the world is oriented around a North/South divide, with the global North characterized by development, industrialization, advancement and superiority over the underdeveloped global South. Cheryl, also, exemplified this paradigm in her descriptions of Africa and Haiti. When asked where she would like to travel to, she answered, "I'd like to appreciate what we have here so I think Africa and picking certain African nations to visit." When prompted for more explanation of what she meant when she said "to appreciate what we have here," she continued:

Just what we take for granted. Clean water and not having to walk miles to get that...and just to have a better appreciation and understanding for the daily work and effort that it entails for them just to survive on a day-by-day basis. I think we as a culture get very impatient if a flight gets delayed whereas in Africa there's not that impatience. I feel that from even just the students from there that I've met there's just an appreciation that I think is lacking in our country.

Part of Cheryl's perceptions of Africa, which she generalized about despite it being a large and diverse continent, stemmed from a number of sources. She mentioned "the students from there that [she's] met" as one source of her understandings. However, she had also been involved with the Heifer Club, an organization that raises money to give farm animals to communities around the world. While she had never visited any countries in Africa, she assumed people there are deprived of basic necessities. Cheryl constructed her generalization of Africans and, "the daily

work and effort that it entails for them just to survive on a day by day basis,” through the lens of Hall’s (1992) notion of “the West and the Rest,” in which “the Rest” embodies an oversimplification of entire regions that are assumed to be bad, undesirable, undeveloped, or rural (Hall, 1992; Loomba, 2005; Hickling-Hudson, 2004).

Similarly, Cheryl employed an element of post-colonial Social Darwinism as she described the experiences of students from her school who traveled to Haiti for humanitarian reasons:

The students come back and oftentimes I’ll have some of those students in my class and they can share what they learned and what they saw and how difficult it was for Haiti. To be there and to see these children, they’re so impoverished and how just giving them a little headband or barrette just made a little girl’s day. Simple things like that. And how satisfying it was for the kids to go and help them, whether it’s to get fresh water into their village or fundraising there.

Furthermore, in one of my observations of Cheryl’s classes, she discussed an extra-credit opportunity for her students in which they brought in items to donate to children in the Dominican Republic. As she discussed this opportunity, she pointed to a student-generated poster on the wall of “brown-skinned” Dominican children with the words, “Help us, por favor!” and, “We need donations!” She listed items students might choose to donate, such as little erasers in ice cream shapes. One of the students called out, “What if they think they’re food?” in reference to the erasers. To this, Cheryl laughed loudly rather than interrogating that student’s rather ethnocentric question. Furthermore, the poster assumed a desperation on the part of children in the Dominican Republic, in need of American donations rather than reforms within the Dominican Republic to overcome economic challenges.

Cheryl’s eliciting of donations and her description of American high school students going to Haiti for humanitarian purposes with her response of “how satisfying it was for the kids to go and help them,” aptly reflects the notion of “voluntourism” as described by journalist Rafia

Zakaria (2014). Voluntourism, Zakaria notes, “is feeding the white-savior industrial complex...As admirably altruistic as it sounds, the problem with voluntourism is its singular focus on the volunteer's quest for experience, as opposed to the recipient community's actual needs.” Zakaria continues:

Typically other people's problems seem simpler, uncomplicated and easier to solve than those of one's own society. In this context, the decontextualized hunger and homelessness in Haiti, Cambodia or Vietnam is an easy moral choice. Unlike the problems of other societies, the failing inner-city schools in Chicago or the haplessness of those living on the fringes in Detroit is connected to larger political narratives. In simple terms, the lack of knowledge of other cultures makes them easier to help.” These relatively affluent high school students can therefore, “do a little good, experience something that their affluent lives do not offer, and ... have a story to tell that places them in the ranks of the kindhearted and worldly wise.

Or, I would add, reinforce simplistic and colonialist stereotypes about certain cultures and societies around the world.

Cheryl made additional assumptions when she described why American students should understand human rights and economic decisions. She framed the question, “How someone who is getting their working papers and going out and making a minimum wage, how does that compare to someone perhaps in Cambodia who is working in a rice field and maybe not getting as much education.” It is unclear if Cheryl investigated with her students the deep-seated cultural, political, and economic effects of imperialism that led to the pervasive inequalities she referred to, or the current blight of urban and rural poverty and socioeconomic inequalities within our own country. But she made assumptions framed within the modernization paradigm that life in Cambodia was inherently pitiful as compared to life in the United States, and that students should know about poverty and hardship in other parts of the world in order to “appreciate what we have here” rather than to investigate from where these inequalities originate, to challenge assumptions of deprivation, and/or to take action to rectify such perceived issues.

And yet Mike realized that some cultural stereotypes and assumptions need to be challenged. He recalled a lesson about China when he had a Vietnamese student observer from a local college in the room:

When I was teaching about China in the past I did a day of Mao, a day of Deng. I mean that's boring. So today we just did China. "What do you know about China?" And a kid screams out (laughing) - I was happy this happened this way, but my Vietnamese guy is in the back. [The student] goes, "They all look alike!" I go, "Okay, that's a good starting point. That's what I'm looking for. That's ignorant. But you haven't been out of here before." And we had a good talk about it like that. And I had [the Vietnamese student observer] explain things about his culture...who is married to a Chinese woman. So he was actually able to bring out some cultural things there. So that makes it real. And I think that's what you gotta do. And I think I want to do more of these things. Let's learn the cultural thing then lets add the historical.

From this anecdote, Mike demonstrated an awareness that students resort to stereotypical language out of ignorance and insularity. He used students' comments as a springboard for a discussion of culture, utilizing the perspective and experience of his Vietnamese student observer as a resource. Once cultural stereotypes were addressed and dismantled, Mike felt, historical context can be added. Thus, although Mike propagated stereotypes at times by exposing students to narratives that highlighted difference and exotica, he also understood that students need to learn to recognize the complexities and roots of culture and to resist stereotyping while developing open-mindedness (Case, 1993).

Thus, the teachers in this study possessed a variety of perceptions about other countries and regions of the world. Teachers who traveled more extensively exhibited more complex perceptions of other countries. Other teachers' language indicated that many of their perceptions are shaped by media influences and prevailing discourses of colonialism/neocolonialism, the North/South divide, and/or American exceptionalism. Interestingly, however, when asked to reflect upon the term "American exceptionalism," most teachers challenged the phrase, indicating that it was a problematic construct laden with hypocrisy and warranting caution.

Challenging Notions of American Exceptionalism

The idea of American exceptionalism, first coined in 1835 by Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America* and popularized during the Cold War, posits the United States as unique and qualitatively different from other nations (DeTocqueville, 2003). This ideology, assumed to be uniquely American, is based on values such as liberty, egalitarianism, individualism, republicanism, democracy, and laissez-faire capitalism and embodies a sense of superiority and righteousness often used to justify American government actions (Lipset, 1996). Critics of American exceptionalism point to the facts that the United States has not, indeed, broken from European history and that its own issues of domestic inequalities, interventionism, and anti-democratic realities expose the hypocrisies of exceptionalist thought (Noble, 2002). But because global history teachers present information about other countries and global issues to their students, I wondered to what extent these teachers reinforced or resisted ideas of American exceptionalism on a personal level. Thus, I asked them the question, “What does the term ‘American exceptionalism’ mean to you?” Overall, I found that most participants in this study expressed ambivalence, if not outright criticism of the term American exceptionalism. Rather, they expressed a somewhat postnationalist view of the role of the United States in the twenty-first century. By “postnationalist,” I mean that they critically reflected upon their particular national identity in favor of universal values (Habermas, 1994) and recognized the negative implications of exceptionalist thought. However, their language revealed a disconnect between their criticism of the term American exceptionalism and their use of exceptionalist discourse in describing the role of the United States in the 21st century.

With a few exceptions, teachers in this study challenged ideas of American exceptionalism through a complex and critical understanding of American and global history. Of all the

participants, Elizabeth used the most vehement language against the idea, taking issue with American self-righteousness and morality:

I don't agree with [the idea] at all. I think that's a lot of arrogance. I think it screams, you know what makes me think of sometimes? Imperialism. It makes me think of that White Man's Burden type... I cringe when I hear things like that...I don't agree that America is exceptional. I think we do our best. I think we've had a long and serious controversial history. I don't know if we should be pointing fingers at anybody in the international community. And all we have to do is look at our own domestic history and see that there are skeletons in our closet...I don't think America is the only country with any morals or high standards in how to treat people.

In fact, Elizabeth invoked ideas of imperialism and Social Darwinist attitudes that the term implies. Part of her opinion derived from having lived overseas for many years and understanding other countries' responses to American government actions.

Other teachers recognized some positive aspects of American exceptionalism in theory, but took issue with the sociopolitical consequences of actions taken by the United States government because of it. Selina, for example, had also been exposed to foreign views of America from living overseas in Pakistan that contributed to her ambivalent opinion of American exceptionalism. While she believed that "America is exceptional" and that she "ultimately agree[d] with the statement," she referred to American values as being exceptional because, "the values upon which it was founded are global values and people are still, despite all the conflict, trying to incorporate those values within their own countries." These values are, she explained:

Equality. The Founding Fathers values. The Bill of Rights. The idea that all people are equal. The striving for that belief. And the belief that diversity is good...It's become a necessary part of us and we've accepted that as a value and all of those things are critical to living well and living in peace with each other.

Selina illustrated a postnationalist sentiment in that traditional American democratic values, such as social equality, human rights, and diversity, have become universal, global, and "necessary" values that enable people to "live well" and "in peace with each other." Thus, in this way, Selina

supported the idea of American exceptionalism.

Yet Selina also conceded how ideas of American exceptionalism can be dangerous. She noted, “I think what becomes dangerous is when Americans think of themselves as exceptional and then are no longer open to the world and no longer open to their own flaws.” Two other teachers challenged the idea of American exceptionalism by pointing out its hypocrisy. Charlie, for example, viewed exceptionalist ideas as problematic for the United States itself. He stated, “The problem with American exceptionalism is that it frames the discourse to be about America’s great qualities and turns away from a lot of the misery and suffering the United States has caused in the world.” Kelly expressed similar sentiments about American hypocrisy as she discussed her views on American exceptionalism:

The reason sometimes other countries get mad at us, as in the U.S., is because when we go in there what are we saying when we say ‘You should be democratic’ or ‘You should be this.’ What are we saying about what they’ve got going on? If you’re living in your house with your parents and I come in and say, ‘Your parents should be like these parents. Here’s the model parents,’ you would be offended at that...

Kelly took exception with the term as a whole because she felt “like it goes with the idea that we’re the hegemon, which we technically are” but that hegemonic status was being challenged. She situated the notion of American exceptionalism within a larger conversation about the role of the United States in a postnational world:

But we’re losing it and we don’t even realize it and we still carry this thing like, chest pumping, we’re American kind of thing. When we don’t even realize where we stand in the world and what’s going on in the world. Like I think the average American doesn’t realize that all these other countries are jockeying and that we’re just sitting here thinking we’re the strongest because that’s what we were fed constantly. USA. USA. And I’m not saying we’re not strong. I just think that we’re a little naive in that way. So when I hear American exceptionalism I feel like it’s naivete and lack of education and understanding. How close we are to, if we have already and don’t even know it, lost our top spot.

Likewise, Charlie, whose dissertation focused on how cultural forces influenced the way

textbooks are written, cautioned against the knee-jerk patriotism that American exceptionalism often invokes. He explained, “The idea [of my dissertation] was to see within our own telling of history the inconsistencies and the problems and the narratives that kind of get distorted and twisted to fit within a larger narrative of the United States as this kind of benevolent country.” Yet, like Selina, he retained some faith in the term “American exceptionalism”, although he “struggle[d] with that a little bit.” He expressed his ambivalence by saying:

The idea of American exceptionalism is that we are this city on a hill, this beacon of light. But I think that there are exceptional aspects of American culture, political rights and such. But I think there’s also some really - focusing on that you are also turning away from serious issues: racism, inequalities, corporate hegemony and power and influence. You also have to look away from both the positive and the negative things the United States has done in the world, whether it be to support terrorism, unequal policies, set up sweatshops that bring more money to owners and corporations here...So I think American exceptionalism is an interesting concept but I think if you were to teach from that framework, you are not preparing students for a global world. You’re preparing them for this sort of blind patriotism that is going to mislead them about the world as it really is.

Charlie conceptualized the world in a postnationalist way in that ideas of American exceptionalism are “not preparing students for a global world.” The world “as it really is” is one in which “corporate hegemony and power and influence” hold powerful sway over national policies. To Charlie, corporate power and hegemony, and the “sweatshops that bring more money to owners and corporations here,” amounted to the new imperialism in a neocolonial world in which laissez-faire capitalism is the new global power in pursuit of an economic empire. And the idea of American exceptionalism supports such a view by masking the negative aspects of neoliberal policies via the “blind patriotism” it promotes.

Of all of the teachers, Mike expressed the most faith in the term “American exceptionalism” but it was a lukewarm endorsement, at best. He said:

I think Americans are very confident in themselves in a lot of ways. And obviously historically we’ve been pretty successful. [But] I think a lot of Americans have got to

wake up and see that a lot of people have caught up to us in a lot of facets...I think America's great in a lot of ways but there's a lot of things we have to get back to the basics that will make us the great country that we have been. I don't think we're awful, but...

His statements reflect some American exceptionalism, itself, when he mentioned that Americans have "obviously...been pretty successful" historically and that the United States was once a "great country." Mike did not challenge this notion with critical discussions of American history and feared that other countries "have caught up with us in a lot of facets," suggesting that the United States, in his view, is in a dominant and superior position globally.

Given the idea of American exceptionalism, therefore, teachers in this study exhibited ambivalent if not hostile views of the term and its implications. While some teachers conceded that a few aspects of American ideals are historically exceptional, such as the emphasis on individual rights, freedoms, and representative democracy, they took issue with the sense of superiority and righteousness into which the term evolved. As critical educators, therefore, these teachers rejected simplistic notions of American exceptionalism and questioned the role of the United States in the world. But their verbal criticism of the term American exceptionalism does not mean that they did not buy into the idea. In fact, most of the teachers in the study perceived the United States at a critical point, using exceptionalist discourse as they described the role of the United States as the twenty-first century unfolds.

The Role of the United States in the Twenty-First Century

In his book, *The Post-American World*, Fareed Zakaria (2012) forecasts the "rise of the Rest" as a key challenge to America's global power. He argues that America's political decline, stemming from its past role as dominating hegemon, is posed against the rise of emerging nations, such as China and India, as they assert their economic growth with strong nationalism and self-determination. If the United States wants to continue to be relevant in the twenty-first

century, Zakaria argues, it must adopt a more pragmatic, honest global strategy that will share power, build legitimacy, and create coalitions.

Zakaria's views are reflected in the responses of teachers in this study who were asked, "How do you see the role of the United States in the twenty-first century?" I asked this question because I wanted to explore how teachers framed the position of the United States in the world as a way to understand their global awareness. Based upon their responses, most teachers identified "the rise of the Rest" as a major challenge to American hegemony. As Doug observed:

The East is making a huge comeback. The Chinese are...the second largest single country economy after the U.S. They've got 1.4 billion people. If anybody thinks we can outcompete them, they're nuts!...They are going to dominate the world and if we want to continue to be at least co-dominant, we better sharpen our game up.

To Doug and others, the United States faces competition from emerging nations, particularly China and India, which threatens its global dominance and position. They saw the need for the United States to "sharpen our game up" if it hopes to maintain some global power.

Selina and Elizabeth spoke about the perspectives people in other countries hold about the United States in the twenty-first century based upon their experiences living abroad. Selina, for example, explained the point of view many Pakistanis hold of America:

Most people like the values. They also see America as a bully in many ways. And so they like the values but don't like the government actions. They think America's hands are in too many places...They think America is hypocritical because of it. And it is! It is! So we say one thing and then we do another...America's gonna serve its own national interests before Pakistan's national interests. But these ideas, those values are so well promoted that...America's being held on this pedestal and of course it's gonna fall.

The "values" of which she spoke are the ideas of equality, justice, and freedom which Pakistani people feel are used to negatively justify American intervention and meddling in terms of foreign policy. According to Selina's views of Pakistani opinion, unless the United States truly lives up

to those values and halts its intrusion into other countries' affairs, its tenuous place as the global hegemon will topple.

Elizabeth recounted a similar view of the United States from the perspective of some people in Russia she met during a recent visit. She noted:

You know [Russians] like Americans but they don't like our policies. They don't mind having us there as visitors but they don't care who the president is and they don't care for our foreign policy...[They worry] they are becoming more like Americans. And they didn't like that. Not in a good way.

Here, Elizabeth referenced the impact of globalization and/or cultural imperialism, in which American products, companies, and, by extension, values influence other cultures. Elizabeth understood that, at least from the perspective of the Russians she spoke with, American hegemony remains prevalent yet deeply disliked.

Other teachers also identified American foreign policy as the cause of America's weakening status. Perhaps because of media influence and discourses of interventionism, in Doug's words, "I listen to NPR and you hear about stuff going on," some teachers in this study felt that the United States has become too involved in other countries' affairs. Doug stated,

You try not to be an American-basher, but just this whole idea that we have to go out and save the world from itself. I tend to think that the world needs to start saving itself. People used to think it was great that America was going to save them. Now they don't want America to save them. So I don't know...We've got to stop this where we have to fix everybody's problems 'cause we have to focus on our own...Sometimes you've got to let some people solve their own problems....Until we get past [our problems] we're not gonna get our house in order enough to help anyone else get their house in order."

Interestingly, he expressed some concern at being perceived as an "American-basher" by expressing a critical viewpoint of American foreign policy. His subjection to ideals of American exceptionalism made him recognize that his opinion might be regarded as anti-patriotic in some way. But he also acknowledged that the United States faces internal issues and challenges that need to be addressed before it can "help anyone else get their house in order."

Other teachers shared the view that the United States must deal with internal challenges that contribute to its weakening global position. For example, Cheryl thought, “if we don’t change our education and our awareness of acceptance...and in our spending and our budget that we could end up being maybe the second or third strongest economy instead of the first.” She perceived the American educational system in jeopardy and a contributing factor to the demise American hegemony. Similarly, Mike referenced studies that suggest the United States scores well below other countries on educational measures, but criticized those measures and did not think the United States was “as far behind as the studies [suggest].”

Kelly expressed a similar sentiment when she said, “Are we supposed to be the savior of the [world]? That’s the other thing that I hear my students get frustrated with is why are we going to all these places? How can we possibly save everybody?” And Cheryl invoked history and waxed prophetic when she discussed the role of United States’ interventionism:

We could fall like Rome if we have more conflicts in other regions of the world and are trying to put out fires everywhere else that may damage us as a world leader. But maybe it will humble us and maybe learn from that, just like Europe and China had to. But we’re still a young nation in comparison with China and India whose histories go so far back...And they’ve had their rises and falls and their golden ages...

She wondered whether or not the United States would see a “positive or negative” change, but she felt, “like we are on the cusp of some kind of change.”

These three teachers did not necessarily support a return to American isolationism, however. Doug recognized that the United States still benefits from global trade and involvement:

My answer to the whole thing in the Middle East is, I don’t care what kind of government you have, just sell us oil cheap. Do whatever you want, but sell us oil cheap. We need to get back to the economic viewpoint. We’ll trade with you people, the George Washington idea. Trade with them, but don’t get involved in their affairs. Not totally isolationist cause I think we need to be out there in the world. If not, we can’t make it on our own. Everything is intertwined. But we’ve got to get away from this idea that the

U.S. army can fix everything in the world.

Here, Doug's expressed a *realpolitik* version of the role of the United States in the world. He recognized the need for the United States "to be out there in the world" because "we can't make it on our own," yet viewed economics as the most practical purpose for United States' involvement overseas, particularly in the Middle East. He questioned the role of the United States military in being able to direct policy in the region and, in fact, urged the government to disengage from the political arena simply for the benefit of cheap oil.

Perhaps Doug's view originated from how the Vietnam Conflict affected his own family. Doug's brothers came of age during the Vietnam era and he noted that his family had strong opinions about the role of the United States in that conflict. He recalled,

[My brothers] were all in the draft pool. My brother graduated '73... I think, if I remember correctly the draft ended in '74. So they were in there...But none of them got called but they were all sweating it out...We used to have knockdown drag out fights about politics, usually in agreement with each other over the dinner table. We talked about current events. My older brothers were all... in college lying [sic] down a bit and the protests.

Furthermore, Doug worried about his son who wanted to deploy overseas as part of his National Guard unit, likely going to Afghanistan or being stationed in conflict zones in the Middle East. For Doug, therefore, American interventionist policies directly affected his family throughout the generations. He personally experienced fear and concern in relation to the United States' role in international conflicts, which likely impacted his opinions about the role of the United States going into the twenty-first century.

Kelly also recognized the complexity of American foreign policy going into the twenty-first century. She noted that "we have to be more global and get along" and challenged neocolonial aspects such as cultural imperialism: "You go in with your background and say

‘Why don’t you dress like us and be like us?’ and all that. And I don’t know that that’s necessarily - should we be seen like that?’ Yet as her students questioned United States’ involvement in foreign countries (“How can we possibly save everybody?”), she observed, “Then the rub is you have a student that might be from that [conflict] area who’s saying, ‘Why isn’t anybody helping us?’ So those are hard questions.” Thus, Kelly remained unsure about the role of the United States going forward.

Based upon these responses, teachers in this study exhibited contradictory views of American exceptionalism and the role of the United States in the twenty-first century. They employed postcolonial language when challenging the idea of American exceptionalism, pointing to its hypocrisies, dangers, and failures, but simultaneously worried about the United States losing its hegemonic global position faced with competition from emerging Asian superpowers and an overextended foreign policy. In other words, they resisted the idea of the United States as inherently “better” than other countries, yet wanted the United States to maintain its hegemonic position.

Summary

The contents of this chapter stem from thinking about my own global awareness - its roots, its formation, and its limitations. How did these teachers’ upbringings impact the development of their cultural identities, sensitivities, and global awareness? What were the experiences that shaped their global awareness? Furthermore, what effects did colonialism, imperialism, and/or American exceptionalism have on the ways in which these teachers understood the world and the global history content they taught? Thus, in this chapter I discussed how the teachers in this study addressed such issues. In short, what developed these teachers’ global awareness and how did the teachers understand the world and the United States within it?

Based upon Merryfield's (2000) study which addressed diversity in teacher background as an element in fostering cross-cultural awareness and global mindedness, I explored the ways teachers spoke about diversity in their upbringing. Specifically, most of these teachers came from communities with little racial/ethnic diversity. In those cases, some teachers framed diversity along religious or socioeconomic lines. Teachers who described their upbringing in racially or ethnically diverse communities felt that they benefitted from such communities and that this experience contributed to their cross-cultural sensitivity and "tolerance." In the case of Selina, in particular, her identification as a person of color and her dual-nationality directly impacted her identity as a "citizen of the world" with the ability to "see many cultures." But most of the teachers in this study framed diversity around whiteness using language that often "othered" people of color and/or transnationals. They normalized Whiteness and sometimes used color-blind discourse in describing their views on race and ethnicity, believing "color-blindness" to be a positive trait, not realizing the problematic nature of such language. For many of the teachers, going to college was described as an "eye-opening" experience in their background that contributed to their perceived cross-cultural awareness and understanding. But while these experiences in college exposed them to more people of color or to people from different backgrounds than their own, their language suggests that they continue to "other" people different from themselves, particularly as some of them described their travel experiences.

Teachers in this study also described their own global awareness. Their responses ranged along a continuum from "growing" to "very aware" and acknowledged that global awareness plays a fundamental role in their professional responsibility as global history teachers. But for most of these teachers, being "globally aware" merely means having a knowledge of global

issues and a basic understanding of world events. Those who felt their global awareness was evolving displayed a more complex understanding of global awareness, realizing that global awareness entails more than basic knowledge and extends to other elements such as foreign language acquisition, cross-cultural sensitivity, and mutual respect for other cultures.

Nevertheless, most teachers felt they gained global awareness in formal ways such as through coursework or research. Yet they also noted that informal life experiences likewise contributed to their global awareness. They spoke about personal connections, work experiences, and age and maturity as factors that enabled them to develop global awareness over time.

Additionally, most teachers cited travel as an important experience through which they feel that they developed global awareness. Those teachers who had not traveled abroad extensively mentioned that travel remains an important goal for them in the future. For the teachers who had visited other countries, in analyzing their travel experiences, I identified the “tourists” versus the “travelers” based upon their descriptions of their visits. The “tourists,” such as Mike and Doug, used ethnocentric and exceptionalist language when describing their travel experiences, suggesting that they harbor such views when considering other countries. They tended to essentialize other cultures based on stereotypes or experiences that reflected their preconceived notions of those countries and peoples. Conversely, the “travelers,” like Selina and Elizabeth, gained deeper insights into culture, exploring the origins and seeking understanding of cultural practices to the extent that their experiences abroad fundamentally transformed them as individuals. Nevertheless, merely being a “tourist” did not preclude participants from arriving at some complex understandings and curiosity about other cultures, as the words of Charlie and Doug demonstrated.

In addition to exploring these teachers’ development of their global awareness, this

chapter discussed their understandings of the world. As media wield tremendous influence on how individuals construct perceptions about the world, I examined how teachers discussed media and their perceptions of other places. Their responses revealed that some teachers challenge stereotypes and colonialist conceptualizations of other countries, but others reinforced stereotypes by consulting and/or using media that portrayed conventional or exotic cultural representations. In fact, almost all of these teachers relied on American or Eurocentric (particularly British) media for information about the world thereby privileging Western views of global events and issues.

Despite their varying perceptions of other countries, these teachers' words largely challenged the idea of American exceptionalism, taking issue with its understood suggestion of sociopolitical superiority and legitimacy. Furthermore, they questioned the role of the United States as the twenty-first century unfolds, with many of them cautioning against American military involvement overseas and urging a critical re-evaluation of American foreign policy. At the same time, however, they employed exceptionalist language in describing the United States in a dominant position that was being challenged by "the Rest." Their language suggested that they assumed the United States to be dominant and other nations subordinate in relation to political and economic global positioning. In other words, while their words problematized the idea of American exceptionalism, their views reflected a fundamental belief in the United States as *the* dominant world power.

This critical analysis, therefore, suggests that some of these global history teachers possessed a degree of colonialist attitudes in relation to the rest of the world and/or normalized their own Whiteness, which may have inhibited their ability to understand substantive cross-cultural sensitivity, a key element of global awareness. Others, however, exhibited more

complex understandings about culture, diversity, foreign countries, and the United States and its place within the world. Yet how did these participants translate their global understandings and awareness into their teaching practice? Such is the focus of the next chapter in this dissertation.

Chapter 5: **“The rest of the world matters:” Implementing Global Perspectives in Teaching**

I approached this study with my own background in global perspectives in education having done extensive research, reading, and analysis of such elements, yet realize most in-service teachers across the United States lack formal preparation or professional development in this area. From my own experiences as a classroom teacher and professional educator, I know that educational discourses constantly circulate within institutions. In my district, teachers routinely wrestle with understanding the latest initiatives, such as Project Based Learning (PBL), Differentiated Instruction (DI), and Inquiry-Based Learning, all in an attempt to meet the standards set by the Common Core. Global education, part of the Twenty-First Century Skills Initiative as discussed previously, is one such term that often circulates within those discourses. But teachers may demonstrate varying degrees of fluency with the term itself, particularly if they lack any formal preparation in the area. Therefore, I wanted to know how the global history teachers in this study understood and made sense of the term “global education.”

In addition to understanding teachers’ definitions of the term, I wanted to explore how these teachers thought about the purposes of global education. That is, did they feel that global education was important in making American students more competitive in the era of globalization? Did they view global education as necessary to make the world a better place overall? Did they think global education *was* important at all, or merely another initiative lacking substance? Central to these questions are teachers’ perceptions of global education and its place within global history and schooling in general.

Similarly, I wondered what skills and opportunities these teachers believed globally aware students should have. Global education scholars identify skills necessary for global awareness,

such as possessing an understanding of global interconnectedness, having an appreciation of diverse cultures, thinking critically about global issues, and having the ability and opportunity to communicate and interact in cross-cultural contexts, among others. Teachers' responses included some of these competencies, but not all. In addition, these teachers identified other competencies, such as digital literacy skills, not included in discussions of global competency skills by global education scholars.

Once teachers spoke about the meaning of global education, its purposes, and skills/opportunities, they addressed how they incorporate elements of global education in their teaching. They described elements of global interconnectedness, teaching for prejudice reduction and attention to global inequalities, perspectives consciousness, and cross-cultural competence in their pedagogical practices. Interestingly, teachers spoke most about cross-cultural competence, suggesting they view this particular element as paramount in their teaching of global history for reasons that will be discussed in the chapter.

In addition to exploring the elements of global education these teachers infused into their teaching, I investigated the challenges they perceived in infusing global elements into their teaching. Teachers largely spoke about challenges such as the Regents exam and a perceived lack of time that they felt hindered the inclusion of substantive global education elements into their teaching. These challenges, to some extent, impacted their pedagogical practices.

Therefore, in exploring teachers' understandings of global education as an educational framework, discussing its purposes and goals, and investigating the ways in which these teachers incorporate elements of global education in the content they teach, I hope to enlighten their teaching practice itself in the context of global education. Thus, this chapter investigates how teachers define global education, explain its purposes, and employ global perspectives in their

pedagogical practices.

The Meaning of “Global Education”: Just a Buzzword?

As mentioned previously, none of the teachers in this study had taken coursework or professional development in global education per se. Yet their understandings of the term suggest that global education elements circulate within existing educational discourses. Teachers identified ideas such as cross-cultural awareness, global interconnectedness, and knowledge of world history and global issues within their definitions of global education.

In addition to their understanding of the term “global education,” teachers in this study discussed their views on the purposes of global education, from the individual, local micro-level to the larger, global macro-level. Moreover, teachers elaborated by sharing their ideas about the skills and opportunities they think globally aware students should have. As such, their understandings of global education, its purposes, and implementation may enlighten their classroom practices when teaching global history and geography to their students.

Definitions of “Global Education”

Global education practitioners and leaders often maintain that one of the major problems plaguing the global education movement are the nebulous, vague, and/or ambivalent definitions of what the term “global education” means (Case, 1993; Gaudelli, 2003). Over time, scholars such as Merry Merryfield (2003) and others have developed certain elements of global perspectives in education, as discussed previously. But it is clear from my interviews that these eight teachers, while they were familiar with the term, had varying ideas of what “global education” means. Some teachers talked about specific elements of global education as defined by Merryfield (2003) such as global interconnectedness and cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity. Others defined the term broadly by equating global education with general global

awareness.

Included in teachers' definitions of the term "global education" were elements of global interconnectedness and taking action. When asked how he defined the term "global education," Mike emphasized the idea of interconnectedness by saying, "We are all interdependent. I think that should be part of global education." And Cheryl, who also taught Advanced Placement World History, defined "global education" as "[having] an awareness of the world around you and how your actions and even your country's actions have on the global scene...how events in one region are like a ripple effect for the rest of the world and vice-versa." Here the idea of interconnectedness revolves around the notion that actions in one place can impact the world.

Within the element of global interconnectedness, many of the teachers in this study believed a major element of global education was increasing the awareness of students to a world beyond their local communities. Charlie referenced the impact of global systems and interconnectedness by saying, "I think [global education] is getting kids out of their comfort zone where they are and opening them up to different experiences, different ways of life but also global institutions and forces that may influence their life." Andrea reiterated the idea of global education as something that makes students "cognizant of the world outside of this microcosm which is the Westside." Doug also hoped that global education means that "[students] will go out and actually do something more than just stay in their neighborhood and work in the service industry." Selina likewise mentioned this point by saying, "I kind of equate it with whole education. That [students] have experiences outside of their own world in as many experiences as they can have that will give them a real sense of the world they live in. Much, much bigger sense than you know their own little teeny world that they're in." Thus, some of the teachers defined "global education" as a general awareness of the world beyond one's own community.

The words and phrases teachers used to describe global education, such as “experiences outside of their own world,” “real sense of the world they live in,” “go out and actually do something more,” and “getting kids out of their comfort zone” suggest that they viewed their students’ lives and experiences as insular and limiting. In this context, therefore, these teachers defined global education as having students explore beyond their known worlds. Yet teachers may not be implying that global education necessitates foreign travel or exploration. Rather, they defined global education as anything that broadens students’ cultural awareness and personal experience, such as merely meeting people from different backgrounds within students’ own communities or being more active within their local environment.

In addition to framing “global education” as global awareness beyond one’s local community, many of the teachers also mentioned the importance of cross-cultural sensitivity when defining the term. Doug stated:

We have an international university here in town and you’re gonna be exposed to these other cultures. And you can either be an ignorant person who is prejudiced about them or if you have a little bit of knowledge about them, maybe you can understand where they’re coming from...You gotta be sensitive to other people and what they think.

Moreover, Mike and Kelly spoke of sensitivity and tolerance in their definitions of the term.

Mike thought it means “not being racist” because “these kids say ignorant things all the time.”

When asked the question, “What does global education mean to you?” Kelly immediately responded, “Tolerance and understanding of the other cultures.” Likewise, Selina stated, “Have an understanding of how many different cultures there are out there and there’s validity in every one of them. And that’s a big, big expectation of [students].” She referred to the difficulties of helping students become culturally aware while also dismantling hegemonic cultural views. She noted that it is a “big, big expectation” for students to develop cultural sensitivity and understanding of different cultures given perhaps their age and limited experiences. But, more

importantly, Selina wanted them to recognize the “validity” in all cultures beyond that of the United States in order to challenge ethnocentric views and respect cultural diversity in the world. Thus, taken together, most of the teachers understood and referenced some of the key elements of global perspectives in education, such as interconnectedness and cultural sensitivity and awareness, even if they were unsure what those elements are. Perhaps, therefore, elements of global perspectives and global education have become integral parts of education discourse as Twenty-First Century Skills initiatives, globalization, and/or technology and social media circulate ideas of global-mindedness.

Only Elizabeth questioned the meaning of the term as far as its value and place in education. She termed it as a “buzzword” and a “trend” with no clear definition, one of the many current educational initiatives that lack substance:

Does it mean you have to be fluent in another language before you leave high school? Does it mean that you do an internship in Mexico? Does it mean that you have to read ten books of nonfiction, one from each country before you leave here? I wonder what that means. To be more globally aware, does it mean that you want a souped up current events class to be aware of what is going on in India? I don't know what they...It'll be interesting to see if it catches on, if it catches fire, if it has a place in high school. I don't know.

However, despite her dubious view of global education initiatives, Elizabeth referenced global education beyond basic global awareness and/or cultural sensitivity. She wondered, “what exactly do you want to focus on in this world of global education? Should students be aware of just facts or should they be aware of the socioeconomic struggles of each country as well? I don't know.” She tapped into ideas of social justice and questioning the hows and whys of global inequalities rather than “just facts.” In fact, Elizabeth demonstrated the most thorough understanding of key elements of global education, as an interdisciplinary, project-based, socially aware educational perspective. Yet while she understood the need for education to

challenge the status quo, she remained doubtful that education initiatives will do that and was very critical of current education reforms, including the “trend” toward global education.

The teachers in this study, therefore, understood and articulated some key elements of global perspectives in education even without formal training in such initiatives, suggesting that global education circulates within existing educational discourses. They recognized cross-cultural awareness, interconnectedness, and global mindedness as important factors for becoming globally aware, elements they also incorporated into their views on the purposes of global education.

The Purpose of Global Education: Cooperation or Competition?

In keeping with their definitions of the term “global education,” the teachers in this study explained what they thought the purpose of global education should be. Like their definitions of the term, teachers’ stated purposes of global education aligned with many elements of global perspectives. Yet responses divided between macro elements, that is, the more ideological purposes of global education that might enrich a larger global community and/or humanity, and micro elements, those that reflect American self-interest or that serve individual needs (Mangram & Watson, 2011). Within the microelements identified by these teachers, I differentiate between practical and philosophical purposes. Yet most of the teachers identified both macro and micro elements in describing the purpose of global education.

Many teachers identified the purpose of global education at the micro-philosophical level as something important for individual enrichment and development. As Charlie aptly explained:

I think it makes you a better person in the sense that you understand what other people experience but also understanding of yourself better....It allows you to look at your own life examined and think there are so many different ways I can live and be and connect and you can enrich your experience.

In this statement, Charlie considered the importance of understanding others’ perspectives and

experiences as a counterpoint to developing one's own sense of self. People broaden their views, expand their choices, and enrich their own lives by becoming more globally aware.

Other teachers also saw the importance of global education for making people better individuals. Cheryl aimed for her students to “leave [high school] more mature, open minded individuals than when they came in” from taking her global history class. Selina likewise stated that “global studies is great because it opens [students'] eyes to a lot of different things they just don't have an awareness of.” And Doug hoped that more global awareness will “spark an interest in some of these other cultures...Hopefully you can encourage some kind of interest in them that maybe if they go to college they'll want to do a semester abroad.” Thus, these teachers spoke about global education as important at the micro-philosophical level for personal enrichment and individual development.

Teachers in this study also perceived global education as serving a very practical purpose at the micro-practical level. More than one teacher mentioned the importance of students being more globally aware simply to function in the world today. For example, as Charlie stated,

I tell my students, when you get older you're gonna meet more Muslims and you're gonna meet more Jews and you're gonna meet people who aren't like you. And you really need to understand who they are and where they're coming from...My hope is as they get older, they'll want to travel. They'll want to meet more people. They'll be more likely to find that interesting and fascinating...[and] have a more sophisticated, genuine understanding and appreciation for the diversity and difference.

Here, Charlie emphasized that the purpose of global education is to understand people different from oneself and, more importantly, instill a sense of curiosity and wonderment about the world. He hoped students will want to travel and meet more people because of a fascination with the people of the world, going beyond mere tolerance to true “understanding and appreciation for the diversity and difference.”

Other teachers expressed a similar sentiment that global education should prepare

students who will be exposed to people different from themselves and, therefore, should understand them. For example, Doug said, “You’re gonna be exposed to these other cultures...maybe you can understand where they’re coming from...Or at least when you go out in the world you won’t have total culture shock ‘cause [the students] will have learned a little bit about where these people are coming from.” Kelly expressed the need to understand different cultures because, “we have to live and work together. And so we better understand why they’re doing what they’re doing.” And Cheryl noted the practical aspect of global awareness for students’ success in the increasingly globalized business world: “It might be more advantageous for students going out in the world today...I think to have any type of success as far as business and interactions with the community, I think it’s important to see the bigger picture.” In other words, students themselves gain important practical skills for interactions in an increasingly globalized world through global education.

Yet as these quotes demonstrate, most of the teachers in this study positioned diversity as “out there,” assuming a homogeneous, white, middle class, English speaking student as the norm. Thus at the micro level, global education is important for the development of the white mainstream student. According to these teachers, global education serves important purposes (“We have to live and work together.”), creates competitive advantages for Americans (“It might be more advantageous for students going out in the world today”), or enriches individuals’ development (to “have a more sophisticated, genuine understanding...of diversity”) all of which privileges and benefits primarily white mainstream students at the micro, individual level in some way both practical and philosophical.

But just as these teachers cited the importance of global education at the micro level, they also engaged its meaning at more macro levels, analyzing its ideological and beneficial aspects

with its views toward creating a better world. Charlie, who recognized the importance global awareness has on the individual, also observed its benefits to the global community at the macro level:

I think to some degree it's also a social justice issue to intervene and speak on behalf of those who have less, whether it be power, money, influence, things like that. So I think it's both. It's a better way of living but it's also - the world's full of inequalities and injustice and we can do more to help each other out and empower ourselves and empower each other.

Charlie saw the purpose of global education to be aware of social justice issues globally and to take action to correct injustices. Doug also emphasized the importance of global action and understanding global injustice: "I'm always trying to change [students'] paradigm or their thing that everything revolves around the U.S. Getting them to think globally. You can act locally, but you gotta think globally. What are the problems and how are you gonna fix them." Thus, their macro views of global education aptly reflected many of the key elements of global perspectives as identified by Merryfield, particularly the need for acting in socially conscious ways and challenging notions of global power and hegemonic structures that create global inequalities.

Similarly, Cheryl constructed her views on the purpose of global education as a means toward peace in very macro-related terms: "I think that the more knowledge they have of global issues maybe perhaps the less conflicts there will be down the road in general. Because the world is getting smaller even though the population is increasing..." Cheryl believed that "justice and human rights and economic decisions are important for [students] to understand." She emphasized the need for students to be aware of global economic forces that shape inequalities around the world, and that their individual actions, such as purchasing clothing made in sweatshops overseas, have global ramifications. Furthermore, she wondered, if students

learned more about people from other countries and different cultures, “would there be less hate in the world?” Cheryl saw the purpose of global education as critical to making the world a more just and peaceful one.

In addition to framing the purposes of global education at the macro level in terms of social justice, some teachers felt the purpose of global education is to challenge intolerance. Bryan and Vavrus (2005) define intolerance as the denigration of difference according to identity, values, lifestyles, racial-ethnic, religious, class, gender, sexuality and ability lines and is typically associated with assumptions about the superiority of one’s own social or cultural group. As an example, Doug related an anecdote when he overheard a right-wing Christian woman in a restaurant “spewing venom” about different religions, particularly to a Mormon boy who was nearby waiting for a table. Doug was angered by her impassioned, intolerant rhetoric and worried that others would believe what she was saying (“Who the heck are you listening to? This lady? Cause I’m a world history teacher and that’s not the case.”) In describing this event, he therefore concluded that, “part of [his] job to try to defuse some of [the intolerance] that is out there. This misinformation about other people. Religious toleration was practiced and it’s the lack of religious tolerance [that] is really more lately. It wasn’t what was going on in the past.” Thus, for Doug, an important purpose of global education is to decrease intolerance thereby decreasing conflicts and misunderstandings around the world, beginning with those of his students and community.

Kelly also hoped that global education would reduce conflict through tolerance and an understanding of others. She related a story about local conflicts and misunderstandings in the community in the weeks after 9-11:

I just [remember thinking] how much work there was to do to just get everyone to understand [Islam]. I remember during that time, they were burning down the Sikh

temple up in [a nearby town] and all the things that were happening from a total lack of understanding. So it's not that I'm trying to be the peacemaker in the world, but I see that as we become more global it's such a necessary thing to understand all these different cultures...and have that ability to know that we all have to. It's gonna become more and more global. It's not like you can sit here and hide...But I feel the urgency. And I feel the urgency especially with all these civil wars and everything. I don't know where we're headed, but I know that we better understand it and we better open our eyes.

Kelly's admonition that "we better understand" the world and its issues because of an "urgency" reveals, to a certain extent, her exposure to media rhetoric that emphasizes global crises and conflicts. Kelly's sense of "urgency" also illustrates her desire to take action, to educate and enlighten her students and her community in order to understand and study conflict, and not to merely "sit here and hide." She challenged the insularity of Americans who fail to engage global awareness and who resist tolerant attitudes toward different cultures, viewing the purpose of global education and awareness as an urgent necessity as the world becomes "more and more global" and events in other parts of the world affect people's lives in the United States.

Yet in the course of discussing the purpose of "tolerance" in global education, teachers in this study did not necessarily use the term "acceptance." Perhaps they equated tolerance with acceptance, not realizing the connotation that the term "tolerance" implies. Nieto (1994; 2002) and Vogt (1994) define the term tolerance as enduring or "putting up with" difference, not embracing it. Indeed, Nieto (1994) argues that tolerance is actually a low-level of multicultural understanding, reflecting an acceptance of the *status quo* but with small accommodations to difference (p. 9). Acceptance, however, implies that differences are acknowledged and their importance are not disparaged. Thus, perhaps these teachers meant to say that global education could reduce conflict and misunderstanding in the world if there was more *acceptance* of difference, not merely *tolerance* of it.

Therefore, when identifying what they felt the purposes of global education are, the

teachers in this study cited practical, philosophical, and moral reasons at both the micro and macro levels. None of the teachers saw global education as unnecessary. Rather, they described the many benefits of global education for individuals, the United States, and the world at large. Moreover, teachers described the skills, attributes, and opportunities students should have in order to develop global awareness, from basic reading, writing, and thinking skills, to broader attributes such as cross-cultural awareness and basic knowledge of global content and issues.

Skills and Opportunities of Globally Aware Students

Global education scholars identify certain competencies that globally conscious students and individuals should have. Some of these competencies include possessing an understanding of global interconnectedness and appreciation of diverse cultures, having the ability to communicate in cross-cultural contexts, thinking critically and analytically about global issues, and possessing a knowledge of global history, geography, and economics, among others (LeRoux, 2002; Merryfield, Jarchow, & Pickert, 1997; Kniep, 1986). Many of the elements of global mindedness are learned skills, reinforced by opportunities that allow teachers and students to practice those skills. I discuss the purposes of global education and skills teachers think are necessary to be globally aware in order to establish teachers' understandings and the impact their views have on their classroom practices.

The teachers in this study, when asked about what skills or opportunities students should have to be more globally aware, posed a variety of answers. Some of their responses focused on basic literacy and educational skills such as reading and writing. Others identified broader attributes such as "open-mindedness" and "knowledge." Some teachers noted the need for educational skills that would benefit their students as they study global issues and/or content, particularly the importance of critical analysis and digital skills. For example, Charlie described

how he does this in class with students: “Looking at a YouTube clip or a news presentation and be able to analyze it and say ‘who’s represented? Who’s *not* represented? What if this group were to speak on this issue? How would their perspective change?’” Charlie encouraged critical thinking with his students as they also learn perspectives consciousness. He understood the value of examining two sides of an issue or questioning the role of the media in presenting information.

Other teachers also identified digital competency as an important educational skill for students to become more globally aware. As Doug explained:

They need to know how to communicate with the technology way more than just updating your Facebook status or putting silly things on Twitter...They need to understand that Twitter and Facebook are driving the change in other parts of the world. Social media is being used for a lot more important stuff than sending out selfies and stuff like that. You try to expose them to that. I try to expose them a lot to technology.

Not only should students know how to use technology in ways beyond typical social media usage, Doug believed, students should also think critically about the importance of digital technology in the context of history and how its use “[drives] the change in other parts of the world” such as during the Green Revolution in Iran or the Arab Spring movements in Tunisia and Egypt.

Likewise, Cheryl saw digital skills as increasingly important for students to have as “the world is getting smaller” because they “can connect with people instantaneously and that’s going to be a lot of their different professions when they graduate from college.” Cheryl taught digital skills as she used technology to expose students to different perspectives and points of view. She said, “I use technology and debates and both sides pointing out both sides of an issue and different issues all over the world.” Thus, having the skills to be critical consumers of digital information on global events and issues remained very important to many of these teachers as it

relates to global education.

At the same time, some teachers in the study cited basic knowledge and understanding as important skills and/or attributes students should have to be globally aware. Cheryl thought students should “have the knowledge base to have some familiarity with issues that are going on...today.” Likewise, Elizabeth wanted students to “know a lot more about geography...They have no idea where things are.” Cheryl and Elizabeth’s observations are supported by research that demonstrates American students possess limited geographic and global understandings (National Geographic-Roper, 2006; World Savvy, 2012).

In addition to basic content knowledge, two teachers strongly urged that students have opportunities to interact in diverse environments thereby hopefully gaining an understanding of different cultures for students’ own development and for practical concerns. Mike said, “I think kids need to be exposed to more diversity. Exposed to other cultures. I’ve really found that having all the Muslim kids around our culture, around the kids have made my kids understand more.” According to Mike, having the opportunity for intercultural experiences and dialogue is important for students’ development of global awareness. Yet his language suggested a disconnect in his thinking about cross-cultural experiences. For example, as this quote demonstrates, Mike excluded the “Muslim kids” from the class as a whole, noting that the presence of the “Muslim kids” in the class “have made [his] kids” more globally aware. He privileged the white, middle class, Christian students by valuing the importance of their global awareness by implying that only they were “[his] kids” and the Muslim students were not. Mike’s views on the benefits of Muslim students in his classes, and their impact on his classroom practices, will be discussed later.

Kelly reiterated the growing diversity of school demographics as a reason for developing

tolerance and understanding:

Being open minded and being able to even desire to learn about the other cultures and being more open to it. I think especially coming from when I grew up to when they are growing up. The odds of me running into somebody from a different country like I said, one student from abroad. Other than that, no one. And now it's an everyday occurrence. And most of these students that come in don't even speak the language. So we're just becoming more and more global. So I think they need the skills to, even if they don't understand, be tolerant of it and be ready to understand and learn.

But exposure to different cultural groups is not enough to establish tolerance, let alone acceptance of difference. From this quote, Kelly seemed to acknowledge that tolerance and sensitivity may be the best educators can hope for to establish readiness to learn about cultural difference. As she said, "even if they don't understand, be tolerant of it and be ready to understand and learn." She saw the development of tolerance as the skill students need to begin with in order to become globally aware rather than acceptance, although she probably hoped for the latter.

Furthermore, Kelly mentioned that students were coming into the school who "don't even speak the language," but she did not identify learning a foreign language as an essential skill for global competence. Perhaps, in this situation, Kelly defaulted to an ethnocentric view in which immigrant/refugee students are expected to learn English, but learning another language for native-born American students seems unnecessary. Certainly, transnational ELL students should learn English to function better in school and society, but the reciprocal view remains much less supported, illustrating that postnationalist sentiments about language reciprocity remain largely unrealized.

Cheryl, however, is only one of two participants who noted that learning another language is an important skill students should have, particularly of certain languages:

I think taking a foreign language. I wish Mandarin was offered here in our school and

it's not. I feel that if [students] are going to be out in the business world that [they] will have to know how to communicate in another language besides English. I think understanding of culture is really important so that they do not offend others. So they have a better understanding and awareness as to why that would impact the decision that other businesses make.

Yet, again, Cheryl noted the acquisition of learning Mandarin as a practical skill given, as she said, the "rise of China" in the world, and that Americans would perform better in the business world of the twenty-first century if they had knowledge of a language besides English and cultural competencies to understand business decisions.

In fact, Cheryl's views aptly reflected Kelly's real experiences in learning about Arab business culture while she worked in cigarette marketing. As Kelly related previously, understanding cultural practices of bartering made her a more savvy businessperson in her dealings with Arab shop owners. Although she did not learn Arabic, she regularly utilized the skills of cross-cultural communication and competence out of practical necessity in the business world. Thus, Kelly understood firsthand why such skills are important in a globalized economy.

Lastly, Selina took a more holistic approach in thinking about the skills that students should have to be more globally aware. She viewed the whole experience of the student in her response. Selina believed that schools might provide a range of opportunities and experiences to help their students become more globally aware, such as taking field trips or making the content more global in its scope:

I don't know that the public education system would be able to fulfill that, but you know, things like field trips. Things like being able to go abroad. Things like having a conversation with someone else from the other side of the world. Having musical experiences from the other side of the world. What is the music education about? Is it about just understanding how to play the piano or are they exploring piano playing or whatever, sitar playing, or whatever globally? That kind of thing. Just to be able to encourage that kind of exploration of self and the world.

Here, Selina illustrated her own understanding of global education as an interdisciplinary

dimension of education that caters to the whole child, allowing them to learn skills in cross-cultural communication, having experiences visiting foreign countries, and gaining an appreciation of global cultures.

As teachers in this study discussed the skills and opportunities they felt globally aware students should have, many focused on basic skills such as writing, critical thinking, and digital skills. Others believed that exposure to diversity and learning another language prepare students for a more globally diverse world. However, only Selina spoke at length about educating the whole child in a global way, with cross-cultural opportunities, travel abroad, and global interdisciplinary learning opportunities as part of the globally minded educational experience. Perhaps, therefore, these teachers understood the basic framework of global education, but still needed to think more broadly about education as a whole in terms of preparing globally minded students. Indeed, Bryan and Vavrus (2005) argue that educational institutions, while having great potential in fostering skills necessary for global awareness, can also be instrumental in reinforcing cultural and political stereotypes, prejudices, and valuation of the United States as global hegemon. Thus, the discipline of social studies alone cannot construct all of the skills and opportunities necessary for global awareness. Nevertheless, these global history teachers did engage in some elements of global education as their discipline allows. In the next section, I describe the elements of global education, as per Merryfield and Wilson (2005), that teachers in this study exhibited in their classroom practices.

Teaching With Global Perspectives

As human beings, teachers bring with them their own biases, prejudices, and points of view into their classrooms. In terms of global education, as I have discussed, teachers harbor their own views of the world, its peoples, and its history. While some teachers exhibited more global

awareness than others, in varying degrees, the teachers in this study incorporated elements of global perspectives in teaching global history. Specifically, they demonstrated some inclusion of local/global connections, prejudice reduction, perspectives consciousness, and cross-cultural awareness in their teaching. Not all of the teachers utilized all of these elements, yet collectively they illustrated some global perspectives in the teaching of global history and, therefore, I include only those elements that teachers described in their teaching. Furthermore, some teachers cited additional global competencies, such as digital literacy, as something they used in their teaching that are not included in Merryfield and Wilson's (2005) list of global elements. But in this section, I incorporate the descriptions of each global element as per Merryfield and Wilson (2005) in order to add clarity to the definition and understanding of the elements that the teachers spoke about.

Local/Global Connections

“Students come to understand their own connections to the larger world. They learn how the actions and beliefs of people around the planet have an economic, political, technological, and cultural influence on American students, their communities, and their nation, who in turn have an influence on the rest of the world.” - Merryfield and Wilson (2005)

Because many of these teachers possessed a critical understanding of global history, they framed much of their teaching using global perspectives that encouraged students to adopt a broad view of history. Merryfield and Wilson (2005) suggest that, in order for students to understand local/global connections, teachers should, “organize their teaching of history, economics, geography, world cultures, and politics so that students learn how people and ideas across the planet interact with and affect each other” (p. 18). That is, topics should not be taught discretely, but rather as interconnected systems across time that impact one another.

In the course of the interviews, most teachers mentioned the need for students to understand the interconnectedness of the world and they make a point of teaching a variety of

lessons that do this. For example, Charlie aptly stated the idea of local/global connections when he said, “The idea of neoconservatism, conservatism is a worldwide thing. We look at international markets. We look at, even the United Nations, to get kids to see the bigger world but also to see how our choices here influence other people’s lives or vice versa. Other people’s choices influence our lives.” Many of these teachers’ lessons, therefore, employed global perspectives in teaching about local/global connections in relevant, meaningful ways that related to students’ own experiences.

In their separate interviews, three teachers described using a lesson in which students learn about globalization and interconnectedness through an examination of clothing and other items. Doug described, “I’ve done the thing with them where I go, ‘OK, let’s start looking at labels on your clothes, your jackets, and stuff like that. Where is all of this stuff from? We don’t make anything here anymore, really’ ...It’s all integrated and it just more and more integrated every single day.” Mike introduced a lesson on globalization and China by having students “get up and run around the room and find as many things as [they] can made in China” thereby sparking discussion and debate about why many items are produced in China, and economic changes over time that affect where and how goods are produced. Cheryl took the lesson further to address issues of global human rights and economic inequalities. She stated:

I think justice and human rights and economic decisions are important for them to understand...One of the things I have them do is find five articles of their clothing and - you know they’re all into brand names and how expensive those are and where they are made in sweatshops. And to have that awareness economically.

Here, Cheryl connected globalization with social justice issues, allowing students to see how their economic decisions affect people in other parts of the world, drawing attention to sweatshop labor. In this way, Cheryl and others attempted to achieve their goals of teaching global interconnectedness by relating content directly to students’ own experiences.

In addition to teaching local/global connections with lessons on globalization in the garment industry, teachers emphasized these connections when teaching about the Columbian Exchange. Doug, in particular, discussed how he approached the topic. “When you do the Columbian Exchange,” he said, “and talking about what did you have to eat and where did it come from. And you...have [students] do a chart. Old World/New World. And it’s amazing how many of them have no clue where stuff comes from and how interrelated the world is.” In this example, therefore, Doug illustrated the relevance and timelessness of global interconnectedness in the context of the past and present in order to educate and enlighten his students.

Similarly, Andrea made local/global and interdisciplinary connections with her students in discussing climate change. She incorporated environmental science in her lessons on geography:

[Students] have to have an eye on what’s going on around them. It’s not just here. It’s not just in [this city]. Like last year it was unfortunate but you could talk about storms around the world and how environmentally things are changing. ‘Well, Mrs. This is global studies. This isn’t science.’ Yeah, but this is a global issue, folks. This is an issue that’s going to impact us historically for years to come. This is going to change history. And why is it going to change history? Because there are all these other issues.

Framing climate change as a global issue that will have an impact on history, Andrea began a larger discussion that had implications for students’ whole education. She allowed them to link history with science, science with sociology and “other issues,” and their local community with the larger world, aptly applying global perspectives in her teaching.

Thus, from this discussion, global history teachers in this study used local/global connections as one element of global perspectives in their teaching. They encouraged students to see beyond their own communities, present global issues that have relevance for their students’

lives, and help students make local/global connections in teaching topics in global history. Furthermore, some found ways to incorporate discussions of social justice in teaching about the interconnectedness of the world, thereby integrating another element of global education into their teaching.

Prejudice Reduction and Attention to Inequalities

“In their teaching of history, teachers help students see connections between prejudice and inequities across time and space.”- Merryfield and Wilson (2005)

The New York State Standards and Scope and Sequence for the Global History and Geography Course taught in grades nine and ten address the teaching of global inequalities in a number of ways. Global inequalities, for example, are addressed in units such as the French Revolution, nineteenth century imperialism, the Industrial Revolution, rise of global communism, and globalization in the late twentieth century, to name a few. Teachers, therefore, have an obligation to teach about these topics and to allow students opportunities to explore points in history when prejudice and/or socioeconomic structures have resulted in inequitable treatment for certain groups.

Of all of the teachers in this study, Charlie spoke most at length about how he teaches about prejudice and inequalities. In the course of our interviews, it became clear to me that Charlie thought about these issues beyond what is externally required by state mandates. In fact, he seemed reflective and deliberate in discussing how he thinks about inequality and how his views impact his teaching. I elaborate on Charlie’s views of social justice because he spoke most at length about his lived experiences that developed his views and engaged ideas of social justice at a sophisticated level, both personally and professionally. “You know, as you get older you realize that the world is a place of inequalities,” Charlie stated. As a college student, Charlie majored in social studies education but, “it was actually anthropology and sociology,” he said, “I

kind of see things a little bit through those social lenses rather than a historical lens...with a critical perspective.” Charlie, who has his doctorate, earned his degree at a university where there was, in his words, “a critical oriented program” that encouraged its students “to think:”

It wasn't just about social justice but everything... and they were very clear about that. In this program we want people who are going to graduate here and go out in the world and make a difference. Make schools better places. Make schools caring places, thoughtful places. Places where people from different perspectives are welcome. And not just welcomed, but embraced as a valuable asset to a school or a classroom.

Thus, Charlie had been formally trained with content knowledge, pedagogical approaches, and a critical lens that influenced the way he taught global history.

Yet even before his formal college studies, Charlie began to consider how prejudice and discrimination affected some people more than others. He recalled a time growing up when his high school’s policy negatively affected one of his friends, who was African-American:

I saw my friends who were African-American, you know, they didn’t always make what they wanted. They didn’t create opportunities for themselves, or the world didn’t allow those opportunities as they wanted. I had a friend I remember in high school and he was an African-American student and he went to [the suburban high school] his whole life and in his senior year his father was sick and they ended up moving to the city. And probably two months before he graduated, the district moved him out after he had been there for his whole life! And they basically said, you know, you don’t live here anymore and so you can’t graduate. He had to start a new school two months before he graduated. And that kind of opened my eyes. Like, gosh! What a terrible thing to do to somebody. And I realize, you know there was a question. A lot of people talked about it. You know, if he was white, would it have been different? If he was a perfect student, would it have been different?...So as you get older you see a pattern. Like maybe things aren’t quite just or aren’t quite fair or maybe preferential treatment towards some and not others.

Charlie’s witnessing of the discrimination faced by his friend during high school instilled in him an awareness of social injustice that he infused into his teaching. He also credited his interest in social issues having been deeply affected by reading *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* in high school:

I read that book as a high school junior and it just opened my eyes to a whole other world. And I just wanted to learn more about the different experience. A different experience in the United States. And I knew friends – again I had friends who seemed to struggle in ways I didn't have to and that kind of opened my eyes. So I think that's why I was always interested in those issues.

Thus, Charlie's awareness and curiosity about how prejudice affects certain groups and results in inequality began earlier in his life, well before he began his teaching career as discussed in the previous chapter.

Now, as a teacher, he approached topics in global history with a critical lens and a mission to enable his students to become more globally aware in this way, as well. For example, Charlie described ways in which his students “look at the human experience...At justice, injustice, inequality, fairness.” He used a variety of examples to illustrate his point:

For example, we look at Hammurabi's Code...Can we find injustices in this law? And then we go...to the Magna Carta as we work our way through different laws - the Justinian Code, the Twelve Tables. Can we find examples of injustices toward groups, examples of class dynamics? Can we see examples of issues towards women and unfairness towards women? And as we go through the course, I try to get [students] to understand that laws are human products and although they evolve as we do, our morals and values evolve also, that tell us a lot about how people lived.

Charlie helped students make connections with history, allowing them to explore past inequalities and injustices and to trace the evolution of justice over time in a variety of settings.

In addition to addressing issues of prejudice and inequalities in the classroom, Charlie was also an advisor for his high school's Builders Club, which encouraged students to “experience different things, but also to understand that the world runs by people connecting with one another, reaching out,” he described. “And that's why they call it Builders Club because it builds relationships across the school and the community.” One of the activities the Builders Club engaged in was serving lunch at a local community center that serviced homeless families.

Charlie noted that this experience could be transformative for the students:

What I always find fascinating is I watch my students look across as they're serving lunch to a kid that's their age that looks just like them but might be homeless or might have a child that's two or three years old already. And it's this really interesting dynamic because they look at each other. And they're looking at our students...Probably here's a kid in school and he's got a pretty simple life and here's a kid - the kids are looking, our kids - saying, 'That's me, but with a very complex and difficult life.' So we are always trying to get them to see other people's experiences and lives as much as we can with what we have.

Unlike other experiences, such as the earlier example of "voluntourism" as described by Cheryl, Charlie made a point of using these experiences to have larger discussions about prejudice and social inequalities with his students:

I think it makes you a better person in the sense that you understand what other people experience but also understanding yourself better...But I also think it's a social justice issue to intervene and speak on behalf of those who have less, whether it be power, money, influence, things like that. So I think it's both. It's a better way of living but it's also, the world's full of inequalities and injustice and we can do more to help each other out and empower ourselves and empower each other.

Charlie saw the benefits the students themselves gained from taking part in experiences that fostered awareness, as Cheryl similarly noted in recounting her students' experiences in Haiti. But Charlie understood that these experiences should have more meaning beyond the "voluntourism" element. He encouraged students to ask important questions about where prejudice and inequality originates and to take action against injustice, discrimination, and the powers that create them.

While Charlie spoke most at length about social justice in his teaching, other teachers discussed it as well. Even Cheryl, who spoke about students' returning to the United States with a "better appreciation of what we have here" after their trip to Haiti, valued the importance of "making a difference in the world community." She discussed her involvement in Heifer International, a group that elicits monetary donations in order to purchase animals for people and

communities around the world. Cheryl, who worked with the group in years past, encouraged her students to participate in fundraising for Heifer International by offering them extra credit for the course. As she described,

[Students] would go and fundraise to make money for an ark, for example, that's five thousand dollars...An ark is a variety of animals that are provided to communities in Africa to help them. They can use the milk from the goats and pass that along when they have offspring. So that's constant giving back. It's just a small change but then at least it lets the students see that it can make a difference.

Apart from the fact that Cheryl generalized the idea that the African continent, not specific places, is in need of "help," she supported the philosophy that underlies Heifer International. Her students learned that their actions can "make a difference" by doing something that help communities help themselves, now and in the future.

Kelly also exhibited a desire to teach her students about global inequities in the hope that they take action. She addressed the issue of inequalities in school funding and the conversations about education that currently circulate. As she explained to her students,

The reason why our school is the way it is, is we have people in [suburban communities] that are paying...The bulk of the taxes come from that...Then I said [the city] doesn't have that. But businesses get tax write-offs to bring business in. So they're not paying taxes, a lot of them. The people aren't paying taxes. They're lower level that are living in subsidized housing. So who's paying taxes? No one. And no one wants to help them, so you have all of the students that are going there and probably need more of the amenities we have - the computers and everything - and don't have it...And we're pointing fingers at them and saying, 'You're doing a poor job.'...And these people who have [money] are pointing fingers because it makes them feel better that they don't have any responsibility towards these people.

In this lesson, Kelly explained how school funding works so that students could understand the disparities in school performance that they see and hear as part of the current educational discourse. Kelly realized the complex reasons for school inequalities and how easy it was, she believed, to "point fingers" at underfunded urban schools when there was "no responsibility for

these people.” But she conceded that students struggle with this topic because of their adolescence. As she stated, “It’s hard to get kids to think out of their world because you know it’s all about them. As it should be. I mean it’s just the way it is.” Yet despite the challenges of getting adolescents to think beyond their immediate concerns, Kelly believed it was important for them to explore the larger ideas of social inequalities nevertheless.

Thus, a few of the teachers in this study recognized the importance of addressing issues of global and local inequalities, both past and present. Furthermore, they encouraged students to take action in the form of extracurricular activities such as the Builders Club or through international non-profits, like Heifer International. By examining this global element, students hopefully realize that inequalities exist everywhere, even within their own communities. Furthermore, by learning about past inequalities, students understand the genesis of discriminatory practices and reasons behind social and economic inequalities. In addition, the global history teachers in this study also encouraged their students to recognize and examine the voices of people different from themselves in order to develop a wider gaze with which to study the past and present.

Perspectives Consciousness

“Students develop skills in perspective consciousness. That is the ability to recognize how people different from oneself construct events and issues through their own histories, cultural lenses, knowledge bases, and experiences.” - Merryfield and Wilson (2005)

An important aspect of teaching perspectives consciousness as part of a global perspective is to allow students to study issues, topics, and events from different points of view, using a variety of sources originating from culturally diverse people and countries outside of the United States. Sources such as primary accounts, literature, and media written or produced by people in different countries enrich students’ understandings of how the same event can be viewed and/or

experienced differently by different people. Traditionally, the study of history has been taught through a monocultural lens that paints a skewed picture of events, disregarding or diminishing the voice and points of view of the subaltern (Banks, 2007; Delpit, 2006; Hickling-Hudson, 2003). Thus, teaching about perspectives consciousness inhabits a critical place within the globally aware curriculum.

Prominently hanging in the front of Doug's classroom was a world map. Upon closer inspection, one realized the map hangs upside down, with Antarctica at the top and the North Pole at the bottom. Doug used this map as the basis for students to understand perspective. As he described, "[Students] will go, 'Wait a minute! That map's upside down.' And I go, 'Is it?' ...You get them going on a conversation about that...Who wrote the maps? The people in the northern hemisphere. All the textbook maps are from them so of course you're gonna put yourself on top here. You're not gonna put yourself on the bottom." Doug's map lesson presented an apt analogy about how history is written; the powerful put themselves at "the top," because they would never want to be "on the bottom." For many teachers in this study, therefore, creating opportunities for multiple perspectives and diverse points of view in their lessons remained a key element in their teaching, allowing students opportunities to hear the voices of those on "the bottom" and to consider the validity of their experiences.

Some of these teachers spoke about how they make sense of perspectives consciousness. To Andrea, perspectives consciousness meant, "just looking at American history from the other side of the Pond. Like, you're really looking at the same things, but you're looking at the catalysts from a different point of view." For example, Andrea recounted a conversation she once had with an exchange student from Germany who explained to her that in Germany, textbooks suggest that, "the United States should have minded their own business" during World

War II. She also remembered a student from India who discussed Gandhi's ambivalent legacy in Indian history. As the girl explained to Andrea, "He was a very good man but he was a little quirky and the entire nation didn't think he was like the Dalai Lama or anything....Not everybody agreed with what he did but they understood his plight." Thus, Andrea, herself, benefitted from hearing the perspectives of people from other countries to enrich her own understanding of content, although she did describe these stories as "skewed" ("You know the skewed stories that are told from nation to nation I think is very interesting.") Her use of the term "skewed" implies a judgement that one narrative is more truthful than another.

Like some of the other teachers, Charlie demonstrated an understanding of perspectives consciousness more consistent with Merryfield and Wilson's (2005) definition. In fact, Charlie's doctoral thesis explored ways in which cultural forces influence the way textbooks are written. In particular, he focused on the Vietnam War, examining five widely distributed world history textbooks by major publishers, representing about 80 percent of the market, and how they represent the Vietnam War in relation to perspective, chronology, and other elements.

Charlie's understanding of perspectives consciousness impacted his pedagogy. In teaching about the Vietnam War, Charlie drew upon some of his doctoral work and shared some of his conclusions with the class. He explained:

For example, the Mai Lai Massacre was told mostly from an American perspective or it was omitted altogether, but it was never humanized by allowing victims of the Mai Lai Massacre to speak for themselves or family members, while in other sources you would see that. So I looked at that as well as chronology. For example, the Gulf of Tonkin crisis. There's a whole series of kind of clandestine missions leading up to that event, American hostilities or aggressive actions. And none of those are included in any of the textbooks.

Charlie recognized the need for the voices of the victims to be heard to create perspectives consciousness. He used these examples with his students as he allowed them to engage in

discussions about perspective, source bias, and reliability of textbook information, helping students critically examine history and how it is written.

Similarly, Doug, who taught an elective on the Vietnam War, often used primary sources from the perspective of the Vietnamese to enrich and broaden students' understandings of the conflict. "I had a video series I show that has a lot of interviews with Vietnamese...It's got interviews with General Giap (Vo Nguyen Giap, a prominent general for the communist People's Army) in it and the premier, the guy who succeeded Ho Chi Minh. And a lot of soldiers from the era...So I try to get the multiple perspectives on it a lot." Hearing accounts from the perspectives of the Vietnamese encouraged students to challenge the American-centric narrative of the conflict thereby augmenting their often preconceived knowledge of the event.

To develop perspectives consciousness, teachers in the study often used primary sources that depicted different points of view of historical events. Charlie encouraged students to "wrestle with some of the difficult issues" in comparing Miguel Leon-Portilla's *Broken Spears*, the Aztec account of the conquest of Mexico with Spanish conquistador Hernando Cortez' account. "We look at the account of Cortez versus Portilla's account with these different codices and pictures and illustrations," he said, "and we really kind of become the historians and allow the [students] to tell me what they believe about the history." In doing so, Charlie not only explored multiple perspectives with his students, he engaged the students in active learning and historical investigation, practicing critical thinking skills and analysis through the use of varying primary accounts.

Doug also fostered perspectives consciousness using simulation activities that examined the conquest of Mexico through various viewpoints. Students were put into five groups - *conquistadores*, Aztecs, African slaves, Native American ancestors, and Spanish plantation

owner. As Doug explained:

Each group had to complete a series of exercises to answer questions. But they had to answer them from the perspective of the group that they were assigned to. And for some of them it was a little difficult. To try to divorce themselves and think in the mindset of how people might think about that. It was great. It was funny in one class. Two guys who were friends, the one guy was the conquistador and the other was an Aztec. And they're getting into it. 'But you guys showed up and made us all sick!' 'Hey, not my fault, you know?' (laughs).

In allowing students to perform a simulation activity that forces them to consider and defend another's viewpoint, including that of the subaltern, Doug tapped into students' higher order thinking skills, which at times they found challenging. Yet these types of activities enabled students to broaden their global awareness, acknowledge the validity of all points of view, and be active participants in gaining perspectives consciousness.

For other teachers, like Elizabeth and Cheryl, multiple perspectives were used often, particularly in studying specific historical events and how various groups in history may have different points of view. Elizabeth noted that she uses multiple perspectives "all the time...in regard to gender, social class, socioeconomic status. All of it." For instance, as in Doug's simulation activity, Elizabeth's students examined the Russian Revolution from the points of view of its various players:

We looked at the Russian Revolution. Who started the revolution. The ideas of peasants versus intelligentsia versus the gentry. All kinds of things like that. Women's perspectives versus men's perspectives. Peasants versus landowners. Middle class. We figured out that there wasn't much of a middle class in the Russian Revolution. That kind of struck them. And it should have.

Elizabeth's use of the first person plural "we" suggests her role as co-constructor of knowledge, acting as a guide, but allowing her students to find connections, interpretations, and meanings on their own. At the same time, she encouraged them to consider history in multiple ways, discovering the viewpoints of the range of players who were affected by the revolution.

Similarly, Cheryl explored multiple perspectives in history while teaching about Napoleon. Students in her class created report cards about Napoleon. “How would the Russians evaluate Napoleon?” she asked, “How would the French evaluate Napoleon? How would the British have evaluated him? How would the French women evaluate Napoleon, how they lost rights in the Revolution as opposed to men, how would they evaluate him?” And she noted gender differences in her students’ responses, with boys granting Napoleon higher scores on his law code than the girls, “because of [girls’] own perspective as being female and all that.”

Yet while Elizabeth and Cheryl’s lessons encouraged students to consider points of view in history, it might be interesting to explore how different countries today teach about these events. How might a Russian textbook treat the Russian Revolution as compared with an American textbook, for example? Could a male student articulate the perspective of a French woman during the Napoleonic era? Thus, based on their responses, while clearly Elizabeth and Cheryl understood the importance of teaching points of view in the context of history, their conception of perspectives consciousness could be developed more broadly.

Many of the teachers cited the curricular unit on nineteenth century European imperialism as the “obvious” topic in which to engage multiple perspectives. Cheryl described one of the sources she uses for this unit that “shows the British hanging the Indians who survived the [Sepoy] Mutiny and it’s the first time kids really see...the brutality of the British. And it wakes them up to see the Eurocentric point of view versus the native point of view.” Charlie’s students read passages from Chinua Achebe’s novel about colonialism’s impact on Nigeria, *Things Fall Apart* from the Nigerian perspective. Thus, a globally aware unit on imperialism is one that develops perspectives consciousness with students but also challenges and explores ideas of hegemony, power relations, and present-day ramifications of colonialism in keeping with the key

elements of a global perspective in education.

But not all of the teachers demonstrated a complex view of perspectives consciousness in the unit on nineteenth century European imperialism. Mike's words, in particular, reflect a Eurocentric view of imperialism in how he taught it. He explained, "You wanna do it (use multiple perspectives) with imperialism. I think that's an easy one. I mean you do it with, what are the foreigners getting out of it and what is being taken away from the natives? That's an easy example. I think we use that all the time." Here, he used language such as the word "native", not realizing the demeaning nature of the term and one that indicates inferiority. Furthermore, he oversimplified imperialism, reducing it to a good/bad binary and painting the "natives" as passive victims during this period in history. Thus, although some of the teachers *said* they taught about multiple perspectives, their other words indicated that they might not be doing so accurately.

Yet one of the challenges teachers mentioned when teaching about different perspectives relates to finding resources from other countries to use in the classroom. Developing perspectives consciousness requires the use of literature, media, and other resources from countries outside of the United States. Doug expressed his frustration in finding such resources. He said, "It's tough trying to find stuff that didn't have the American point of view in it...I use more online sources to find stuff where, if it's not from the country, at least it's less American, Eurocentric on stuff...Trying to bring in other perspectives. It's a lot harder to do." The perceived paucity of resources from other countries remained a major frustration for teachers who wished to develop true perspectives consciousness with their students. But given that these teachers privileged Western media sources, as discussed previously, it may be that they do not routinely go beyond such sources to find others that may reflect different global perspectives,

indicating a lack of global awareness on their own parts.

Only one teacher, Elizabeth, interrogated the perspectives inherent in the curriculum itself. Elizabeth recognized that, while she tried to “see what’s important in other countries,” she admitted that “it might just be from the perspective of what *we* think is important to other countries.” She made a valid point. After all, the New York state scope and sequence for global history and geography is written by American curriculum writers who become the gatekeepers of what is deemed most important for students in New York to learn about. In a sense, students are learning global history from the perspective of these curriculum writers, begging the questions, what is included and what is left out of the global history curriculum itself?

Collectively, therefore, teachers in this study stated that they recognized the importance of perspectives consciousness in teaching global history. They tried to incorporate a variety of perspectives and points of view when they taught certain topics, allowing students to see beyond a myopic view of history. However, it is unclear if they possessed a true understanding of perspectives consciousness. Furthermore, finding resources from sources outside of the United States and European perspectives remained a challenge for them, as did the curriculum itself, written by American authors who pick and choose the scope and sequence of the global history and geography course taught in New York State. Yet of all of the elements of global perspectives, teachers spoke at length about fostering cross-cultural competence with their students, particularly in relation to the multicultural diversity of their school districts and their classrooms.

Cross-Cultural Competence

“Students develop skills in communicating and interacting with people different from themselves. Through cross-cultural experiential learning, students learn skills and cultural knowledge that help them understand and collaborate with people from different cultures.” - Merryfield and Wilson (2005)

Of all of the elements of global perspectives, these teachers spoke most at length about cross-cultural awareness and competence. As mentioned previously, teachers' goals in teaching global history aimed to reduce prejudice, foster tolerance, and engage students in an awareness of the larger world. Therefore, teachers were eager to discuss how they foster cross-cultural awareness and competence in their classrooms. In examining how these teachers talked about fostering cross-cultural appreciation and competence, I explore three categories the teachers' talk revolved around regarding this topic - the cultural festival, immigrant and refugee students, and teaching about Islam.

The cultural festival: Promoting tourism, not competence. Some teachers spoke about their schools' cultural festivals as a way to promote cross-cultural understanding. In one area school district, the cultural festival entailed a gymnasium filled with tables, each labeled and decorated with the flag and name of the country, manned by a person dressed in traditional clothes who stands ready to answer questions about her culture. In the "Arts and Crafts" section, children diligently strung together beads to create a "traditional" Kenyan bracelet or color Chinese paper lanterns while fragrant smells of rice pilaf, baklava, meatballs, and pierogies, the foods of many cultures, filled the air. Irish step dancers (from the local dance school) took the stage in colorful costumes, their fake ringlets bouncing in time as they performed the Rosscommon Reel. Meanwhile, school administrators stood by, proud to showcase the diversity and multiculturalism of the district via this Festival of Nations, which featured prominently on the district's webpage during the week preceding the event.

If this type of event seems familiar, it remains a common practice in many school districts. In fact, three of the teachers in this study discussed their schools' attempts at cross-cultural learning via the ubiquitous "Cultural Festival." However, global education scholars warn against

the use of cultural festivals to promote cross-cultural competence. These displays of “surface culture” oftentimes merely reinforce simplistic stereotypes of cultures and do nothing to address the “internal” cultural understandings that create true cross-cultural competence. As Merryfield and Wilson (2005) explain:

Substantive culture learning includes knowledge of both internal and surface culture plus skills in intercultural competence...The attributes of surface culture (food, art, dress, music) have long been popular topics in regional geography or world cultures courses. But surface culture by itself is not only inadequate for understanding other cultures, it may actually constrain students’ ability to develop global understanding (p. 41).

Surface culture, such as that often on display at school cultural festivals, presents to students only a glimpse of cultural understanding. “Students often enjoy these topics as much as a tourist does,” Merryfield and Wilson write, “Laughing at some customs, surprised at how ‘strange’ others seem, enjoying the novelty of differences and recognizing some commonalities (p. 41).” Three of the teachers in this study discussed their districts’ cultural festival. While some of the teachers praised their school’s cultural festival, others recognized that these festivals fall short of true cross-cultural learning, yet viewed the event as something that was “better than nothing.”

Cheryl is one teacher in the study who hailed her school’s “Festival of Nations” as an event that was “very successful” and a “great display of our cultural diversity here.” She described the Festival of Nations as follows:

It’s really neat. We have poster boards and parents and cuisine and crafts that represent the cultures of our school district, for example Kenya. A former student and I attended that one and helped children learn how to play games, painting. Um, Ukraine, Bosnia, Macedonia, Greece, and Irish. We have Irish dances that come in. Martial arts and tons of different entertainment. It changes from year to year and it’s been very successful. It continues to grow...

She had been a part of the Festival of Nations since it began, about four years ago. Although it was developed by the foreign language department, “to enhance the cultures that are here in the district,” Cheryl’s Advanced Placement World History students contributed research for the

informational posters designed to “educate the community” about politics, society, and “economic factors” in each country represented. As Cheryl explained, “We tweak the boards from year to year, but the first year my students had the most hands-on involvement. And now they attend for extra credit and they help to give information about countries of their choice that they have a certain background with.” Cheryl seemed proud of her involvement in the Festival of Nations, noting, “It’s nice to be a part of it, to see everyone come out...and it’s a free event.”

Yet Kelly and Selina, whose districts also showcase cultural festivals, appeared more critical of such events. Kelly informed me that her school used to have a cultural festival at the end of the school year, but had not produced one for the past two years. “I tried to revive it,” Kelly explained, “But even with that I feel like I don’t want it to be a show and tell. I wanted it to be incorporated throughout....I feel like we are not recognizing the diversity the way that we could. I think there are other opportunities.” While Kelly did not dismiss the cultural festival idea entirely, she felt the need for more opportunities for the diversity in the district to be supported and, in her words, “to try to make them feel more included in ways that aren’t just a day to do your culture. I don’t think that’s necessarily a bad thing, but that’s not all it’s about either.” Kelly recognized the problematic nature of traditional cultural festivals that emphasize surface culture without a deeper understanding of how cultural diversity enriches a community and intrinsically contributes to its entirety.

Selina expressed a similar sentiment when she discussed her very diverse, urban school district’s cultural festival. She described the cultural festival as follows:

It’s put on by the ELL (English Language Learning) department. And they put it on once a year. The kids go to an assembly in the morning and they do various different activities. This year we had a fashion show and we had - we didn’t even have a speaker so it was just a fashion show and the principal speaking. Last year I believe they had a speaker come in. And then they have a parade of flags and then in the afternoon they had another assembly...and sell food, of course, from around the world. And they did tons of

performances, most of which were dances.

Like most cultural festivals, the one at Selina's school focused on surface culture such as food, dances, and a parade of flags, but had included some speakers in the past to enrich students' understandings of cultural aspects beyond surface culture. She also mentioned that the ELL students make presentations about their countries the day before the festival by visiting classrooms around the school, "and everybody dresses up as well that day." She, herself, enjoyed wearing traditional Pakistani clothes to school the day of the event to showcase part of her own heritage. And while Selina noted some positive aspects of the festival, namely that the "ELL kids love it because they are showing off their own cultures," she felt that more could be done to promote the exceptional diversity in her school:

I just think in terms of learning a lot more can be done. I had volunteered just to help out and had a couple of things I suggested, like do booths that had information...I also did a little passport thing for them where they had to have a passport and inside their visas were getting to know one other kid...that was from a different country and write about them and then do a virtual tour in the library of one other country, and then they could get a prize for that...But the ELL department fell flat on their face with that. They didn't really do prizes so the kids didn't buy into it.

By encouraging students to "visit" other countries and to meet and talk to students from different countries, Selina demonstrated her understanding that cultural learning needs to be more substantive, beyond the surface culture of food, clothes, and dances pervasive in such festivals. Her idea of using a passport and visa to document students' virtual travels cleverly taught students about international travel and laws. In addition, by guiding students to engage directly with a person from another country, students had an opportunity to develop cross-cultural competence, defined by Merryfield and Wilson (2005) as "develop[ing] skills in communicating and interacting with people different from themselves." Thus, while the pervasive cultural festival idea attempted to educate communities about the diversity in their districts, they often

fell short of true substantive cultural learning, focusing mainly on surface culture in a one or two day event.

Fostering cross-cultural awareness in the classroom: Transnational students.

“I enjoy asking for their opinion and their knowledge when we come to certain topics...if they feel comfortable enough to share that. It provides another layer of learning that’s very interesting.”- Cheryl

“Immigrant kids are really great kids...Why aren’t we drawing on their experiences and their real world knowledge?” - Andrea

Despite some studies suggesting that American teachers view English Language Learners (ELLs) with a deficit lens (O’Brien, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Harklau, 2000), the teachers in this study perceived their ELL students, many of whom are immigrants or refugees, very positively. While the teachers recognized some of the challenges immigrant students face, particularly with learning English, they also believed such students enrich content knowledge by sharing experiences and different perspectives in their classrooms. However, out of the eight teachers in this study, only two taught in districts with sizeable numbers of ELL students. For the other teachers, therefore, experience with transnational students remained limited.

Andrea, one of the teachers who had transnational students in her global history classes believed these students bring a wealth of cultural information to larger discussions, creating opportunities for cross-cultural interactions within the classroom itself. She explained that immigrant/refugee students in her multicultural, multiethnic global history class “constantly” engaged in cross-cultural discussions and experiences. “I don’t think there’s a day that goes by when we don’t have some aspect of that conversation,” she stated. She recalled two of her refugee students, one from Iraq and one from the Democratic Republic of Congo, delivering presentations to the class describing their refugee narratives, experiences in their new

communities, and aspirations for the future. “You could hear a pin drop,” Andrea recalled, “while freshman were sitting here listening to it...And like this is really happening right now!” The other students connected with the global content they were learning because of the personal element refugee students brought to the discussion.

Furthermore, Andrea used the difficult stories of her transnational students’ experiences as a point of comparison in teaching her other students about education. “Occasionally the kids would ask, ‘Would you do this in your country?’ Andrea related, ““Oh no! If I didn’t do my homework we would have to stand outside with stones in our hands on a ledge overlooking a chasm.’ And the kids would be like, ‘What?’ (with disbelief).” In this example, Andrea used an extreme perspective to illustrate differences in educational experiences in an attempt to instill more value regarding education in her native-born students. She likewise referred to another immigrant student explaining to the class how he would run twenty miles back and forth to school from his home because he did not want to miss school. She noted that the other students in the class enjoyed hearing this story told. “The great part is seeing them interact that way and ask those questions in a meaningful, deep way,” she said. Not only did the immigrant/refugee students bring a new perspective on education to her other students, Andrea believed, she used them to foster cross-cultural interactions and awareness thereby broadening understanding and lessening conflict between the two groups.

Yet Andrea might not have realized that such approaches of “singling out” students of color is problematic because it puts the onus on the students themselves to foster cultural awareness. Scholars of culturally relevant pedagogy and multicultural education (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002; May, 1999; Banks, 2007) warn against this practice in that it essentializes one person’s perspective to be that of the entire cultural group. Yet in this study

other teachers used the experiences of Muslim students in their classrooms, believing they enrich their other students' understandings about Islam.

Cross-cultural awareness in the classroom: Teaching about Islam.

“We have a growing Muslim population so we spend a lot of time with the Middle East, looking at the developments. A lot of students can’t believe there is so much rich culture and history...It opens their eyes but it also validates my students’ experiences. Every year I have at least four or five Muslim students and I teach about religions and belief systems and Islam. I have them teach it with me.” - Charlie

Although many of the teachers in this study had students from a variety of different countries and cultures in their classrooms, most teachers chose to discuss their Muslim students and teaching about Islam when asked about cross-cultural learning in the classroom. I never asked directly how teachers teach about Islam and Muslims, yet almost all of them focused on this topic, perhaps because of rampant media exposure about radical Islam and its ensuing hypersensitivity and hypervigilance towards Muslims. In general, teachers felt that educating their non-Muslim students and dispelling myths and exaggerations about Islam and terrorism was a critical purpose in teaching global history. As Doug stated, “My duty as an ancient history teacher who teaches the start of Islam is to point out to [students] that the Islamic religion doesn’t hate.”

One of the resources teachers used in the classroom in teaching about Islam and Muslims were the students themselves. As Charlie mentioned in the quote above, many teachers valued and respected the information about Islam shared by the Muslim students in their classrooms, perhaps not realizing the problematic nature of “singling out” such students. In Mike’s district, for example, there was a large Bosnian Muslim community, having emigrated to the area during the Bosnian War in the 1990s. “I’ve really found having all the Muslim kids around our culture...have made my kids understand it more,” Mike said. However, Mike referred to the non-

Muslim students as “my kids,” but overlooked the fact that the Muslim students were “his kids” as well. Mike appreciated the contributions they brought to normalizing the non-Muslim students’ understandings of Islam, but did not seem to understand that he was “othering” the Muslim students to those from the dominant culture (i.e., white, middle class, Christian). He did not acknowledge the diversity in the room by treating students from the dominant culture in the same way.

Yet Mike’s motivations were well intentioned. Mike mentioned that many Bosnian students played on his soccer team. When they stayed after school awaiting practice, team members often shared food and snacks, as they were on one of the days I visited the school. Mike related that the non-Muslim students were respectful of dietary restrictions of the Muslim players. “Even just the pork. They (the non-Muslim students) understand,” he said, “They were just doing it today (in relation to food after school) ‘Don’t worry, there’s no pork in here.’ Those types of things.” Mike was sure that the non-Muslim students in the class and on the team respected the Bosnian Muslim students. He felt the influx of the Bosnian population “has changed things in a good way because they are all Islamic so you get more diversity and the kids understand.” As Mike explained, “Kids don’t understand that these kids (the Bosnians) are Islamic. So they talk the terrorist thing. And I go, ‘No, they’re not terrorists.’ When the kids complain about their lives, I’m like, ‘These people (the Serbians) tried to slaughter them, so shut up. I don’t want to hear about it.’” In this example, Mike refused to allow the non-Muslim students to disparage Islam by referring to all Muslims as terrorists given the Bosnian student population in the school. In fact, the Bosnian Muslim students were normalized into the school culture to the extent that the other students did not realize they had different religious and/or cultural beliefs. Furthermore, Mike used the Bosnian immigrants’ experiences of fleeing the

Bosnian genocide to bring perspective to students' complaints about their own lives. But although Mike used Muslim students to try to foster deeper understandings of Islam by personalizing Islam and addressing misunderstandings, he inadvertently "othered" them.

Although his district did not have many Muslim students, Doug also used one of his students as a resource when teaching about Islam. In an attempt not to offend or to misinform, Doug often asked the student for clarification about certain Muslim practices. He asked his Muslim student, "Am I right on that? Did I get that right?" "We're able to get the perspective at least in that class with a student who follows that religion with the Five Pillars and the praying five times a day and the fasting," Doug said of the student, "He is able to give his class more information on it." Similarly, Kelly encouraged her Muslim students to share their experiences of how their religious beliefs informed their daily activities:

I know about the Muslim hand washing...But it's a very private thing. And I was able to have a student who was more than happy to tape his family washing for prayers. And they have a special wash sink in their house, and they have a special prayer area. And he left me with that CD...I still have that CD to use and show the students what it's really like because your religion is a private thing...And the kids are very thankful. A lot of them know him and that makes it more relevant to them and more understandable.

Kelly hoped that by personalizing religious beliefs and practices, the Muslim student helped his classmates better understand how Islam is practiced. At the same time, Kelly indicated that the student made his religion more accessible and less intimidating to his classmates, helping them to develop more tolerance and substantive cultural knowledge about Islam.

Kelly's own personal life connected somewhat to Balkan culture, which she felt allowed her to connect better with her Bosnian students. Kelly's partner was Macedonian and she often discussed her knowledge of Macedonian culture and language with her students, thus imparting a degree of credibility to her teaching about the Balkan region. As she explained:

With the Bosnian students, I have a little bit of an edge because my boyfriend...is

Macedonian. So I know a little bit of the language. And Bosnia and Macedonia are very close. So the kids, I feel it's a better connection if you know a little bit about their culture and they feel you're not being show and tell-y, they'll open up a little more to you.

Kelly realized that her Bosnian students, at times, felt singled out merely because of their culture, acting as the default resource for all things Muslim as discussed in class. They might, therefore, have resented the underlying tokenism inferred by classroom discussions of their culture. Kelly believed her deeper understanding of Macedonia and the Balkan region, because of her personal connections, imparted a degree of respect in the Bosnian students' eyes and gave her "an edge" with them. Through mutual respect, gained by possessing more substantive cultural knowledge, Kelly believed that her classroom discussions of Islam in global history were enriched.

But like Mike, these teachers fell into the practice of asking marginalized students to educate their peers and to represent an entire culture. They did not realize the problematic nature of such an approach, although Kelly alluded to it when she noted that the Bosnian students might have felt "singled out" by her. Nevertheless, it was the mainstream white, middle class, Christian students who benefit from this attempt at cross-cultural awareness. The practice lacked reciprocity, indicating a privileging of the dominant culture and an incomplete view of diversity on the part of the teachers.

Despite the problematic nature of using individual Muslim students as cultural experts in the classroom, teachers' hopes in teaching about Islam related to dispelling stereotypes or challenging preconceived ideas about Muslims in order to foster cross-cultural awareness. Selina herself, who was a practicing Muslim, explained why she thought some Americans feel threatened by Islam:

I think it depends on where you live. I think there's a lot of fear and a lot of ignorance about it. People just don't know. But because there's so many symbols that are dramatically different about it I think that people are just afraid and they don't think you

can mesh the cultures together. So for example Indian culture is a lot more accepted because the Indians have been able to assimilate a lot easier into the culture in a nonthreatening way...Having a dot on your head is not really threatening to Americans. But for some reason having the hijab on your head is...But if you're in an urban area it's not a big deal at all...I think it's possible to mesh both of them, but I feel like right now American culture feels threatened by the parts of Islamic culture that are, I guess, would be in conflict with American culture. Hijab versus bikini, for example.

Living in upstate New York was not as comfortable for her as living in a larger metropolitan area like Chicago, which had more integrated diversity. She recalled similar negative attitudes towards her as a teacher working in one of the more affluent suburban communities in the area:

When I came [to that district] I was very nervous about sharing my background with the students there. And I think that was a mistake but there were a lot of negative experiences [there]. That first year it was just really hard. You know, I had a parent essentially call me a terrorist. And I felt like I couldn't share who I was at [that school]. I felt like that would have been received negatively and so I didn't share. And that really affected me. It affected me. It affected my teaching. And I still feel like I'm just now beginning to get back to my own teaching roots to how I teach and what I like to do as a teacher. I never did that [there]. I would say that that was the only place that felt that my being different was not welcome. And I don't know why. It could be me. Because nobody really says that, but there is a culture that you live by and if you don't live by that, I don't know. I just always felt like I didn't fit in.

When I interviewed her, Selina was teaching in a much larger, more diverse urban school district where she felt very comfortable sharing her religious identity with students to help them understand her beliefs more deeply. As she said, "It's kind of exciting because I can talk about a lot of this stuff and hopefully open [students'] eyes in a positive way rather than in whatever way they've already set in their ways." By feeling more comfortable in the school, Selina could speak openly about Islam without worrying about attacks on her character or beliefs, thereby helping to dispel any preconceived ideas or stereotypes students may have about Islam or Muslims. She did not feel threatened by the diverse community in her urban school as she did among the more affluent, predominantly white community in the suburbs; perhaps she identified with the urban students as a member of a religious and ethnic minority within the larger

American society. In doing so, she acted as both a resource about Muslim culture and traditions for her students, as well as an example of a religious minority in the United States, constantly negotiating her identity and culture on a personal level, which impacted her teaching.

In addressing cross-cultural awareness in the classroom, Kelly likewise noted that her students often harbor negative stereotypes about Muslims that she tried hard to challenge. She encouraged open dialogue about Muslim stereotypes, hoping that discussions about stereotyping and media influences informed students and helped to promote tolerance. “[Students] have a preconceived idea of what a Muslim is and they’ll bring their notions in,” she stated, “And I have Muslim students who will say, ‘Our Muslim...’ and some students didn’t even know they were Muslim because, in their words, ‘they didn’t look Muslim.’” She used students’ misunderstandings as a place to begin the conversation about cultural norms and the reality of other places, rather than what they are exposed to in the media. She said:

For me that part of it is huge. I try to acknowledge it when we go through different area of content, and we talk about what it’s like there and what the people are like...So [Muslim students] will bring in pictures of where they are from...then the kids are like, ‘Well, that looks just like our city’ ...Just to open their eyes because I know that for anyone our idea of what it’s like there is what we see on TV every day. We just see what is presented to us from the war-torn areas...But I like the fact that we are diverse because you get someone who’s been sitting next to them all year [who] is now telling them their perception.

Kelly also recalled a time when she invited one of her student’s parents, a woman who converted to Islam, to speak to the students about choosing this religion rather than being born into it. She helped to “dispel the terrorist idea” by focusing on the positive aspects of Islam as a religious choice. Furthermore, she spoke about the role of women in Islam, challenging perceived notions of female subservience in the religion. To Kelly, this woman’s presentation was “a real eye-opener” that “helped to make it more global, like you’re actually talking to people who are doing it.” Like Selina did in her own classroom, by personalizing Islam, teachers presented

information to students, hoping they become more educated, sensitive, and substantively culturally aware.

Overall, in addressing cross-cultural awareness in the classroom, teachers in this study often cited teaching about Islam as a major topic that necessitated deeper understanding in order to promote cultural sensitivity, understanding, and ideally acceptance. But many teachers utilized the Muslim students in their classrooms, members of the Muslim community, or in the case of Selina, themselves, to try to personalize and normalize Islam within an American culture that arguably perceives Muslims as threatening. Their ubiquitous desire to speak about teaching Islam in the context of cross-cultural awareness, therefore, suggests that these teachers viewed the discussion of Islam and Muslims as one of paramount importance in fostering cross-cultural understanding overall. Perhaps they did not realize, however, that their focus of culture is situated within the Other.

Additional cross-cultural learning opportunities in the classroom. In addition to using other students and their parents as sources of cross-cultural learning in the classroom, many of the teachers in this study employed other ways of including cross-cultural awareness in their teaching. Like having immigrant or refugee students of their own share their stories and experiences, teachers invited members of the local community to visit their classrooms and speak about their cultures. One segment of upstate New York's growing refugee population included members of the Lost Boys of Sudan who arrived to the United States in the early 2000s. Both Mike and Elizabeth mentioned that they invited individuals from the Sudanese community to visit their classrooms and share their narratives with students. Mike, in particular, liked to use oral history and guest speakers in his lessons because "they make it real" for the students.

Kelly used to use pen pals in the past to allow students to connect with other students in

different countries directly. She found that the students greatly enjoyed learning about the small cultural similarities and differences in the course of their communications. She recalled one time when her students were “blown away” upon learning that, while they sometimes were let out of school on account of snow, students they were corresponding with in Eritrea sometimes were released for “threat of terrorist attack days.” She then used this opportunity to explore with her students the geopolitical position of Eritrea as a country and what the implications were by having terrorist attack days built into the school calendar there.

Kelly’s pen pal activity likewise allowed her students to challenge their own cultural assumptions and understandings in relation to language. As she explained:

Some sent back things just to hear how they write their English because it’s a different language. And so they’ll say ‘I have hair brown’ and the kids would crack up. And I’d say, but there’s the tolerance. What you don’t understand is we’re one of the few countries that uses the adjective that way. Like in other languages they use it after [the noun]...We say ‘brown hair’ and we think because the hegemon, we’re the big one that you know it’s us, but it’s really not...And I said, ‘See, that’s why you have to have a tolerance for it.’ When they’re translating it literally how they would say it, that’s different than we do but it’s still correct...So that was a real eye opener.

In this example, Kelly illustrated the need for students to challenge their dominant position and assumptions by explaining the reasons for linguistic idiosyncrasies in the letters written by students in other countries. Furthermore, she challenged her students to imagine writing letters in a second language, the mistakes they might make, and how they would feel sharing those letters with native speakers. Through the element of cross-cultural communication, Kelly hoped to invoke empathy and understanding on the part of her students and allow them to question the reasons why English remains the dominant language of international communication.

Unfortunately, not all of the pen pal exchanges resulted in culturally sensitive understandings. Kelly recounted how one of her students had inadvertently offended a pen pal in

the Philippines. “Somebody found out that in one of the countries, the Philippines, they eat hamsters,” she recalled, “I usually read all their letters before they went out, but this one seemed innocuous...and this girl asked, ‘Do you really eat them?’ So yeah. That made the whole school stop writing us letters because they were insulted. And I was like, ‘Should have read that letter!’” In this example, Kelly aptly illustrated the problem of presenting cultural stereotypes and exotica. Not only are these images often misleading and offensive, they further the us/them divide by emphasizing extreme cultural differences rather than similarities of experience that might develop understanding. Kelly understood that she “should have read that letter” to educate her student about offensive cultural stereotypes. However, since she did not, the school in the Philippines responded by disrupting their correspondence, an ironic lesson in cross-cultural communication. Ultimately, Kelly stopped using pen pals with her classes because of time constraints and other challenges.

Other teachers spoke about wanting to incorporate cross-cultural conversations using technology such as Skype, they found the logistics a challenge and, therefore, did not use them. Both Cheryl and Charlie mentioned that teachers in the foreign language department sometimes used Skype for their classes to communicate with other classes overseas, but they, themselves, did not, both because of time and logistical concerns. Instead, they turned to the Internet, particularly YouTube or TED to find videos with speakers from other countries to share with their students. Cheryl, for example, showed Malala Yousafzai’s speech to the United Nations discussing the importance of education for girls globally. But Cheryl conceded, “that was still just a small element of cross cultural that fits into that.” She realized that by relying on videotaped speeches, cross-cultural communication became one-directional and did not allow for an opportunity to practice cultural communication skills, a key component in global awareness

and literacy.

Thus, of all the elements of global education as outlined by Merryfield and Wilson (2005), teachers in this study spoke about cross-cultural awareness and understanding the most. The teachers viewed fostering cross-cultural awareness as an important professional responsibility as they taught global history and geography in order to foster tolerance, cultural understanding, and hopefully appreciation within their students. While some of the teachers believed their districts' cultural festival created an opportunity to enrich students' understandings of cultural diversity, others questioned the depiction of surface culture that such festivals often emphasize. Moreover, they found it logistically difficult for their students to engage in cross-cultural communication with people in different countries, instead relying on students from different cultures within their own classrooms to educate their classmates about culture, a problematic practice.

Challenges to Global Education in the Classroom

When asked to discuss what they perceive as challenges to implementing global perspectives in their teaching practice, teachers largely spoke about the challenge of state mandates, particularly the Regents exam and lack of time, as issues that impact their teaching practice in relation to global education. While they identified other perceived challenges as well, such as lack of financial resources, district emphasis on other initiatives, and complexity of the curriculum, I chose to limit the discussion to state mandates and time because these factors most directly address teaching practice in relation to global education.

The Regents Exam and Annual Professional Performance Review

"It's all about the glorified test." - Elizabeth

Global history teachers in New York State face the task of preparing students for a high-stakes Regents exam at the end of the two-year course. The teachers, of course, do not know in

advance what content questions will be asked on the exam; any of the numerous curricular topics could appear on the Regents assessment, from Thomas Malthus or Atahualpa to Aung San Suu Kyi or Father Miguel Hidalgo. Therefore, teachers feel a strong responsibility to cover all areas of the curriculum in order to adequately prepare their students for this high-stakes exam, often resulting in the “art of mentioning,” in Apple’s (1992) words, rather than in extensive, meaningful studies of many topics.

Thus, given the nature of this high-stakes Regents exam with its emphasis on basic, random content knowledge, teachers in this study were critical of the assessment and the way the course is designed. Repeatedly, the teachers’ language suggested harsh criticism of the scope and sequence of the course (“I think the idea of teaching the Global History and Geography in one course is absurd. It’s too much. It’s too complex,” “I’m still trying to figure it out. What they’re [the state] doing,” “I think it’s a huge mistake to do it over two years. It’s way too much,” “I think the global history curriculum is killing itself. It’s just not as efficient or as effective as it could be”). As Charlie explained in more detail, “The way New York state has it laid out it’s really a litany of things to teach and that’s reinforced with an exam that takes a small fraction of those things and tests students on those things with a limited set of skills, interpretation, scripted writing, and multiple choice questions.” Charlie acknowledged that he “struggle[d] to open it up” to go beyond the curriculum and incorporate “excursions” into global topics that are more interesting, using more inquiry and critical thinking, but also declared that the “state exams are a big challenge to that.”

As mentioned previously, the Regents exam weighs the multiple-choice component more heavily than the essay portions, causing some teachers to emphasize such questions throughout the year. Doug disliked the Regents Exam’s emphasis on multiple-choice questions, noting that

multiple choice is not “a great way” to assess students, but that “they have to take multiple choice because that’s what the Regents is.” He also used the Regents exams as a way to choose certain content to focus on. As he stated, “I’ll go look at the Regents exams and say, ‘okay, what are these kids gonna see on a test so that I make sure that I at least cover that stuff.’” Mike also noted that he is sure to “cover” material that “will show up on the Regents.”

In fact, from my observations of the teachers in their classes, I noticed that Doug and Mike were not alone in using Regents exams to guide instruction. Other teachers in this study used past Regents questions on unit tests or as part of classroom review. While these teachers utilized various forms of instruction and assessment, I observed the use of past Regents exam questions and topics on a number of occasions. In one of the lessons I observed, Cheryl, for example, introduced a lesson on Meiji Japan by reviewing Japanese history that students studied the previous year. “What do you remember about Japan from ninth grade? How much ninth grade review do we need?” she asked as she handed out a graphic organizer to the class. Based upon student responses, they did not seem to remember much. One student, for instance, confused Japan with Korea, causing Cheryl to remark that she “needs to review ninth grade material” with the class. Furthermore, the packet she handed out to the class contained numerous multiple choice questions from past Regents exams that students were expected to complete for homework. Other teachers also used past Regents exam questions on assessments they shared with me, from multiple choice questions to compare/contrast essays and document-based questions. Thus, the Regents exam, in a sense, became the driving force for instruction and assessment in many instances.

As we discussed the challenges to implementing global education in their instruction, the teachers spoke about how the focus on test performance greatly impacts the way they teach. For

example, Selina explained that she would “love” teaching the Global History course in a more thoughtful, engaging way by using films, for example. But she lamented that her school district was greatly focused on quantitative measurements of student performance to the detriment of this type of teaching. “Every month there’s a major test or something that I have to do or get through,” Selina said, “And then of course there’s a push for the Regents. It’s not like I can really take time to explain anything [to the students].” She explained the tension she felt between the way she would *like* to teach and the way she felt her district was *forcing* her to teach, emphasizing testing over creative instructional techniques. She must “get through” these quantitative measures and “push for the Regents.”

Kelly also worried that the increasing importance placed on the Regents exam and standards was causing her to “lose [her] relationship with the students.” She felt a tremendous push from her district leaders to prepare students for the Regents exam, causing her to not “waste time on things that I feel are really important.” Like Selina, Kelly’s words suggest a frustration with the Regents exam and the curriculum. She could not “waste time” going into depth about what she felt were “important” topics, suggesting that perhaps the topics tested on the Regents exam were not as important to her. Furthermore, she valued her “relationship with the students” but lamented that state mandates interfered with her ability to foster those relationships because of the constant push to cover content in preparation for the Regents exam.

Mike also recognized that the extreme focus on the Regents assessment detracted from more global learning. “I think we’re kind of being handcuffed by the test...You should be able to learn about these other cultures,” he said, “It’s such an interconnected world now and if we’re not, I think it would be more influential for the kids to learn about the culture rather than teach toward the test, which I hate. But I do what I gotta do right now.” Mike used global language

(“interconnected world”) but saw the test as an impediment to global learning, illustrating the tension between the priorities of the state (passing scores on standardized tests) and global learning. He felt restrained or “handcuffed” by the Regents exam, which he believed limited his ability to teach creatively about cultures and global connections which may have facilitated more global awareness among his students. Ironically, the global history and geography assessment, in his view, did not prepare students to be globally aware. But, he lamented, “I do what I gotta do right now.”

Mike’s expression of “I do what I gotta do right now” aptly describes the extreme pressure many teachers felt to “get the kids through” the test. And this pressure is compounded by the recent teacher evaluation system, called the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) in New York state, in which twenty to forty percent (and perhaps as much as fifty percent in the future) of a teacher’s evaluation score is determined by student performance on state assessments. Thus, the Regents exam becomes high-stakes for both students and teachers, likely creating an even more pronounced “teach to the test” syndrome. Hence, the teachers’ words in relation to challenges of global education often revolved around APPR and “teaching to the test.” As Mike explained, “Too much focus is on the test. Now with our evaluations, you’re forced...it takes out creativity...” Mike felt impaired by the Regents assessment, “forced” to teach in ways that limited creativity or in-depth analysis of Global content. For example, because he did not “teach the high end kids all the time,” he said he must “put in in language that my kids will understand so they can get through it...I really hammer, I *hammer* vocabulary every single day.” Thus, for Mike, APPR mandates created a tension between what he saw as creative teaching versus the “bare bones” information (“this is what you’ve got to know”) in order to “get kids through [the test].”

Thus, state mandates, particularly the Regents exam and its connection to teacher evaluation scores, impacted these teachers' pedagogical choices. Time was spent on review of material likely to appear on the Regents exam in June. Multiple-choice questions were used regularly on student assessments throughout the year to prepare students for such types of questions. And some teachers urged students' memorization of key terms and facts in order to help them "get through" the test at the end of the year, one that was high stakes for both students and teachers as their districts prioritized test scores and other quantitative measurements at the expense of what these teachers viewed as more substantive assessments of global learning.

The Challenge of Time

I wonder if we had more time to focus on those issues would there be less hate in the world? - Cheryl

The challenges of teaching such a content-laden course attached to a high-stakes assessment was further complicated by time constraints, according to the teachers in this study. As their words revealed, time constraints caused teachers to explore global topics in less depth as they feel a concerted "push" to "cover content" at the expense of making meaningful connections with global history and global issues. Similarly, the perceived lack of time also had an impact on the way these teachers developed their lessons. They spoke of sacrificing relevant inquiry-based discussions of global content during class time or important skill development in areas such as writing. Thus, teachers repeatedly spoke of time as creating a major challenge for the implementation of global education in their teaching.

"The challenge with global that I find is that it's almost a new book every week instead of a new chapter," Cheryl explained, "If we had more time to make those big picture connections I think it would be more beneficial for the students entering the world today." Cheryl's words aptly illustrated a major challenge that these teachers felt impacts the inclusion of global

elements in their teaching. The amount of content to be “covered” in a limited time hindered in-depth teaching of global content that may well influence how globally aware, or not, students could become. Kelly likewise noted her frustration with the content-driven nature of the Global History course. She felt that in the quest to cover the required content, the relevance and interest of certain topics is lost. As she said, “That is my goal, to make it more relevant and interesting. It’s frustrating to feel like that’s not exactly what I’m attaining. I’m doing my content, but am I making the students ready for the world they’re going into?” Interestingly, her words suggested a fundamental disconnect between the content of the course and preparing students “for the world they’re going into.” Both Cheryl and Kelly understood the potential the course had in preparing globally aware students, but felt they could not adequately make meaningful connections between the content and its relevance because of the amount of content the state mandated they cover. As Cheryl aptly stated, “I wonder if we had more time to focus on those issues would there be less hate in the world?”

In addition to the concern that lack of in-depth study of global topics because of time constraints hindered larger global knowledge, other teachers worried that some of the interest in learning was lost. Doug, for example, wanted less time in class lecturing about the names, dates, and “the boring part of class.” But he believed he must teach such topics because students would be tested on them at the end of the course. He felt he did not have enough time to discuss much in depth with his students, “and that’s why kids hate social studies.” Elizabeth shared a similar sentiment. “I think the new curriculum takes out a lot of the cultural stuff that I found really grabs students’ attention,” Elizabeth explained, “There’s no time for it anymore. Now it’s names, dates, cause, effect. There you go. And that’s, yes that’s history, but a lot of the fun stuff...is no longer. There’s no longer time to teach it. So I think that’s also a disservice.”

Elizabeth feared that she was doing a “disservice” to her students by leaving out interesting discussions and explorations of global cultures and other “fun” material that may better connect her students with history, thereby creating more global awareness on the part of her students.

The perceived push to cover vast amounts of content in a limited amount of time also had an impact on the way these teachers developed lessons. Some stated that they felt the need to replace projects or inquiry-based activities that would explore global issues with more time-efficient PowerPoint lectures, for example. Kelly described the frustrations expressed by one of her friends, a fellow social studies teacher:

My girlfriend went from [a junior high school] to the high school and she said, ‘We always had this philosophy. We would still do projects,’ she goes, ‘But there’s no time for projects. There’s no time to get deep into anything. It ends up being a lot of Power Points.’

Because of a lack of time, teachers often resorted to “glossing over the topics,” Kelly said, rather than teaching “things that are relevant...the current issues in the world, and that’s what [students] need.” Charlie, also, noted that the lack of time combined with content requirements limited his ability to implement inquiry-based learning opportunities, key components of global education and now included as part of the new C3 Frameworks for New York State social studies. As he said:

If you're gonna do inquiry it needs to be some depth and some time to explore and examine things. But you also have to have the resources to support you if you have kids do quality work. I don't know that we do. This is the factory model where you have 30 desks in a classroom, you just keep rolling through the material and your PowerPoint and I don't think that's what inquiry looks like.

While Charlie knew that inquiry-based learning was important in history and global education, he acknowledged that it was difficult to do, given time constraints, lack of resources, and the amount of material students needed to learn. Thus, he felt frustrated that curricular mandates

forced teachers to “keep rolling through the material” with Power Points rather than devote time to inquiry-based instruction.

While Kelly and Charlie mentioned the challenge of time that impact their teaching practices, Selina talked about time as an impediment to skill development among students. Selina strongly maintained that students should develop their skills more, particularly in writing. She stated, “I like the idea of focusing on writing but there is *never* any time. It feels like there is absolutely no time to do it...So content versus the skill is just very, very difficult.” Selina’s words, therefore, indicated that she felt she could not teach adequate content-area writing instruction given the push to “get through” the curriculum. She must sacrifice time-consuming writing instruction in favor of covering mandated content.

Yet despite these concerns about time, some teachers devised ways to implement a variety of teaching methods that aimed to overcome time constraints and allow students to examine global topics with more depth. As they spoke about perceived challenges to implementing global education in their teaching, some teachers’ language shifted to a discussion of strategies they use to overcome such obstacles. In an attempt to create more time in the instructional day to explore topics in more depth, for example, Doug was taking a professional development course in “flipping” his classroom. As a relatively new teaching method, “flipping the classroom” entails videotaping lectures and posting them online for students to access and watch at home, leaving more class time for discussion and analysis, rather than basic content instruction. Doug was hopeful that, by flipping his classroom, he would “be able to do more deep dives into the places we’re talking about and what is really going on in the history.” Furthermore, Doug intentionally found the time to focus more deeply on topics he found interesting. “I only did a couple of days on the Mongols,” he said, “cause I didn’t know how

much time I'd have to give to it. But we'll do more on the Mongols next year cause it's cool!"

Charlie, also, created some time to focus on inquiry based projects, despite his uneasiness with the time such projects take during the school day:

Every time, every year this time I say is it worth it? And then I look at the products and I think it is. But it's just so much time because I have to be three to four days a week with them in the computer lab, supporting them, helping them out. But then I think that's what we should be doing anyways.

Charlie recognized the importance of trying inquiry-based activities in order to give students themselves the opportunity to explore global history more in depth, a key element of global education. He noted that he must sacrifice "three to four days a week" of teacher-centered classroom instruction in order to allow time for students to complete global projects, but he thought, "that's what [he] should be doing anyways."

Charlie and Doug, therefore, utilized teaching techniques they hoped would surmount the obstacles created by curricular mandates. Yet they remained wary; after all, the time they spend on projects and in-depth analysis was borrowed from other topics in the curriculum that could not, therefore, get the same attention. As Charlie questioned, "Is it worth it?" Thus, the depth versus breadth conundrum is one that particularly confounds many global history teachers (Reitan, 2015).

Therefore, over the course of these interviews, virtually all of the teachers' language suggested a frustration with the amount of content they needed to cover in a substantial enough way given time constraints and pressures of state mandates and exams. Some teachers noted that the drive to cover content took time away from adequate skill development such as writing, or from inquiry-based lessons that may provide a depth of understanding to material. Even from my observations, I noted that the bell often rang in the middle of engaging activities, disrupting opportunities for reinforcement or meaningful closure. Yet some teachers tried to overcome the

challenges of time constraints by finding different ways of presenting material or engaging in deeper examinations of global topics as they taught the curriculum. But overall their language and actions suggested that they view global education as something that needed to be added to the existing curriculum, rather than something that could be woven throughout their teaching of global history content. They largely perceived the Regents exam, in particular, as a key hindrance to global education and one that impacted their teaching, particularly given its high-stakes attachment to students *and* teachers. Is it any wonder, then, that teachers may forsake substantive critical and analytical investigations of global issues and content in favor of basic, superficial factual knowledge students need to pass the Regents exam? And if so, how “globally” will our Global History and Geography course really be taught?

Summary

In this chapter, I explored how teachers understood global education and how their understandings impact their teaching practice. Given the often vague and/or nebulous definitions of global education within the field, yet acknowledging that global education circulates within existing educational discourses, I discussed the way the teachers in this study defined the term “global education.” In general, these teachers had varying definitions of global education, but identified two key elements, namely global interconnectedness and cross-cultural sensitivity, as integral parts of their definitions. Only one teacher, Elizabeth, questioned the meaning of global education, suspecting it to be another “buzzword” lacking substance in current educational initiatives. Nevertheless, most of the teachers recognized cross-cultural awareness, global interconnectedness, and global mindedness as important factors for becoming globally aware suggesting that global education elements circulate within existing social studies and educational discourses.

When asked about the purposes of global education, teachers identified both practical and philosophical reasons at the micro and macro levels. For example, these teachers spoke about global education at the micro-philosophical level as something important for individual enrichment and development. Moreover, they noted the practical purpose of global education at the micro level as a critical component to functioning in the world today, particularly as globalization increasingly connects the world. Yet they also engaged the purpose of global education at more macro levels, analyzing its ideological and beneficial aspects for social justice and conflict reduction through cross-cultural sensitivity and understanding.

However, in discussing the purposes of global education, some of the teachers privileged white middle class Christian mainstream students by using statements such as, “my kids need to know about Muslims,” or “when you get older you’re gonna meet people who aren’t like you.” Their responses suggest that they positioned cultural diversity as something outside of the dominant culture, and that by learning more about “other” cultures, “their” students would be better prepared to compete in the global marketplace, not realizing that “their” students included *all* students in their classrooms.

In addition to discussing the purposes of global education, teachers in this study spoke about the skills and opportunities they felt globally aware students should have. Specifically, they cited critical analysis and digital competency skills, as well as basic knowledge and content understandings of global issues and current events, as important aspects of global awareness. Furthermore, some teachers strongly urged that students develop an understanding and appreciation of different cultures, especially given the increasing diversity of school demographics. Interestingly, only two participants identified learning a foreign language as a critical skill for global awareness, perhaps because as social studies teachers they were focused

on social studies skills. And only Selina described skills necessary for global awareness in a holistic way, citing a range of opportunities and experiences students should have at all levels of their educational experience in order to develop global awareness, such as using interdisciplinary global connections, study abroad opportunities, or meeting people from different countries.

While the first half of this chapter investigated teachers' understandings of global education and its purposes, the second half explored ways in which teachers implement elements of global education in their teaching practice. Using key elements of global education outlined by Merryfield (2003), I categorized data according to elements of local/global connections, prejudice reduction and attention to inequalities, perspectives consciousness, and cross-cultural competence.

Within the element of cross-cultural competence, I discussed how teachers spoke about the cultural festival, transnational students, and teaching about Islam. Overall, the teachers spoke most about cross-cultural sensitivity as an important goal in their teaching global history. However, virtually none of them used cross-cultural communication in the classroom. While most of the teachers wished they could foster more cross-cultural activities, such as pen pal exchanges or Skype conversations with people in other countries, certain challenges existed that make such cross-cultural learning opportunities difficult. Furthermore, some teachers spoke about using students in the classroom as resources in learning more about cultures, such as by asking the Muslim students to discuss their religious practices. The teachers who referenced such one-way cultural conversations perceived these as positive exchanges, perhaps not realizing the problematic nature of singling out students to act as cultural ambassadors for the benefit of other classmates.

Lastly, teachers discussed certain challenges that they perceived limited the inclusion of

more global elements in their teaching. Specifically, they cited the Regents exam and a lack of time as key elements that impacted the inclusion of global perspectives in their teaching. Many of the teachers noted the high stakes nature of the Regents exam for both students and themselves, particularly with its more recent connection to teacher evaluation scores. In many these classrooms, the Regents exam drove many assessments and content that was covered. The teachers who spoke about the Regents exam believed it to hinder their ability to teach with the creativity they desire, or to incorporate more in depth analysis of global issues and content given limits on time. Nevertheless, some teachers, such as Charlie and Doug, continued to find ways of teaching that attempt to overcome these challenges.

Overall, the teachers in this study described some key global education elements in their teaching, but also demonstrated a lack of thorough understanding of global education and/or teaching about diversity. As individuals subjected to many types of discourses (cultural, educational, national, global) from various sources, their understandings of global education continued to evolve and change. Thus, the constantly shifting meanings they made of such ideas were reflected in the ways they constructed global education, elaborated on its purposes, and implemented it in their classrooms.

Chapter 6:

Conclusion

Though I obviously did not know it at the time, this dissertation essentially began as early as 1994 when I found myself sitting in a small cafe in a beautiful medieval town in central France conversing with two British expatriates about life, culture, politics, and the state of the world at that time. My eyes were opened by the perspectives of these individuals raised in countries and cultures different than my own, and continued to be widened as I lived and traveled abroad throughout my young adulthood. As a citizen of the United States, raised in a white middle class family, subjected to depictions of my country as the global leader, and inculcated with notions of American exceptionalism via education and media, my worldview contrasted with their own and those of people I encountered in my time abroad. Interestingly, though not surprisingly, people I encountered almost always seemed to know more about the United States than I did about their countries and cultures. Consequently, upon returning to the States and beginning my teaching career, I often wondered how education can create more globally aware citizens and how social studies, in particular, can reinforce and/or challenge the metanarrative of history that positions the United States at the center of global politics and culture.

As the world entered into the twenty-first century, with forces of globalization, technology, and transnational populations making the world smaller than ever, I wondered to what extent our educators themselves are becoming more globally aware and how “globally” is our global history being taught. Why might many of our students in New York State, armed with at least two years' worth of mandated global history content, fail to graduate from high school with adequate global knowledge? How is the Global History and Geography course offered in grades

nine and ten taught to them? In other words, how "global" is the Global History that is being taught? With these questions in mind, this dissertation project aimed to explore the ways in which thinking globally enters into the secondary social studies classroom via teachers' epistemological and pedagogical understandings, students they teach, curriculum they follow, and resources they use. Specifically, I sought to understand how eight secondary global history teachers construct their global awareness or world views, make meaning of global history content, and frame their teaching in relation to their understandings of global education. Thus, this study sought to answer the following questions:

- i. How do secondary social studies teachers construct global awareness and the global content they teach?
- ii. How do secondary social studies teachers' global understandings impact their teaching practices?

Using global education frameworks, symbolic interactionism, and colonial/postcolonial theory, I investigated these teachers' development of their own global awareness and perspectives, and how their understandings impact their teaching. As I elaborate upon in the next section, this research overall revealed a varied and, at times, contradictory understanding of these issues on the part of the teachers in this study, with teachers demonstrating a worldview shaped by meanings constructed via social forces, media, and discourses that perpetuated ideas of American exceptionalism and/or essentialization of other nations and cultures. At the same time, teachers' words challenged these ideas, suggesting they were cognizant of the problematic nature of such narratives and were subjected to competing discourses as they taught global history. They were continuously negotiating these competing discourses that contributed to their worldviews and understandings of global education and the global history they taught.

Summary of Findings and Further Connections to Literature

Chapter Four of this dissertation focused on the first research question: How do secondary social studies teachers construct global awareness and the global content they teach? In investigating this question, I explored the impact of diversity in teachers' upbringings as a factor that related to their cross-cultural awareness growing up. I also analyzed teachers' travel experiences, or lack thereof, the language they used to describe places abroad, and their views on the term American exceptionalism and how it relates to the role of the United States in the 21st century.

Some teachers in this study who were exposed to more racial/ethnic diversity in their backgrounds demonstrated a more sophisticated understanding of cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity. In support of Merryfield's (2000) findings, teachers in this study who were raised in ethnically diverse areas, had lived abroad, or who had exposure to racial/ethnic diversity in college, felt that these experiences helped them to develop more cultural sensitivity, a key element of global education. Selina, for example, raised in both Pakistan and the United States, expressed a critical view of the dominant culture and possessed a dual-cultural identity that impacts the ways in which she views the world. Similarly, Elizabeth acknowledged the ethnocentric views within the United States and reflected on the cultural awareness that living abroad in Italy and England engendered within her. And Charlie recalled his experiences as a child living within a multicultural environment marked by friendship and community that contributed to his development of cultural awareness, sensitivity, and socially just ways of viewing the world.

But even for those teachers who were raised in more ethnically diverse areas, cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity was not assured. For example, although Doug spoke positively about

the multicultural student population within his high school growing up, social forces and institutional segregation prevented him from participating in any substantive cross-cultural interactions and experiences. Charlie, also, noted the breakdown of cross-cultural opportunities once he went from his home environment to his school, supporting the ideas of critical race theorists (Delpit, 2006; Perry, 2002; Tatum, 1997) who explore issues of institutional segregation and the impact of such practices on all students.

Furthermore, most of these teachers did not experience much, if any, ethnic diversity in their upbringings, and largely framed diversity as something different from themselves and outside of their own experiences (Perry, 2002; Banks, 2001). For example, some teachers' use of color-blind discourse in describing views on race suggests a disengagement from critically examining cultural differences and may contribute to their limited views of multiculturalism and cultural awareness. Their inability to "see color," and by extension to "see difference," undermines broader conversations about local, national and global inequalities brought about by past policies and practices (Neville, 2008; Tatum, 1997).

But just as teachers who had spent significant time abroad possessed more complex and sophisticated understandings of cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity, they also used less American, Eurocentric, or stereotypical language in describing other countries or their experiences abroad. Teachers who had traveled to foreign countries as "tourists," or who those who had never traveled outside of the United States and Canada, used more ethnocentric and stereotypical language in describing specific travel experiences or other places abroad. Their frames of reference continue to be shaped by Western social and media representations of other countries and cultures, some of which perpetuate the essentialization of The Other and/or frame "the Rest" as inferior, strange, or troubled (Nealon & Giroux, 2012; Loomba, 2005; Hall, 1992;

Said, 1978). This is seen, for example, when Mike used stereotypical language when describing the Irish as drinkers or the Russians as mobsters, when Doug discussed Kuwaitis' hygienic practices, or when Cheryl described the children of Haiti in poor and pitiful terms. These results suggest a continuation of prevailing colonialist and ethnocentric ideas that may limit global awareness in classrooms (Roberts, 2007; Hickling-Hudson, 2003; Hahn, 2001; Willinsky, 1998; Nyambe & Shipena, 1998).

These teachers' language also reflects the North/South divide (Nyambe & Shipena, 1998). Cheryl described Africa, for example, as a place she would like to visit in order to "appreciate what we have here," and Doug described the Middle East as a dangerous place he would be fearful of visiting because of "all of the conflicts there." The North/South divide is partially shaped by Western media representations of the global South that perpetuate neocolonialist assumptions and binaries that these teachers are subjected to (Brewer, Graf, & Willnat, 2003; Myers, 1995; Nederveen Pieterse, J., 2009).

Yet most of these same teachers were sophisticated enough to critically reflect on some of their experiences, suggesting an awareness of their subjectivity and ethnocentrism and from where it originates. Charlie and Doug, for example, reflected upon the causes of the poverty that they witnessed in parts of Mexico rather than merely taking it for granted. Kelly and Elizabeth understood that the media represents issues through an American-centric lens that filters information. Selina recognized that her understandings of certain parts of the world were limited by her lack of travel to and interaction with people from these places. Thus, these teachers' experiences and words both reflect and critically examine colonialist and neocolonialist discourses. Their worldviews, therefore, are evolving constructs as these teachers continuously negotiate meanings of discourses to which they are subjected (Blumer, 1986).

The constant negotiations of meaning that these teachers experience as they try to make sense of the world is further illustrated by their views of American exceptionalism and the role of the United States in the 21st century. While these teachers largely challenged the idea of American exceptionalism in describing what the term means to them, they used American exceptionalist discourse, at times, when discussing the role of the United States in the 21st century. Many of these teachers believed the United States to be a dominant world power whose status is being challenged by the “rise of the Rest.” While they disagreed that the United States was “better” than other countries, they expressed unease when discussing the possibility that the United States would lose its paramount global position. Thus, they largely resisted the rhetoric of American exceptionalism that upholds United States’ global superiority, but perhaps also internalized the idea. For instance, a number of the teachers in this study isolated ideas such as “freedom,” “democracy,” and “rights” as exceptional ideas that should be universal. They support Said’s (1993) argument that in the American view of the past, the United States is a “righter of wrongs” around the world, pursuing tyranny and defending freedom (p. 5). They perceive the global position of the United States as being challenged, suggesting that they view the United States in a dominant position to be challenged. In other words, their language expresses displeasure with the negative associations of American exceptionalism, but their worldview is shaped by decades of such rhetoric that allows these teachers to understand the United States as the global hegemon, for good and for bad.

Chapter Five of this dissertation focused on the second research question: How do secondary social studies teachers' understandings of global education impact their teaching practices? I explored the meanings and purposes these teachers ascribed to global education and investigated to what extent they implemented global elements into their teaching practices. In

addition, I discussed the challenges these teachers identify in incorporating global perspectives in their teaching.

Teachers in this study viewed the purposes of global education in both philosophical and practical terms. Some cited philosophical reasons for global education at the micro, individual level, believing that global education makes individuals more open-minded, “tolerant,” and well rounded. But their words revealed a privileging of the white, mainstream, middle class American student. They suggested that global education serves to benefit individual students, but really meant white middle class students rather than all students. They also cited practical purposes of global education at the micro-level, suggesting, for example, that learning about the world will make students from the United States more competitive in a global marketplace and acquire skills to interact with people different from themselves. But, again, the implication remains that it is the white middle class student who benefits most from global education. It is the Other who is different and must be learned about in order to enrich white American students’ development.

But these teachers also noted the need for global education at the macro-level in terms of creating a more cooperative, peaceful world. Some educators wanted global education to promote cross-cultural understanding, perspectives consciousness, and conceptions of the world as an interconnected system in order to make the world a better place. Many of these teachers, for example, spoke about critically analyzing global inequalities in order to act in socially conscious ways. They also discussed the danger of cultural intolerance as a cause of global conflict and see their role as teachers to challenge such views. Thus, these findings reflect issues within the field of global education itself, which faces conflicting ideas of its purposes (Pike, 2008). On the one hand, global education is important to develop global citizens. But on the

other, global education serves to benefit American students and create competitive advantages for them. This latter belief exemplifies the persistence of neoimperialist sentiment even within the field of global education itself (Pike, 2008).

Despite not having formal preparation in global education or providing a coherent definition of the term, teachers exhibited some elements of global education in their teaching of global history. These elements included local/global connections, prejudice reduction and attention to inequalities, perspectives consciousness, and cross-cultural awareness. The inclusion of such elements suggests that these aspects of global education are part of social studies education as a whole and are integral elements to how these teachers think about the world and approach the teaching of global history. They are not merely tacked on to an already arguably overloaded curriculum. But the inclusion of such elements remains uneven among these teachers. For example, many spoke about using different perspectives when studying history, relying on first hand accounts and resources provided for by textbook companies. But it remained unclear to what extent they use current resources from perspectives outside of the United States. Some teachers noted that such resources were difficult to locate or for students to understand. Other teachers, for example, continued to use colonialist language (the “native point of view”) in their descriptions of how they teach about imperialism, despite acknowledging the importance of incorporating different perspectives into this unit of study. In other words, their own fundamental perspectives on this topic remain rooted in colonialist discourses and understandings. Only Elizabeth questioned the perspectives inherent in the curriculum itself, noting that what is taught is often “from the perspective of what we think is important to other countries.”

Out of all of the elements of global education, these teachers perceived cross-cultural

awareness as the most important global element of their teaching. They all believed that fostering cross-cultural awareness and understanding was a primary goal in teaching about global history. However, almost none of the teachers engaged in cross-cultural communication activities with people in other countries, but recognized that the changing demographics within American public schools and society at large made cross-cultural sensitivity more important than ever. Cheryl, for example, hailed her school's Festival of Nations as a great way to showcase the many cultures in the district, not recognizing the problematic nature of such festivals as reinforcing superficial cultural representations. Furthermore, many teachers described moments within their own classrooms that singled out transnational students, English Language Learners, or students from religious minorities, particularly the Muslim students, to act as cultural ambassadors to the white middle class majority. Cross-cultural opportunities were decidedly one-way in these teachers' descriptions. Additionally, many of the teachers believed cross-cultural awareness would foster "tolerance," perhaps equating the term with "acceptance," but not interrogating the true meaning of the word as one that means merely "putting up with" difference. Only a few of the teachers spoke about students' communicating directly with people from other countries in a cross-cultural fashion, by using pen pal exchanges or Skype conversations, for example. Some teachers did utilize members of the larger community as volunteer guest speakers who engaged in cultural dialogues with students. But for the most part, cross-cultural communication opportunities, despite being highly valued by these teachers, remained limited and/or problematic.

Finally, teachers in this study spoke at great length about the challenges they perceived to the inclusion of global perspectives in their teaching, including state mandates such as Regents exams, teacher evaluation systems, Common Core requirements and lack of time. Like teachers

studied in Grant, et. al. (2002), most of these teachers expressed frustration with the perceived disconnect in what the Regents exam emphasizes and what state standards and Common Core require. Furthermore, given the high stakes nature of the Regents exam in Global History and its connection with new teacher evaluation systems, the Regents exam greatly impacted the content and skills these teachers emphasized in the classroom. To many of these teachers, superficial “mentioning” of historical facts and knowledge replaced in depth, substantive investigations of global issues and content. These teachers did not necessarily view state mandates themselves, particularly the emphasis on a high stakes Regents exam tied to teacher evaluation scores, as preparing students for a 21st century global education. Indeed, two recent studies support the assertion that state mandated testing, time constraints, and lack of professional development present challenges to global education even within districts committed to such initiatives (Kilpatrick, 2010; McCarthy, 2011).

However, some of the teachers in this study tried to resist the “teach to the test” syndrome by trying new ways of instruction, such as flipping the classroom, or using inquiry-based projects despite the time involved with such activities. They made curricular and pedagogical decisions that allowed for more opportunities to infuse global perspectives into their teaching. Nevertheless, based upon the degree to which they spoke about the challenges to global education in their teaching, all of these teachers expressed frustration and a tension between state mandates and what they viewed as quality teaching. In other words, while they expressed a desire to teach more “globally,” out of necessity, their primary focus remained on teaching according to state mandates within communities that may or may not be globally aware themselves, thereby perpetuating the superficial nature of global understanding among many people within the United States.

Limitations and Next Steps in the Field

This study was limited to secondary Global History and Geography teachers in New York State. Although the examination of global perspectives in teaching is important among all disciplines, including the teaching of United States history, I chose to limit my study to teachers who teach the global history curriculum given its inherent focus on world history and geography. I also limited this study to teachers, rather than students, because I was particularly interested in how teachers make sense of the subject matter they are teaching rather than the views of the students in this regard. Furthermore, while elementary teachers in New York state also teach social studies, including the studies world communities and studies of Eastern and Western hemispheres curriculum in grades three, five, and six respectively, secondary social studies teachers' subject matter background is solely in the social sciences and, therefore, more exclusive for the purposes of this study. Additionally, for practical and logistical reasons, I studied only social studies teachers in New York State rather than those in other geographic regions.

Another consideration of this study is the limited number of potential participants and the number of interviews for each. I understand that a small amount of time spent interviewing and observing participants does not necessarily foster a relationship. However, it was not my intention to make generalizations based on the data, nor are generalizations the goal of qualitative research. As Karp (1996) asserts, "One does not need huge sample sizes to discover underlying and repeating forms of social life that, once described, offer new levels of insight for people" (p. 202). Rather, I am interested in, as Bogdan and Biklen (2007) state, "enlarging the conception of the phenomena under study" (p. 36). The conclusions of this study must be understood in the context of the study. Yet they serve to illuminate the larger field of global education and teaching practice (Willis, et. al, 2007). Thus, broadening the understandings in the

field, rather than generalizability, was the goal of this dissertation.

To take this research further, more studies could investigate social studies teachers' global understandings, particularly those from states in which global history or global studies are not mandated courses. It would be interesting to investigate how history teachers in Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, or other states with conservative resistance to newer frameworks of history make sense of the world and global history. Likewise, a comparative study of such teachers with teachers in New York State could perhaps discern whether or not the content of the curriculum contributes to global awareness.

More importantly, more studies need to address social studies teachers in relation to transnational students and/or English Language Learners, particularly in how social studies content is understood or conveyed to students from different countries living in the United States and attending American schools. While research in relation to teaching English Language Learners and/or transnational students continues to grow, there remains more work to be done in relation to the content of history and such students, and the impact that cultural and national perspectives have on the understanding of social studies taught in United States schools. This would include a critical analysis of the curriculum itself, examining ways in which colonialist and/or neocolonialist/neoimperialist persist within the curriculum itself based upon the perspectives of those who contribute to its development.

Finally, the aim of this study was not to examine the cultural sensitivity of teachers, by using measures of cross-cultural awareness, for example. But it would be interesting to further investigate the ways in which cultural awareness is taught by teachers who have very little intercultural experience. Most intercultural and cross-cultural education, for example, amounts to feel-good, superficial investigations of stereotypical cultural practices or utopian heralding of

equality, difference-blindness, and cosmopolitanism. Teachers, in short, do not teach cross-cultural competence well, in part because they do not possess it themselves. As sociologist Milton Bennett (1993) explains, "Intercultural sensitivity is not natural. It is not part of our primate past, nor has it characterized most of human history... The continuation of this pattern in today's world of unimagined interdependence is not just immoral or unprofitable – it is self-destructive" (p. 21). At the same time, as Grossberg (1993) argues, "people cannot be successfully changed if one begins by telling them that their deepest beliefs and investments are mistaken... we must begin where people already are if we want to move them somewhere else" (p. 99). How are practitioners to do that? I suggest that we begin by decolonizing the frameworks to which social studies education, and by extension teacher education, have clung.

Implications and Recommendations: Decolonizing Social Studies and Global Education

This study attempted to illuminate the field of social studies education by examining global history teachers' understandings and practices in relation to the growing field of global education. From this research, I offer four recommendations in areas that may help to encourage global education and create more globally aware teachers and students. These areas include teacher preparation programs, school districts, state mandates, and the social studies curriculum itself.

As this small study demonstrates, and other studies support, many in-service social studies teachers lack any formal preparation in global education, teaching transnational and ELL student populations, and/or culturally relevant pedagogy (Cho & Reich, 2008; O'Brien, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Calir, 1995). Furthermore, many have a limited background in living among ethnically and culturally diverse populations or experience with foreign travel that may contribute to global awareness (Merryfield, 2000; Gay, 2002). As such, teacher preparation programs throughout the

United States need to address the movement toward global education, as directed by state and national initiatives, by training pre-service teachers in areas of global education, international education, and culturally relevant teaching.

Colleges and universities, as gatekeepers of new generations of teachers, need to implement required study abroad and foreign language opportunities. These opportunities should be substantive and meaningful, focused on cultural and linguistic immersion rather than merely travel programs in which American students live and study together in cultural isolation. Likewise, colleges should ensure that future educators take coursework responding to twenty-first century education needs. Such teacher preparation would include an interdisciplinary knowledge base with coursework in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences to develop a substantive awareness of global issues, events, and challenges (Roberts, 2007). Furthermore, higher education must do more to address issues of privilege within national and global contexts. Pre-service teachers in all subject areas need required training in culturally relevant pedagogy, multicultural education, and global education that examines issues of inequalities, social justice, and interdependence. Yet such conversations should not be confined to students in education programs. Colleges and universities have an obligation to address such issues universally by fostering cross-cultural dialogue, hiring more international faculty and administrators and/or people of color, creating opportunities for international collaboration in all fields of study, and committing to a mission that prepares graduates for an increasingly interdependent and global future.

Additionally, teacher preparation programs in higher education need to reach out to school districts and share resources to help train in-service teachers in such areas. After all, many in-service teachers may have been completed their education training before the twenty-first

century even began. Forces of globalization, technology, and media will continue to create a need for globally aware and culturally sensitive educators who may then, hopefully, transfer their skills and knowledge into creating more globally and culturally aware students. A number of colleges and universities are making global education a priority in their teacher education programs. Ohio State University, Florida International University, and American University are a few of the increasing number of higher education institutions that offer programs in global education and have outreach programs with local school districts to offer resources, professional development, and content expertise in all facets of global education. Thus, colleges and universities can act as facilitators of global education implementation themselves, as well as for school districts

Yet the movement toward global education also needs to be supported by school districts themselves. The discipline of social studies alone cannot singlehandedly create globally aware students. Successful global education involves commitment at the classroom, school, district, and community levels together. It involves substantive cross-cultural communication opportunities, critical investigations of global issues across disciplines, valuation of transnational student populations, and continuous reinforcement of global education by district leaders.

For districts truly committed to global education, financial resources are put toward professional development for all teachers in areas of global education, cross-cultural awareness, teaching transnational students, critical pedagogy and others. Districts also put money and resources toward study abroad opportunities, field trips, or other opportunities for cross-cultural learning. They assist teachers in finding resources from other countries and time to create meaningful, inquiry-based, global lessons that develop students' worldviews. Furthermore, they mandate and support foreign language, social studies, and global education in the elementary

grades so that students develop global awareness from an earlier age. The Boston Public School District, for example, has a department of global education that supports schools, teachers, and students in developing programs and implementing travel abroad opportunities, student exchanges, study tours, language immersion programs, and service learning for all of their students. Similarly, the Poudre School District in Colorado includes a number of schools committed to global education as elementary IB (International Baccalaureate) schools or as global academies, and the Asia Society facilitates over thirty public schools throughout the United States, including one in Rochester, New York, committed to developing globally competent, college ready students. But as importantly as being committed to establishing global education within their districts, district leaders must also confront and challenge the mandates that create major obstacles for true global education.

As the teachers in this study unanimously argued, current state mandates that emphasize standardized testing, rigid requirements, and an overloaded curriculum create major challenges to the implementation of global education elements in teaching. State leaders need to seriously re-examine the Regents exam in Global History and Geography to determine its alignment to the state standards they, themselves, created. By changing the Regents assessment to one that measures students' ability to reason, think critically, and examine key themes rather than discrete facts (which are key aspects of the current standards), state leaders may, by extension, allow teachers the flexibility to implement a globally aware curriculum. Rather than worry about "covering material" in preparation for a high-stakes test, social studies teachers will be able to create more lessons that incorporate substantive global education elements, such as cross-cultural opportunities, critical analysis of global perspectives, inquiry-based projects about global issues, and others.

Happily, such revisions to the Global History and Geography Regents exam are currently being explored by the New York State Department of Education. The revised Global History Regents exam will likely have three main sections: a stimuli based multiple-choice question section, constructed response items with short answer responses, and a document-based essay related to an enduring global issue. Such revisions aim to target both global history content, but also critical-thinking and other social studies skills as addressed in the Framework (EngageNY, 2015). But even with these structural changes to the Regents exam, the curriculum itself needs to be re-examined in the context of a twenty-first century global society.

Thus, the final recommendation is in the area of social studies education itself. Social studies education is arguably at a pivotal moment in education. Either curriculum developers and practitioners continue the metanarrative of history that has been largely unchanged in the past forty years and be complicit in the perpetuation of American exceptionalist discourse and neocolonial ideas and understandings, or challenge them with a reframing of social studies, one that is decolonizing and global in its approach. A decolonizing and postcolonial perspective in global and social studies education attempts to correct the lies, distortions, and omissions spread by Western ethnocentrism and American exceptionalism. It challenges the negative legacies of colonialism and interrogates their continuation via neocolonial practices (Merryfield & Subedi, 2006; Coulby, 2006; Hickling-Hudson & Alquist, 2004). According to Merryfield and Subedi (2006), decolonizing the mind takes place when, "people become conscious of how oppressors force their world views into oppressed people's lives in such ways that even in later generations people may never realize that their ideas and choices are affected by colonialist or neo-colonialist perspectives" (p. 287). This idea is a difficult proposition; it challenges the core orthodoxies in Western practices of education (Smith, 1999). But these practices must be confronted. The

social studies that is taught in schools can either reproduce or begin to break down "overlapping patterns of cultural, economic, and political exploitation" (Coulby, 2006). Ironically, it is only through education, despite its complicity with American exceptionalist and Eurocentric discourses and practices, that it is possible to interrogate and challenge colonialism's legacy.

Achieving a decolonization of the curriculum will be challenging. As Said (1993) notes, "It is more rewarding – and more difficult – to think concretely and sympathetically, contrapuntally, about others than only about 'us'. But this also means not trying to rule others, not trying to classify them or put them into hierarchies, above all, not constantly reiterating how 'our' culture or country is number one" (p. 336). Similarly, Blaney (2002) urges educators to challenge their students to reexamine their own positions of privilege and cultural superiority and to focus on their role as global actors. Interrogating ideas of privilege, socioeconomic dominance, and discourses of power is difficult. But if social studies education is to meet the goals set forth by the Common Core Standards and Twenty-first Century Skills Initiative, and if teachers are to interact more effectively with increasing numbers of students from other cultures, truly appreciating the histories and potential of the students who sit before them, then these interrogations are crucial. As Willinsky (1998) says, "Students have a right to see what the West, and its proud process of education, has made of them, even as this knowledge is bound to complicate and implicate their education" (p. 247). We must educate our teachers, and by extension our students, to challenge current ways of thinking about the world and to explore the deep divisions still inherent within global systems, examining how differences are constructed and taught. Only then can educators and students become more globally aware.

Appendix A

School District Information

| School and Grade Levels | Teacher Participant(s) | School Setting | Number of Students in School/Main Ethnicities | Number of Students in School with Free/Reduced Lunch | Number of Students in District | Number of ELL Students in District |
|---|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| North Upstate Junior High Grades 8/9 | Charlie Kelly | Large Suburban | 1,483 White: 1,304 Black: 61 Latino: 35 Asian: 23 | 422 | 9,239 | 95 |
| East Upstate High School Grades 9-12 | Mike Cheryl | Fringe Suburban | 1,075 White: 947 Black: 49 Latino: 16 Asian: 29 | 239 | 3,544 | 57 |
| West Upstate High School Grades 9-12 | Elizabeth | Large Suburban | 1,370 White: 1,266 Black 29 Latino: 23 Asian: 20 | 209 | 5,643 | 17 |
| South Upstate Junior/Senior High School Grades 7-12 | Doug | Fringe Rural | 406 White: 351 Black: 27 Latino: 9 Asian: 0 | 137 | 902 | 9 |
| Miller High School Grades 9-12 | Andrea Selina | Mid-Size Urban | 1,173 White: 255 Black: 471 Latino: 233 Asian: 186 | 953 | 20,622 | 2,674 |

Information acquired via the National Center for Education Statistics, located within the U.S. Department of Education and the Institute of Education Sciences.

Appendix B

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Describe your family background.
2. How did you become interested in social studies education?
3. Describe any cross-cultural experiences you have had.
4. Describe your thoughts about the current Global History and Geography course.
5. Describe how you learn or have learned the content that is taught in the Global History and Geography course.
6. What sources of information do you consult to learn more about global issues?
7. Explain what the term "global education" means to you.
8. In your view, what is the purpose of global education?
9. Discuss your own global awareness.
10. What are your thoughts on the term "American exceptionalism"?
11. Describe your philosophy in teaching social studies.
12. What are your goals in teaching global history to your students?
13. Describe how you choose which resources to use in your global history classroom.
14. Describe a typical global history lesson.
15. To what extent do you use multiple perspectives in teaching students global history?
16. To what extent do you use cross-cultural opportunities in teaching students global history?
17. What challenges, if any, do you perceive in implementing global education?
18. Describe your experiences with immigrant students.

Appendix C

Email Recruitment Message

I am a PhD candidate at Syracuse University beginning research for my dissertation study. I am in the process of recruiting subjects for my study and wonder if you might be interested in participating. In particular, I need current global history teachers (9th and 10th grade) for interview and possible observation. Your participation would involve being interviewed two or three times throughout the course of the school year for approximately one hour per interview. It may also involve you being observed a few times throughout the school year during a global history class in session.

If you would be willing to participate in this study, or have further questions or concerns regarding this request, feel free to contact me at 315-xxx-xxxx or via email.

Thank you very much in advance for your consideration of this request.

Ardyth Watson
PhD Candidate in Teaching and Curriculum
Syracuse University

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form: Interview

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING AND LEADERSHIP
150 HUNTINGTON HALL
315.443.2685

Doctoral Dissertation: Secondary Social Studies Teachers' Understandings of Global Education

My name is Ardyth Watson, and I am a doctoral student at Syracuse University. I am inviting you to participate in a research study. Involvement in the study is voluntary, so you may choose to participate or not. This sheet will explain the study to you. Please feel free to ask questions about the research if you have any. I will be happy to explain anything in detail if you wish.

I am interested in learning more about how you understand and teach global history and global education. You will be asked to be interviewed two or three times. This will take approximately two or three hours total. All information will be kept confidential. I will assign a number to your responses, and only my dissertation committee and I will have the key to indicate which number belongs to which participant. Furthermore, in any articles I write or any presentations that I make, I will use a made-up name for you, and I will not reveal details or I will change details about where you work.

For the purposes of data collection, I wish to record your responses using an audio recording device during the interview. This recording will only be used for data transcription and analysis. Upon completion of the study, data will be erased.

If you do not want to take part, you have the right to refuse to take part, without penalty. If you decide to take part and later no longer wish to continue, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

If you have any questions, concerns, complaints about the research, contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Mangram at jamangra@syr.edu or 315-443-2685. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at 315-443-3013.

All of my questions have been answered, I am 18 years of age or older, and I wish to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this consent form.

I agree to be audio recorded

I do not agree to be audio recorded

Signature of participant

Date

Printed name of participant

Signature of researcher

Date

Printed name of researcher

Appendix E

Informed Consent Form: Observation

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING AND LEADERSHIP
150 HUNTINGTON HALL
315.443.2685

Doctoral Dissertation: Secondary Social Studies Teachers' Understandings of Global Education

My name is Ardyth Watson, and I am a doctoral student at Syracuse University. I am inviting you to participate in a research study. Involvement in the study is voluntary, so you may choose to participate or not. This sheet will explain the study to you. Please feel free to ask questions about the research if you have any. I will be happy to explain anything in detail if you wish.

I am interested in learning more about how you understand and teach global history and global education. You will be asked to be observed about one or two times. Each observation will last one class period. All information will be kept confidential. I will assign a number to your observation notes, and only my dissertation committee and I will have access to the notes from the observation. Furthermore, in any articles I write or any presentations that I make, I will use a made-up name for you, and I will not reveal details or I will change details about where you work.

For the purposes of data collection, I will be taking notes during the observations. Upon completion of the study, data will be thrown away.

If you do not want to take part, you have the right to refuse to take part, without penalty. If you decide to take part and later no longer wish to continue, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

If you have any questions, concerns, complaints about the research, contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Mangram at jamangra@syr.edu or 315-443-2685. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at 315-443-3013.

All of my questions have been answered, I am 18 years of age or older, and I wish to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature of participant _____
Date

Printed name of participant

Signature of researcher _____
Date

Printed name of researcher

Appendix F

Principal Notification Letter

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING AND LEADERSHIP
150 HUNTINGTON HALL
315.443.2685

Dear Principal:

My name is Ardyth Watson, and I am a doctoral student at Syracuse University. I am conducting research for my dissertation that involves classroom observations and interviews of global history teachers. This letter will explain the study to you.

I am interested in learning more about how secondary social studies teachers understand and teach global history and global education. This study will focus only on global history teachers; I do not plan to take notes about children in the school. Teachers will be interviewed two or three times and possibly observed at least once. Each observation will last one class period. All information will be kept confidential. While the focus of the study is on teachers, I will be observing the teacher's interactions with students in the classroom. While I am conducting observations, I will be taking notes on what I observe. Only my dissertation committee and I will have access to the notes from the observation. Furthermore, in any articles I write or any presentations that I make, I will use pseudonyms for all people I observe, and I will not reveal details or I will change details about the school. Upon completion of the study, data will be thrown away.

Please be advised that while the risks to participants are minimal, they may include unintentional disclosure of identifying characteristics. However, pseudonyms will be used in the dissertation and any subsequent articles or presentations to reduce this risk. The benefits of this research may include opportunities for teachers to reflect upon their teaching practices and philosophies. This research likewise aims to inform social studies education of the ways social studies teachers understand and implement global education practices. Information obtained from this study will hopefully enrich our current understandings of education in light of Common Core requirements and other current initiatives in education.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Mangram at jamangra@syr.edu or 315-443-2685. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at 315-443-3013.

Sincerely,

Ardyth L. Watson

References

- Abdullahi, S. (2003, April 26). *Teachers' knowledge, awareness, and pedagogy of global education in secondary schools*. Proceedings of Supporting Interdisciplinary Inquiry: College of Education Research Conference. Florida International University.
- Adler, P. & Adler, P. (1987). *Membership Roles in Field Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Alger, C. & Harf, J. (1985). Global education: Why? For whom? About what? Paper commissioned by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for the Guidelines for International Teacher Education Project. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Altheide, D.S. & Johnson, J.M. (1994). Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research, in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M. (2011). *Interpreting Interviews*. London: SAGE Publications.
- American Forum for Global Education. (2002). Global Education Checklist. Retrieved from <http://www.globaled.org>.
- American Statistical Association. (2014). ASA Statement on Using Value Added Models for Educational Assessment. Executive Summary.
- Anderson, C. (1982). Global education in the classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 21(3), 168-176.
- Anderson, L. (1990). A rationale for global education. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action* (p. 125-142). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. (2002). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J. Gubrium and J. Holsten (Eds.), *The Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Avery, P. (2004). Social Studies Teacher Education in an Era of Globalization. In S. Adler (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Social Studies Teacher Education*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- Baker, E., Barton, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H., Linn, R., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Shavelson, R., & Shepard, L. (2010). Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers. Briefing Paper #278. Economic Policy Institute.
- Bandyopadhyay, R. & Morais, D. (2005). Representative dissonance: India's self and Western image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1006-1021.
- Banks, J. (1994). *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice*. Third Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 5-16.
- Banks, J. (2007). *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, Second Edition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Batey, J. & Lupi, M. (2012). Reflections on student interns' cultural awareness developed through a short-term international internship. *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 39(3), 25-44.
- Becker, H. and Geer, B. (1957). Participant Observation and Interviewing: A comparison. *Human Organization*. 16, 28-32.
- Benitez, H. (2001). Does it really matter how we teach? The socializing effects of a globalized U.S. history curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29 (2), 290-307.
- Bennett, M. (1993). Towards Ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural

- sensitivity. In R.M. Paige, Ed. *Education for the Intercultural Experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Blaut, J. (1993). *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Blaney, D. (2002). Global education, disempowerment, and curricula for a world politics. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6 (3), 268-282.
- Blumer, H. (1986). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. University of California Press.
- Bogdan, R. (1972). *Participant Observation in Organizational Settings*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative Research for Education*. Fifth Edition. Boston: Pearson.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Boorstin, D. (2012). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing.
- Boser, U. (2014, May 4). Teacher diversity revisited. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/report/2014/05/04/88962/teacher-diversity-revisited/>
- Boston, J.A. (1997). Professional development in global education. In M. Merryfield (Ed.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators* (pp.168-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Brewer, P., Graf, J., & Willnat, L. (2003). Media influence on attitudes toward foreign countries. *International Communication Gazette*, 65(6), 493-508.
- Bryan, A. & Vavrus, F. (2005). The promise and peril of education: the teaching of in/tolerance in an era of globalisation. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*, 3(2), 183-202.
- Buehrer, E. (1990). *The New Age Masquerade*. Berentword, TN: Wolgemeith and Hyatt.
- Burack, J. (2003). The student, the world, and the global education ideology. In J. Leming, L. Ellington, & K. Porter (Eds.), *Where Did Social Studies Go Wrong?* Washington: Fordham Foundation.
- Carignan, N., Sanders, M., Pourdavood, R. (2008). Racism and ethnocentrism: Social representations of preservice teachers in the context of multi- and intercultural education. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 4(3), 1-19.
- Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57 (6), 318-325.
- Cavanaugh, E. & Veracini, L. (2013). Editor's Statement. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3(1), 1.
- Center on Educational Policy. (2007). *Choices, Changes, Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era*. Washington, DC: Center on Educational Policy.
- Charon, J.M. (2007). *Symbolic Interactionism: An introduction, an interpretation, an integration* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Clarke, V. (2004). Students' global awareness and attitudes to internationalism in a world of cultural convergence. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 3(1), 51-70.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards>.
- Cornwell, D. & Roberts, B. (2010). *The 9/11 Terrorist Attack and Overseas Travel to the United States: Initial Impacts and Longer Run Recovery*. United States Department of

- Homeland Security Working Paper. Retrieved from
https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/ois_ni_911_wp.pdf
- Coulby, D. (2006). Intercultural education: theory and practice. *Intercultural Education*, 17(3), 245-257.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2006). Global Education Policy Statement.
- Crowley, V. (1999). Towards a postcolonial curriculum for the new millennium. In Johnson, B. & Reid, A., (Eds.). *Contesting the Curriculum*. Sydney, Australia: Social Science Press, 100-111.
- Cunningham, G. (1986). Blowing the whistle on global education. Report of U.S. Department of Education Region VII Office Denver, CO.
- Cushner, K. (2007). The role of experience in the making of internationally-minded teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 27-39.
- Cushner, K. & Mahon, J. (2002). Overseas student teaching: Affecting personal, professional, and global competencies in an age of globalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(1), 44-58.
- Darling Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8-15.
- Delpit, L. (2006). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- DeMott, B. (2011). Sure, We're all just one big happy family. In Ivery, C. & Bassett, J. (Eds.), *America's Urban Crisis and the Advent of Color-Blind Politics: Education, Incarceration, Segregation, and the Future of U.S. Multiracial Democracy* (pp. 36-41). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- DeTocqueville, A. (2003). *Democracy in America*. London: Penguin.
- Deutscher, I. (1973). *What We Say/What We Do*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- DeVault, M. & McCoy, L. (2002). Institutional Ethnography: Using interviews to investigate ruling relations. In J. Gubrium and J. Holsten (Eds.), *The Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- De-Velasco, R. & Fix, M. (2000). Overlooked and Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools. *Urban Institute* 12-13. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/overlooked.pdf>.
- DeWitt, S., Patterson, N., Blankenship, W., Blevins, B., DiCamillo, L., Gerwin, D., Gradwell, J., Gunn, J., Maddox, L., Salinas, C., Saye, J., Stoddard, J., & Sullivan, C. (2013). The lower-order expectations of high-stakes tests: A four-state analysis of social studies standards and test alignment. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 41(3), 382-427.
- Dowling, R. (2005). Power, subjectivity, and ethics in qualitative research. In Iian Hay (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. 2nd Edition. Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenhart, M. & Howe, K. (1992). Validity in Educational Research. In LeCompte, M., Millroy, W. & Preissle, J. (eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- el-Aswad, e. (2013). Images of Muslims in Western scholarship and media after 9/11. *Digest of Middle East Studies*, 22(1), 39-56.
- Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- EngageNY. (2015). Global History and Geography Regents Exam Development Survey.

- Retrieved from <https://www.engageny.org/content/global-history-and-geography-regents-exam-development-survey>.
- Evans, M. (2010). Framing international conflicts: Media coverage of fighting in the Middle East. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 6(2), 209-233.
- Fickel, L.H. (2000). Democracy is messy: Exploring the beliefs and personal theories of a high school social studies teacher. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 28(3), 359-389.
- Fitchett, P. & Heafner, T. (2010). A National Perspective on the Effects of High-Stakes Testing and Standardization on Elementary Social Studies Marginalization. *Theory & Research in Social Education* 38,(1), 14–30.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Friedman, T. (2007). *The world is flat 3.0: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Picador.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Gaudelli, W. (2003). *World class: Teaching and learning in global times*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gorski, P. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education.

- Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 515-525.
- Goulah, J. (2009). Navigating identity reformation, marginalization, and 'soft' colonization in former Soviet immigrant students. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8, 159-173.
- Grant, S.G., Derme-Insinna, A., Gradwell, J., Pullano, L., Lauricella, A., & Tzetzso, K. (2002). When increasing stakes need not mean increasing standards: The case of the New York Global History and Geography exam. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(4), 488-515.
- Grant, C. & Portera, A., (Eds.). (2011). *Intercultural and Multicultural Education: Enhancing Global Interconnectedness*. New York: Routledge.
- Grant, S.G., Derme-Insinna, A., Gradwell, J., Lauricella, A., Pullano, L., & Tzetzso, K. (2002). Juggling two sets of books: A teacher responds to the New York State Global History exam. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 17(3), 232-255.
- Grossberg, L. (1993). Cultural studies and/in new worlds. In McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W., eds. *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. (2003). *Inside Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. (2002). From the individual interview to the interview society. In J. Gubrium and J. Holsten (eds.), *The Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Habermas, J. (1994). National Unification and Popular Sovereignty. *New Left Review*, 219, 3-21.
- Hahn, C. (2001). Democratic understanding: Cross-national perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 40(1), 14-22.
- Hahn, C. (2001). Democratic understanding: Cross-national perspectives. *Theory into Practice*,

40(1), 14-22.

Hall, S. (1992). *Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1992). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *The formations of modernity: Understanding modern societies an introduction book 1* (p. 275-333). Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Open University.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage Publications.

Hanvey, R. (1976). An attainable global perspective. *The American Forum for Global Education*.

Harris, E. (2015, April 1) Cuomo gets deals on tenure and evaluations of teachers. *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/01/nyregion/cuomo-gets-deals-on-tenure-and-evaluations-of-teachers.html?_r=0

Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: A reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review*, 55 (3), 265-275.

Hickling-Hudson, A. (2003). Multicultural education and the postcolonial turn. *Policy Features in Education*, 1(2), 381-401.

Hickling-Hudson, A. (1999). Globalisation, postcolonialism, and educational change. In Meadmore, D., Burnett, B., and O'Brien, P. eds. *Understanding Education: Contexts and Change for the New Millennium*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.

- Hickling-Hudson, A. & Ahlquist, R. (2004). The challenge to deculturalisation: Discourses of ethnicity in the schooling of indigenous children in Australia and the USA. In A. Hickling-Hudson, et al, eds. *Disrupting Preconceptions: Postcolonialism in Education*. Queensland, Australia: Post Pressed.
- Hickling-Hudson, A., Matthews, J., & Woods, A. (2004). Education, postcolonialism, and disruptions. In A. Hickling-Hudson, et al, eds. *Disrupting Preconceptions: Postcolonialism in Education*. Queensland, Australia: Post Pressed.
- Hill-Anderson, B., Harrison, A., & Tardino, A. (2012). Keeping Social Studies Alive in the Elementary Classroom. *Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies*, 73 (2), 1-11.
- Holm, G., & Farber, P. (2002). Teaching in the dark: The geopolitical knowledge and global awareness of the next generation of American teachers. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 12(2), 129-144.
- Howard, G. (2006). *We Can't Teach What We Don't Know: White Teachers, Multiracial Schools*, 2nd edition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jackson, L. (2010). Images of Islam in US media and their educational implications. *Educational Studies*, 46(1), 3-24.
- Jansen, G. and Peshkin, A. (1992). Subjectivity in Qualitative Research. In LeCompte, M. Millroy, W. & Preissle, J. (eds.) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Johnson, J. (2013). *Latin America in Caricature*. University of Texas Press.
- Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education*, 118(2), 282-293.
- Jorgensen, D. (1989). *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies*. London:

Sage.

Joseph, G.G., Reddy, V., & Searle-Chatterjee, M. (1990). Eurocentrism in the social sciences.

Race and Class, 31(1), 1-26.

Karner, T. (1994). *Masculinity, Trauma, and Identity: Life Narratives of Vietnam Veterans with post Traumatic Stress Disorder*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Kansas.

Karp, D. (1996). *Speaking of sadness: Depression, disconnection, and the meanings of illness*.

Oxford University Press.

Kilpatrick, J.E. (2010). *Global Education in Massachusetts: A case study of two high schools*.

(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Boston University, Boston, MA.

Kirk, J. & Miller, M. (1986). *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks,

CA: SAGE.

Kirkwood, T. (2001). Our global age requires global education: Clarifying definitional

ambiguities. *The Social Studies*, 92(1), 10-15.

Klein, R. (2015, February 18). Oklahoma legislators move to push AP U.S. history courses out of schools. Huffington Post. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/18/oklahoma-ap-us-history_n_6702710.html.

Kniep, W. (1986). Social studies within a global education. *Social Education*, 50(7), 536-542.

Kucsera, J. & Orfield, G. (2014). New York State's extreme school segregation: Inequality, inaction, and a damaged future. Report by The Civil Rights Project. Retrieved from

<http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/ny-nor-flet-report-placeholder/Kucsera-New-York-Extreme-Segregation-2014.pdf>

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational*

Research, 70, 1, 25-53.

- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Education Research Journal*, 32, 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African-American Children*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lavigne, A. (2014). Exploring the Intended and Unintended Consequences of High-Stakes Teacher Evaluation on Schools, Teachers, and Students. *Teachers College Record*, 116(1).
- LeRoux, J. (2001). Re-examining global education's relevance beyond 2000. *Research in Education*, 65, 70-80.
- LeRoux, J. (2002). Effective educators are culturally competent communicators. *Intercultural Education*, 13(1), 37-48.
- Lipset, S.M. (1996). *American exceptionalism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Liu, D. (1998). Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 3-10.
- Loomba, A. (2005). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Madsen, D.L. (1998). *American exceptionalism*. Oxford: University Press of Mississippi.
- Mangram, J. & Watson, A. (2011). Us and Them: Social studies teachers' talk about global education. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), 95-116.
- Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents. (2008). Global Education: A Call to Action. Position Paper. Retrieved on from www.longviewfdn.org/files/34.pdf.

- Massachusetts Global Education Advisory Council. (2012). Council Statement. Retrieved from www.mass.edu/boe/sac/councils/global.html.
- Mauthner, N. & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Journal of Sociology*, 37(3), 413-431.
- Maxwell, J. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(3), 279-300.
- May, S. (1999) Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding essentialism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 11–41). London, England: Falmer Press.
- McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W., eds. (1993). *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- McCarthy, M. H. (2011). Superintendents' perceptions of the role and goal of global education in the 21st century and the ways superintendents shape programs and policies to implement global education: A case study of three Massachusetts superintendents and their K-12 districts. Unpublished dissertation. Boston College.
- McNeil, M. (2014, March 19). Race to top reports detail winners' progress, challenges. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/03/19/26rtt.h33.html>
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: The Orion Press.
- Merryfield, M.M. (1991). Preparing American secondary social studies teachers to teach with a global perspective: A status report. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 11-20.
- Merryfield, M.M. (1992). Preparing social studies teachers for the twenty-first century: Perspectives on program effectiveness from a study of six exemplary teacher education

- programs in global education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 20(1), 17-46.
- Merryfield, M. (1994). Shaping the curriculum in global education: The influence of student characteristics on teacher decision making. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 9(3), 233-249.
- Merryfield, M.M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.
- Merryfield, M.M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 429-443.
- Merryfield, M.M. (2001). Moving the center of global education: From imperial worldviews that divide the world to double consciousness, contrapuntal pedagogy, hybridity, and cross-cultural competence. In W.B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 179-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Merryfield, M. M. (2004). Elementary students in substantive culture learning. *Social Education*, 68(4), 270-274.
- Merryfield, M.M., Jarchow, E., Pickert, S. (1997). *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Merryfield, M. & Subedi, B. (2006). Decolonizing the mind for world-centered global education. In Ross, E.W., ed. *The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Merryfield, M. & Wilson, A. (2005). *Social Studies and the World: Teaching Global Perspectives*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Merton, R. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American*

- Journal of Sociology*, 78(1), 9-47.
- Miller, S.M. (1952). The Participant observer and "over-rapport". *American Sociological Review*, 17(1), 97-99.
- Mishler, E. (1979). Meaning in context: Is there any other kind? *Harvard Educational Review*, 49(1), 1-19.
- Morse, A. (2005). A look at immigrant youth: Prospects and Promises. Report by the National Conference of State Legislatures Children's Policy Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/a-look-at-immigrant-youth-prospects-and-promisin.aspx>
- Myers, G. (1995). The inscription of difference: News coverage of the conflicts in Rwanda and Bosnia. *Political Geography*, 15(1), 21-46.
- Myers, J. P. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for Global Citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370-394.
- Myers, J. & Zaman, H. (2009). Negotiating the global and national: Immigrant and dominant-culture adolescents' vocabularies of citizenship in a transnational world. *Teachers College Record*. 111(11), 2589-2625.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Search for Schools and Colleges. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/>.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2002). Frequently Asked Questions: Ask NCELA No. 14. Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/faq/14shortage.htm>

- National Commission on Asia in the Schools. (2001). *Asia in the Schools: Preparing Young Americans for Today's Interconnected World*. New York: Asia Society.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). *Curriculum Standards for Social Studies*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2001). Preparing Citizens for a Global Community. Retrieved from <http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/global>.
- National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). (2013). *The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards: Guidance for Enhancing the Rigor of K-12 Civics, Economics, Geography, and History*. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.
- National Geographic-Roper Public Affairs. (2006). Final Report: 2006 Geographic Literacy Survey. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalgeographic.com/roper2006/pdf/FINALReport2006GeogLitsurvey.pdf>
- Nealon, J. & Giroux, S. (2012). *The Theory Toolbox: Critical Concepts for the Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences*. Second Edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2009). Media and global divides: Representing the rise of the rest as threat. *Global Media and Communication*, 5(2), 221-237.
- Neville, H. (2008) Color-Blind racial ideology. *Encyclopedia of Counseling*, 1063-1065.
- New York Post*. (2012, April 11). Fears Regents exam will kill grad rates. Retrieved from <http://nypost.com/2012/04/11/fears-regents-exam-will-kill-grad-rates/>
- New York State Education Department. (2013). New York State Common Core Social Studies Framework Grades 9-12. Retrieved from <https://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/ss-framework-9-12.pdf>
- New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee. (1991). *One Nation, Many*

- Peoples: A Declaration of Cultural Interdependence*. Albany, NY: New York State Education Department.
- Nieto, S. (1994). Affirmation, solidarity, and critique: Moving beyond tolerance in multicultural education. *Multicultural Education*, 1(4), 9-12, 35-38.
- Nieto, S. (2002) Affirmation, solidarity and critique: Moving beyond tolerance in education. In E. Lee, D. Menkart, & M. Okazawa- Rey (Eds.), *Beyond heroes and holidays: A practical guide to K-12 anti-racist, multicultural education and staff development*. Washington, DC: Teaching for Change.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Noble, D.W. (2002). *Death of a nation: American culture and the end of exceptionalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Noddings, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nyambe, J. & Shipena, I. (1998). Global education on the threshold of a new millennium: The 21st century teacher for the new generation learner. *Reform Forum: Journal for Educational Reform in Namibia*, 7, 1-6.
- Office of Travel and Tourism Industries. (2014). U.S. Citizen Traffic to Overseas Regions, Canada, and Mexico. Research Report. Retrieved from <http://travel.trade.gov/view/m-2014-O-001/index.html>.
- Ohio Department of Education. (2009). Ohio Teachers Going Global. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov>.
- Olsen, C. & Kroeger, K. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of*

- Studies in International Education*, 5, 116-137.
- Omi, M. (2011). Color-Blindness, Racism, and Multiracial Democracy. In Ivery, C. & Bassett, J. (Eds.), *America's Urban Crisis and the Advent of Color-Blind Politics: Education, Incarceration, Segregation, and the Future of U.S. Multiracial Democracy* (pp. 24-30). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Ortloff, D. (2011). Moving the borders: multiculturalism and global citizenship in the German social studies classroom. *Educational Research*, 53(2), 137-149.
- Osunde, E. & Tlou, J. (1996). Persisting and common stereotypes in U.S. students' knowledge of Africa: A study of preservice social studies teachers. *Social Studies*, 87(3), 119-124.
- Otis, G., Chapman, B., & McShane, L. (2015, March 14). New York City is rife with underperforming schools. *New York Daily News*.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Retrieved from <http://www.p21.org>.
- Patton, M. (1980). *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. London: SAGE.
- Pence, H. & Macgillivray, I. (2008). The impact of an international field experience on preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 14-25.
- Perry, P. (2002). *Shades of White: White Kids and Racial Identity in High School*. North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Peshkin, A. (2000). The nature of interpretation in qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 29(9), 5-9.
- Pew Research Center (2003). *Views of a changing world: How global publics view war in Iraq, democracy, Islam and governance, globalization*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory into Practice*, 39(2), 64-73.

- Pike, G. (2008). Citizenship education in global context. *Brock Education*, 17(1), 38-49.
- Popkewitz, T. (1980). Global education as a slogan system. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10 (3), 303-316.
- Powell, R. (1996). Epistemological antecedents to culturally relevant and constructivist classroom curricula: A longitudinal study of teachers' contrasting worldviews. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(4), 365-384.
- Quashigah, A. & Wilson, A. (2001). A cross-national conversation about teaching from a global perspective: Issues of culture and power. *Theory into Practice*, 40 (1), 55-64.
- Quezada, R. L. (2010). Internationalization of teacher education: Creating global competent teachers and teacher educators for the twenty-first century. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 1-5.
- Rapoport, A. (2013). Global citizenship themes in the social studies classroom: Teaching devices and teacher attitudes. *The Educational Forum*, 77(4), 407-420.
- Ravitch, D. (2013, August 7). It started with No Child Left Behind. *New York Times*.
- Reimers, F. (2009). 'Global competency' is imperative for global success. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(21), A29.
- Reimers, F. (2010). Educating for global competency. In J. Cohen and M. Malin, eds. *International Perspectives on the Goals of Universal Basic and Secondary Education*. Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Reitan, E.A. (2015). Breadth vs. depth in the teaching of the survey course in world history. *The Social Studies*, 55(7), 261-264.
- Report of the Harvard College Curricular Review. (2004, April) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Faculty of Arts and Science Retrieved from

<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/home/news-and-notice/news/press-releases/release-archive/releases-2004/curricular-review-04262004.shtml>.

Riessman, C. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Rizvi, F.; Lingard, B.; & Lavia, J. (2006). Postcolonialism and education: negotiating a contested terrain. *Pedagogy, Culture, and Society*, 14(3), 249-262.

Roberts, A. (2007). Global dimensions of schooling: Implications for internationalizing teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 9-26.

Robinson, M.L. (2011). The difference between the articulation of globalization based upon global education implementation as measured by global competence of secondary principals in the United States. Unpublished dissertation. University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Sahin, M. (2008). Cross-cultural experience in preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(7), 1777-1790.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.

Samson, J. & Collins, B. (2012). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English Language Learners. Report issued by the Center for American Progress. Retrieved

from

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fn0VcOdu1vj9ifFfLUGDrkKapL75pPVEl6vtKrEd4/>

Schafly, P. (1986). What is wrong with global education? *St. Louis Globe Democrat* (March 6, 1986), 23.

Schukar, R. (1993). Controversy in global education: Lessons for teacher educators. *Theory into*

- Practice*, 32(1), 52-57.
- Scott, M. (2009). Marginalized, negative, or trivial? Coverage of Africa in the UK press. *Media, Culture and Society*, 31, 533-557.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Singer, A. (2014, July 7). Are math teachers really better than social studies teachers? Everything depends on the “cut” score. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-singer/are-math-teachers-really-_b_5563549.html
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 94–106.
- Smith, D. (1999). Globalization and education: Prospects for postcolonial pedagogy in a hermeneutic mode. *Interchange*, 30(1), 1-10.
- Smith, J. (1984). The problem of criteria for judging interpretive inquiry. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(4), 379-391.
- Sparks, S. (2013, May 7). Education funders giving more to same few studies show. *Education Week*.
- Spradley, J. (1989). *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies*. London: SAGE.
- Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 330-364.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Procedures and techniques for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tatum, B. (1997). “*Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?*” *And Other*

- Conversations about Race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Taylor, K. (2015, March 22). Cuomo fights rating system in which few teachers are bad. *New York Times*.
- Tejeda, C. & Espinoza, M. (2003). Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: social justice reconsidered. In P. Triforias, ed. *Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Change*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Think Global Ohio. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.thinkglobalohio.org>.
- Thornton, S. (2005). Incorporating internationalism into the social studies curriculum. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness* (pp. 81-92). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tierney, W. & Dilley, P. (2002). Interviewing in Education. In J. Gubrium and J. Holsten (Eds.), *The Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Tolin, L. (2008). Disaster fatigue leads to drop in American giving. *The Boston Globe*.
- Torney-Purta, J. (1985). *Predictors of global awareness and concern among secondary school students*. Columbus, OH: Mershon Center of the Ohio State University.
- United States Department of Education. Preparing to serve English Language Learner students. Report. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/appalachia/pdf/REL_2008049main.pdf.
- Urso, I. (1990). Teacher development through global education. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action* (p. 100-109). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Vogt, W. P. (1994). What is tolerance and why should we teach it? *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, 16(3-4), 277-296.

- Warren, C. (2002). Qualitative Interviewing. In J. Gubrium and J. Holsten (Eds.), *The Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Warren, C. & Karner, T. (2010). *Discovering Qualitative Methods: Field Research, Interviews, and Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Weiss, R. (1994). *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wiggan, G. (2009). Paying the Price: Globalization in Education. In Wiggan, G. & Hutchinson, C., eds. *Global Issues in Education: Pedagogy, Policy, Practice, and the Minority Experience*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Williams, P. & Chrisman, L. (1994). *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2015). The Wisconsin Global Education Achievement Certificate. Retrieved from <http://cal.dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/cal/pdf/globaled-certificate.pdf>.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387-409.
- World Savvy (2012). World Savvy Global Competency Research Results. July 26, 2012. Retrieved from

http://static1.squarespace.com/static/541b08ace4b03814779bda86/t/5421075de4b06fd9d8387503/1411450717698/Final_WS_Market_Research_Study_Aug_2012.pdf

Worldwatch Institute (2007). *State of the world: Our urban future*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Wu, J. (2010). An empirical study of stereotyped images of China in American media. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1 (6), 913-917.

Yamashita, H. (2006). Global citizenship education and war: The needs of teachers and learners. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 27-39.

Zakaria, F. (2012). *The Post-American World: Release 2.0*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Zakaria, R. (2014, April 21). The white tourists' burden. *Al-Jazeera America*.

Zevin, J. (1993). World studies in secondary schools and the undermining of ethnocentrism. *Social Studies*, 84(2), 82-87.

Zhang, L. (2010). The Rise of China: media perception and implications for international politics. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 19(64), 233-254.

VITA

Ardyth L. Watson was born in Orange County, New York. After graduating with honors from Goshen Central High School in 1989, she attended the State University of New York College at Geneseo where she majored in history. Her undergraduate honors thesis in history, earned her a session prize at the 1992 *Phi Alpha Theta* History Honor Society Conference. While at SUNY Geneseo, Ardyth took part in a month-long study tour of the former Soviet Union, traveling through Central Asia and Russia. In 1993, she graduated *summa cum laude* from SUNY Geneseo, moved to Scotland, and traveled throughout Europe for approximately a year before returning to the United States and beginning her teaching career. Ardyth taught seventh and eighth grade social studies at the C.J. Hooker Middle School in Goshen, New York for eight years, acting as co-coordinator of the K-8 social studies program for the district. While teaching, Ardyth earned her Masters of Science Degree in Education from SUNY New Paltz, majoring in Second Language Education with a concentration in ESL. After a hiatus from teaching to begin a family, she enrolled in the doctoral program in Teaching and Curriculum at Syracuse University, focusing on social studies education. While at Syracuse, Ardyth acted as teaching assistant and instructor for the inclusive elementary education and secondary social studies programs, devising a course entitled Global Perspectives in Social Studies Education. In 2010, she returned to K-12 teaching with a full time position as a social studies teacher at Fayetteville-Manlius High School. In addition to teaching a variety of courses, including AP U.S. History and Global History, she serves on school and district level committees, advises the Oak Tree Chapter of National Honor Society, co-advises the National History Day club, and has co-taught an inservice course about global perspectives in education to colleagues in the district.