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ABSTRACT

The challenge we face as educators is how to best prepare our students for an increasingly complex and interconnected world. A growing interest in global citizenship education is evidenced by its inclusion in academia related to curriculum development and teacher preparation (Banks, 2008; Merryfield, 2000; 2001; 2003; 2009; Myers, 2006; Nussbaum, 2002). I, following other scholars, argue that global citizenship education provides an opportunity to develop tolerances, appreciation for differences, and global awareness, as well as providing a format to address current and future global issues (Ikeda, D. 2005; Noddings, 2005a; Merryfield 2000; 2007; 2009). Yet, a review of the literature indicates a lack of studies with practicing teachers. This study seeks to address this issue. I conducted a cross-cultural interaction research project with practicing elementary teachers in South Carolina upstate elementary schools and teachers in Egypt. The study sought to investigate how teachers in the United States conceptualize global citizenship and global citizenship education, and to examine the effects of cross-cultural interaction upon their conceptions. Findings suggest that cross-cultural interaction broadens conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education, and increases a sense of value for global citizenship education. In addition, findings suggest that teachers in rural areas believe low socio-economics and community isolation limit their students’ ability to comprehend global concepts. Other findings indicate a reluctance to go outside the standards to address a topic, even if the teachers find it valuable. This study has the potential to contribute to the fields of global citizenship education and staff development for practicing teachers by providing a better
understanding of conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education, as well as the effect of cross-cultural interactions.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The concept of citizenship is historically associated with an individual’s relationship and membership with a nation state (Adler, 2008; Banks, 1997; Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Levstik & Tyson, 2008); therefore, citizenship education has traditionally focused on national pride, patriotism, and national identity (Banks; 1997; Klibard, 2004; Urban & Wagoner, 2009). Banks (2001) addresses the idea of assimilation as a focus in citizenship education:

Citizenship education in the past, in the United States as well as in many other nations, embraced an assimilationist ideology. In the United States, its aim was to educate students so they would fit into a mythical Anglo-Saxon Protestant conception of the “good citizen.” Anglo conformity was the goal of citizenship education. One of its aims was to eradicate the community cultures and languages of students from diverse ethnic, cultural, racial, and language groups. (p. 6)

Historically, education was used as a tool to promote loyalty to the nation state through citizenship education (Jefferson, 1779; Mann, 1848). In the 20th century, Social Studies has often been the content area charged with the responsibility to create more informed and active public citizens (Banks, 1997; Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Rapoport, 2010; Wade, 2008). The issues and agendas surrounding the question of citizenship and citizenship education are significant in the current pluralistic society of the United States,
as well as in the context of a more dynamic international relationship between citizens of various nation states (Banks & Nguyen, 2008).

The notion of global citizenship has gained prominence in education and educational research during the last decade (Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Merryfield, 2009). Recently, global citizenship education was promoted at the international level with the adoption of the United Nation’s Secretary-General’s Global Education First Initiative (2012). Education Above All (EAA) (2012) underscores the UN Secretary-General’s call for global citizenship education as underpinning the timeliness of global citizenship curriculums, such as the UNICEF curriculum. Furthermore, EAA draws attention to the significance of the Netherlands-funded UNICEF program specifically to promote global citizenship in ten Dutch states as an indicator of the growing priority to provide equitable and substantive global citizenship education (2012). Recently, UNICEF partnered with national universities and scholars in developing global citizenship curricular for Canada (UNICEF Canada, 2014). Another program gaining prominence in the field of global citizenship curricula includes the United Kingdom’s Oxfam International, which was originally organized in the 1940’s to address poverty and inequity, but has expanded to actively promote global citizenship education in more than 90 countries (Oxfam Education, 2015). Another organization, The Global Citizenship Initiative (2015), boasts global citizenship activity and programs in over 50 countries. While some scholars argue that the concept of global citizenship is abstract and vague (Putnam, 2002), a growing body of scholarship and research promotes global citizenship education as a tool for
navigating increasing global tensions and injustices in a more interconnected world (Appiah, 2008; Merryfield, 2000b; Noddings, 2005a).

**Background of the Study**

Education for and of global awareness is not new (Appiah, 2008; Shattle, 2008). Global citizenship (termed cosmopolitanism by some scholars) has its roots in the ancient Greek philosophy of Diogenes (Appiah, 2008; Myers, 2006), but is also seen in the early 19th century Buddhist writings of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (Ikedo, 2005). However, a more recent and renewed interest in global citizenship is evidenced by the incorporation of this idea in academia, related to curriculum development and teacher preparation (Banks, 2008; Merryfield, 2000; 2001; 2003; 2009; Myers, 2006; Nussbaum, 2002). In the United States, global citizenship education curricula are widely available and aligned to the National Council for the Social Studies standards (NCSS) and Common Core State standards (CCSS) (Global Citizens Network, 2014; TeachGlobalEd, 2014; UNICEF, 2014). As mentioned previously, other international organizations such as Oxfam International (2014), UNICEF (2014), the Global Citizenship Initiative (2015), and the International Baccalaureate Organization (2014) also provide global citizenship education curricula.

Large theoretical divisions exist within the scope of global citizenship education ranging from the economic self-serving interests of capitalism to the more cosmopolitan concept of collective responsibility (Schattle, 2008). Spurred by increased globalization, educational institutions seek curricula to further advance the competitiveness of American
students on the global academic spectrum as well as global economic/job market (Dill, 2013; Parker, 1996; Schattle, 2008). However, these and other educational scholars (Banks, 2008; Merryfield, 2000b; Nussbaum, 2002; Noddings, 2005a) also point to global citizenship education as an opportunity to reduce intolerance and prejudices by providing a critical and inquiry-based model that seeks to broaden understanding of diversity, cultures, and different ways of life.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to provide empirical data related to cross-cultural interaction between current practicing teachers of differing cultures as a process in exploring and developing conceptions of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Educators’ conceptualization of what is and is not global citizenship, as well as their conceptualization of its importance influences their instruction in the area (Harshman & Augustine, 2013). I seek to add to the literature by providing a different perspective from previous research that has typically focused on preservice teachers, practicing teachers in global studies Master’s programs, and/or teachers associated with the International Baccalaureate Program (Harshman & Augustine, 2013; Merryfield 1995; 2000a; 2000b; 2003; 2007). This focus of my study is on public school practicing teachers, who face many daily challenges, including curriculum requirements, the pressure of high stakes testing, administration and/or district initiatives, and the demands of their students’ individual academic needs.
The medium for the cross-cultural interaction in my study is an asynchronous online discussion forum, in which teachers in the United States and teachers in Egypt interacted and discussed ideas about global citizenship. The framework of the study is based on socio-cultural constructivist theory that contends that individuals construct new knowledge or ideas (conceptualize) during social interactions within a cultural setting. Socio-cultural theory stems from Vygotsky’s exploration of development and learning (Gauvain & Parke, 2010).

Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57)

**Research Questions**

Practicing teachers worldwide are facing the day-to-day challenges of an ever-perplexing and changing educational environment. The cross-cultural interaction component of my study is not part of required course work, nor required by the educational institution with which they are associated. It is my belief that my study will contribute to the understanding of global citizenship education in an under-explored area. The central research question is:
1. Does cross-cultural interaction enhance U.S. elementary teachers’ awareness and conceptualizations of global citizenship?

The sub-questions are:

2. How do U.S. elementary practicing teachers conceptualize global citizenship?

3. At what level of importance do U.S. elementary teachers place global citizenship instruction?

4. What resources and strategies/practices do U.S. elementary teachers use for global citizenship instruction?

The central question related to intercultural interaction, and the possible effect the interaction has on U.S. teachers’ awareness and perceptions, must have a foundation in the sub-questions. The sub-questions provide a basis from which to analyze and compare the pre-interaction and post-interaction conceptualizations of the teachers.

**Rationale**

My interest in global citizenship education has its roots in my experiences as a teacher in Egypt, and heightened by my marriage to an Egyptian and the three children we had together. At the time, I saw my interest as being in international education. My husband and I initially lived in the United States, and all our children were born in the US. However, as time passed and our attempts at infusing Egyptian culture, the Arabic language, and Muslim traditions into our family met with meager success, we decided moving to Egypt was in our family’s best interest. As my husband, Sherif said, “The
American culture is easy. It’s everywhere. They can learn to be Americans in Egypt, but they can only learn Egyptian culture, Arabic, and our Egyptian traditions in Egypt.”

The following 12 years in Egypt as a “foreign” mom, ex-patriot, and educator expanded my view of the world and broadened my awareness of diversity, cultures, traditions and the significance each plays in our day-to-day lives. I also became increasingly aware of the richness of my family’s experience as citizens of two different worlds. As my children navigated summer vacations in a post-9/11 America, as well as home life in the post-9/11 Arab world, I observed the lack of tolerance and understanding on both sides. The subsequent invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq provided fodder for discussions and debates with family and friends on both continents! Living in Egypt changed my reality and perspective, while challenging my preconceived ideas. When I entered the doctoral program as an educator, my skill set found a new focus, inspiration, and terminology in global citizenship education, introduced in a critical theory class. Acknowledging the lack of understanding of globalization and its effect on education, I began to investigate the connections between intolerance and globalization.

**Intolerance and Globalization**

The growth of intolerance during first two decades of the 21st century (Stotzer, 2007) points to an increasingly narrow and less inclusive mind set, thereby resulting in a lack of skills that students need in an increasingly global world. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) issues a yearly report on hate crimes in the United States, and the 2013 report reveals that in the previous year, “5,796 criminal incidents involving 6,718
offenses were reported as being motivated by a bias toward a particular race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity/national origin, or physical or mental disability” (FBI, 2013). The FBI concluded that the majority of these crimes were motivated by racial bias (48.3%), sexual-orientation bias (19.6%), religious bias (19%), and ethnicity/national origin bias (11.5%) (2013). An important point to consider is that these are just the reported incidences, and scholars suggest that many hate crimes go unreported (El-Haj & Bonet, 2011; Huynh & Fuligni, 2010).

These statistics should alarm parents, educators, community members, and policy makers, and the situation only becomes more complicated by the increasing globalization of world societies (Jones, 2010; Ray, 2007). While disagreeing if the impact is marginal, moderate, or intrusive, researchers agree that world citizens need to take note and be aware of its political, social, and economic implications (Appadurai, 2000; Apple, 2009; Mittleman, 2002; 2007). An increasing global community (whether physical or abstract) can result in a narrow, protective stance, often called fundamentalist thinking, which results in increased discrimination, prejudices, and eventually hate crimes (Alviar-Martin, 2008; Ray, 2007).

As a term, “globalization” indicates a more hybrid and fluid world (Ray, 2007). In fact, globalization is itself the consequence of “structural and cultural processes” (p. 2) that are revealed in a variety of different ways (economically, socially, culturally) in the local, national, and global environments (Ray, 2007). Following World War I, the growth of international organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade
Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank heightened global awareness and interaction (Jones, 2010; Ray, 2007). The end of the Cold War, collapse of the Soviet Union, and increased international communication provided a view of a borderless world and fueled the theoretical debate of globalization (Outhwaite & Ray, 2005; Ray, 2007).

While some social scientists argue that globalization began with early exploration, particularly with the push of colonization in the 17th century (Frank, 1998; Robertson, 1990), others argue that globalization is a more recent phenomenon, and is actually a new international system, associated with increased communication and technology (Friedman, 2000; Giddens, 1990). Ray (2007) contends that globalization is “essentially about transnational flows (of people, money, cultures, goods, etc.) across borders, but its effects will always be spatially located somewhere, and virtual spaces are downloaded and accessed in particular places” (p. 7). Ray’s concept of globalization is particularly suited to the current study. Though the teachers are interacting cross-culturally, they are doing so within their particular place, and that particular place has socio-cultural influences that impact their conceptualizations (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1986; 2005; Super & Harkness, 1996; Vygotsky, 1972).

As the world becomes increasingly globalized, increasing numbers of individuals and groups are sharing experiences similar to mine. International career opportunities have expanded, as have international educational opportunities. The challenge we face as
educators is how to best prepare our students for this increasingly complex and interconnected world.

Theoretical Structure

Socio-cultural constructivism provides the foundation for my overall study, the choice of methodology, as well as the design. My experience as a practitioner and a student drew me to the theory, which is based on social and cultural contexts’ influences on the learning processes of individuals, as well how these contexts influence the learning processes of groups (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Bruner, 1996; Vygotsky, 1972). Simply stated, an individual’s social and cultural environment plays a significant role in how the individual constructs knowledge, truth, and their unique belief system. These constructs guide individuals as they make decisions and carry out societal responsibilities.

Various studies indicate the significant role the teacher plays in the academic achievement of the student (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Heilig, 2005), especially when the teacher is faced with a growing multicultural classroom (Sleeter, 2001; 2014). As this study focuses on global citizenship and global citizenship education, I consider the teachers’ multicultural conceptualizations to be paramount. Within the study, I incorporated various aspects of socio-cultural theory by exploring the perceptions of teachers before and after a cross-cultural interaction project. The U.S. teachers live and work in a rural upstate South Carolina area, situated in the middle of a conservative Bible Belt region, and most have not had the opportunity to
interact cross-culturally with professional counterparts in the educational field. Based on the socio-cultural constructivist theory, the primary question driving my line of inquiry is: does cross-cultural interaction with other professionals influence American teachers’ conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education?

**Significance of the Study**

This study seeks to add to the literature by providing practicing teachers’ point of view of global citizenship and global citizenship education. While teachers are bound by standards, they still maintain a certain amount of autonomy in the classroom and therefore can exert control over the underlying concepts or framework of content being studied. This study can provide insight and add beneficial knowledge for administrators, practicing teachers, as well as professional development in the field of global citizenship education.
Globalization

Globalization is an ongoing international force encompassing the interconnectedness of world citizens economically, politically, socially, and culturally. It involves the transmission of knowledge, discussions, and transfer of power, as well as trade and equity issues (Al-Rodham & Stoudman, 2006). Few researchers argue that globalization is non-existent, and most agree that globalization is impacting nation states at varying levels (Jones, 2010; Ray, 2007). While disagreeing if the impact is marginal, moderate, or invasive in individuals’ daily lives, researchers agree all citizens need to take note and be aware of its political, social, and economic implications (Guillen, 2001; 2010; Mittleman, 2002; 2007). Globalization is not a new phenomenon. Many scholars argue that globalization began hundreds of years ago with the borrowing of ideas between nations and cultures and also manifested in the periods of ancient exploration (Merryfield & Duty, 2008; Raskin, Banuir, Gallopin, Hammond, Kates, & Swart, 2002).

However, the increased use of the internet, social media, and news on demand has given rise to a greater public awareness of globalization and increased debate (Clarence, 2011; Merryfield & Duty, 2008; Ray, 2007). Globalization is not a linear or generalizable phenomenon; instead it is a dynamic process and is “expressed in particular histories and political configurations” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. x). The increasing interconnectedness implies that what occurs beyond our nation’s borders affects local communities (Stromquist, 2002). Whether it is a political decision, an economic crisis, or a military action, events around the world can impact jobs, salaries, food, and gas prices,
as well as determine if and when a nation goes to war (Guillen, 2001; 2010; Merryfield & Duty, 2008; Mittleman, 2002; 2007).

The debate over the definition of globalization is long and varied. A recent scholarly article (Al-Rodham & Stoudman, 2006) provides 114 definitions from the past two decades. The definition of the term often relates to the field within which it is being discussed, whether political, economic, social or cultural. It is a complex phenomenon involving various aspects of an increasingly interconnected world. For the purposes of this paper, I use the term globalization to characterize the interconnected lives of world citizens. “Globalization is a process that encompasses the causes, course, and consequences of transnational and transcultural integration of human and non-human activities” (Al-Rodham & Stoudman, 2006, p. 5).

Recent scholarly accounts of globalization and curricula state that the outcomes of a globalized world have created an education design that is clearly tied to economic goals and to the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the service of the development of individual and national competitiveness within the global economy as early as elementary school (Clarence 2011; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Yet, other scholars argue that the primary focus of education in a globalized world should not only focus on economic competition, but also on social, environmental, and social justice objectives such as women’s rights, equity in education, and political freedoms, which are the fibers of our interconnected lives (Ikeda, 2005; Myers, 2006; Noddings, 2005a). Students, as future citizens, will need
new skills (Stromquist, 2002) “to organize, debate, learn and engage in actions and discourse on issues facing their planet” (Merryfield, 2008, p. 434).

While the term globalization indicates a sharing of cross-cultural ideas, it is the West that maintains a stranglehold as the arbiter of global influence, at the expense of majority world languages, cultures, and traditions. Various international trade agreements driven by Western political interests such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the growth of Western-based transnational companies have resulted in the global dominance of the English language in global commerce and industry (Bamgbose, 2001; Ray, 2007). In response to the dominance of English in the world market, nation states around the world incorporated English language programs into their national curricula (James, 2005; Shi, 2006). Some national schools incorporate English as early as kindergarten, while in others it is introduced in upper elementary (Hayden, 2006). Therefore, even as the world becomes more globalized and interconnected, the role of the West as promoter of hegemonic practices that directly or indirectly support the status quo remains present (Goldstone, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Myers, 2006; Ray, 2007; Steavenson, 2011). Ironically, the West, wielding the most influence globally, has done little to introduce curricula that educate students in global affairs, issues of social justice, or global responsibility (Barber, 2002; Myers, 2006; Noddings, 2005a). Global citizenship education provides a much-needed opportunity to develop global awareness and address current and future global issues among students (Ikeda, D. 2005; Noddings, 2005a; Merryfield 2000; 2007; 2009).
Following other scholars, I argue that global citizenship education provides an opportunity to develop respect for all individuals, appreciation for differences, global awareness, as well as provides a format to address current and future global issues (Ikeda, D. 2005; Merryfield 2000; 2007; 2009; Noddings, 2005a). Thornton (1991) states that teachers are the gatekeepers in the classroom and can therefore control the knowledge, concepts, beliefs, and values taught in the classroom. The effect of curriculum on attitudes and beliefs has become a widely accepted fact among educational researchers (Allen, 2000; Kubow & Fossum, 2003; Lewis, 2006). Therefore, addressing the knowledge base and awareness of teachers is critical in effectively integrating global citizenship education into the curriculum. During the past decade, scholars have conducted a limited amount of research in the area of awareness of and the belief in the efficacy of global citizenship education within the educational community. As much of the research has been conducted with pre-service teachers, or with teachers enrolled in Master’s level global education classes (Merryfield, 1998; 2000; 2007; 2009; Myers, 2006), this research addresses a gap in the research by investigating the attitudes of practicing teachers in the field.

**Brief History of Global Citizenship Education**

The concept of being a world citizen can be traced to the ancient Greek philosopher Diogenes, who lived between 412 and 323 B.C.E. (Appiah, 2008; Dower & Williams, 2002). Considered the father of Stoicism, Diogenes referred to himself as a *kosmoa polites* (citizen of the world or universe) (κόσμος πολίτης), from which the term
“cosmopolitan” derives. Though citizenship was and is bound by political boundaries, the philosopher sought to explain his concept of being a world citizen (2008; 2002). Appiah (2008) delineated three major precepts for global citizens from Diogenes’ ideas: (a) no world government, no single political unit; (b) concern and care for the fate and circumstances of all human beings, those in our community and those beyond; and (c) there is much to learn and gain from conversations with those who are different (2008). The early ideas, though containing a core ideal relevant to modern interpretation, were philosophical in nature and related to the belief the universe has a divine order governed by reason and humans were part of this order. Global citizens, then, existed because they saw themselves as “existing meaningfully only within this ordered, reasoned whole” (Dower & Williams, 2002, p. 2).

The connection between this earlier philosophical view and the modern, more humanistic view is the foundational belief that individuals are members of a wider body, rather than limited to political boundaries and nation states (Dower & Williams, 2002). The modern view stresses an interconnectedness that was explored by 17th and 18th century philosophers and writers such as Immanuel Kant. Kant espoused cosmopolitanism, and while he did not support an authoritative world government, called for a system that relied upon mutual respect, acknowledging the existence of a single moral community in which humans share mutual rights such as equality, freedom, and independence (2002).
The idea of global citizenship is also reflected in 19th century Buddhist writings of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (Ikeda, 2005). Makiguchi, the first president of a Buddhist lay group called Soka Gakkai, proposed an educational idea that, while beginning with local community responsibility, reached beyond the local and embraced the global (2005). In his view, individuals should demonstrate the core principles of global citizenship at the community level. He rejected ideas of nationalism and advocated for an idea of globalization that required observable or concrete actions or content. Therefore, in Makiguchi’s philosophy, the identity of a global citizen exists on three levels: local, national, and global. Ikeda (2005) sums up this position as the development of public-spiritedness. Global citizenship should develop through a “dynamic harmonization and development of these three levels” (p. x). The ultimate goal is to make contributions to global humanity, contributions that will return/reverberate to the nation state and community. Makiguchi saw education as the tool to develop global citizens. As Ikeda explains, Makiguchi saw the “ultimate purpose of the state is the pursuit of the prosperity of human civilization and the advancement of human reason” (Ikeda, 2005, p. xi).

The early 20th century saw a rising interest in global citizenship in the United States. Drawing on Kant’s work, individuals saw themselves as part of a world order that H. G. Wells called mental cosmopolis (Dower & Williams, 2002; Schattle, 2008). The world Federalist movement developed in the early 1940’s as a group of individuals disillusioned with ineffectiveness of the United League of Nations in preventing a second major war. The devastation of both World War I and II drew together people who sought alternatives to war, and many became involved in the World Federalist Movement (2002;
World Federalist Movement, 2014). While this movement involved a small number of people, the spirit of the world federalists became part of the impetus that some scholars credit with leading to the 1960’s and 1970’s concerns with inequity and global issues, resulting in a renewed interest in global citizenship (Dower & Williams, 2002).

In the United States, global education began in the 1960’s as part of the reactions to ethnocentric and nationalistic mentality reflected in the studies in academia (Arnove, 1999; Myers, 2006). An increase in televised news communication and increasing levels of travel and transnational economic activity heightened American citizens’ awareness of poverty, environmental issues, and human rights violations around the world (Dower & Williams, 2002; Schattle, 2008). A new interest in global citizenship brought focus to these issues, and fostered a developing sense of global responsibility (2002).

James Becker (1972; 1976; 1979) and Lee Anderson (1979; 1982) are recognized by scholars as having made large intellectual contributions to the global education movement in the United States, and thereby, the developing idea of global citizenship (Kirkwood-Tucker, 2011). In the 1970’s, Becker co-authored books that called for broader global objectives in secondary education programs and curriculum. Anderson, recognized for his contribution to the scholarly literature on global education, supplied arguments and rationales for the globalization of the U.S. curriculum.

While Kirkwood-Tucker (2011) refers to Becker as the “father of global education” (p. 8), others contend the publication of An Attainable Global Perspective (1976; 1982; 2004) moved Robert Hanvey to the forefront as the “father of modern
global education” (TeachGlobalEd.net, 2014). Hanvey delineated five focus areas of educational curriculum, which he termed dimensions. Hanvey’s five educational focus areas are: perspective consciousness; state of the planet awareness; cross-cultural awareness; knowledge of global dynamics; and awareness of human choices (Hanvey, 1976; 1982; 2004). His unique contribution is a systematic curriculum that does not depict the United States as the dominant country.

Scholarly reviews of work in global education and global citizenship reflect Hanvey’s continued influence (Myers, 2006). Citing his work as seminal, scholars refer to his framework as they explicate current concepts of global citizenship and global education (Merryfield, 1998; 2009; Myers, 2006). Hanvey’s goal was to provide a framework for U.S. elementary and high school teachers to follow, in order to guide students to a more global perspective (Hanvey, 1976). However, he wrote for an exclusively American audience and “situated within a particularly American perspective on the nature and value of global education” (Klein, Pawson, Solem, & Ray 2014, p. 17). Though endeavoring to explicate the global interconnectedness of all people, the framework focused more on recognizing and appreciating diversity, rather than a more critical stance of inter-related responsibility (Klein, et al, 2014).

Merryfield (1998; 2009) and Myers (2006) contend that Hanvey’s dimensions, while valuable and serving as a guide, do not directly address the inclusion of marginalized voices. Educators must re-conceptualize global education by including the diverse theories and perspectives of others in their own words, not a summary or
Students must be exposed to the literature and theories, as well as to concepts of imperialism and how it contributed to the current state of world affairs (Merryfield, 2009). Beyond this, providing realistic intercultural experiences are necessary for students and teachers to develop global mindedness and a true sense of global citizenship (Merryfield, 2009; Myers, 2006).

While educators give lip service to the importance of global citizenship education, little or no support is being provided in the area of professional development or pre-service instruction (Myers, 2006). A brief overview of selected elementary, middle, and high school pre-service programs reveals scant reference to the ideas of global citizenship, though the tenants of global citizenship can be addressed within all content areas (2006). In fact, globalization has become an overreaching phenomenon that has real impact on the fundamental aspects of life, from economics, to culture, to language, and the ways we view ourselves (Nsamenang, 2006). Ignoring the effects of globalization on society translates into a gross neglect of the educational system whose goal is to educate students for future roles and interacting with individuals of various cultures in an ever-changing world (Amtzis, 2013; Davis, 2006; Myers, 2006).

Definitions of Global Citizenship

A significant issue facing global citizenship instruction lies in the lack of consensus among scholars of the definition of a global citizen (Davies, 2006; Leduc, 2013; Merryfield, 2000; 2009). When discussing citizenship, one relies on traditional ideas of political boundaries and the laws and terms of citizenship for specific nation
states. There is no unifying government to bring together the global, nor a particular group, individual, or organization to which the global citizen must answer (Noddings, 2005a). The concept of global citizenship is often seen as vague, unclear, even muddy or messy (Dower & Williams, 2002; Myers, 2006).

Roman (2003), drawing on the work of Cronin and DeGreiff (2002), Falk (1996), and Nussbaum, (1996), identified the definitions of upper-level global citizenship and lower-level global citizenship. The upper-level definition indicates a focus on global competition, preparation of students to maintain the hegemonic status quo (though addressed in terms of performance), and an awareness of global issues in order to be successful in the market. The lower-level definition of global citizenship has a focus on the common good, equity, social justice, and environmental issues (Roman, 2003). Tully (2005) addresses the same dichotomy and explains the tension:

These two forms of global citizenship have different names in different literature: low intensity versus high intensity global citizenship, representative versus participatory, neo-liberal versus democratic, restrictive versus non-restrictive, civil versus civic, global citizenship from above versus citizenship from below, hegemonic versus counter-hegemonic, liberal democratic versus agonistic, global versus local, modern versus alternative modernities, hegemonic versus subaltern … many of the most important struggles around the globe today are over these two types and the struggles themselves consist in the enactment of these two modes of citizenship in two corresponding practices of global citizenship. (p. 16)
Andreotti (2006) contrasts soft global citizenship with critical global citizenship in order to explicate the definition and tease out the issues of power, voice, and difference. For example, those who adhere to soft global citizenship see change as being imposed, whereas a more critical global citizen sees change as being from the “inside to the outside” (p. 4). In soft global citizenship, individuals feel a responsibility for others that results in teaching others the correct way (again imposing). On the other hand, a critical global citizen sees responsibility as being a dynamic process of learning with the other and in which each person has accountability.

Other scholars point to global education and to developing global citizenship, the purpose of which is to heighten awareness of the interdependence among nation states, as well as to advance cultural understanding (Banks, 2004). Merryfield (2000; 2009) espouses a perspective that focuses on understanding oneself in relation to the world, or global community, as well as how one might negotiate responsibilities and critical inquiry in a new and developing awareness of self, local community, and global community. Banks (2008) and Hansen (2008) associate the term cosmopolitan with global citizenship. The tenets of cosmopolitanism indicate a concern for others beyond local community and national political boundaries. Therefore, citizenship education should guide students to attain an identity and attachment to the global community while nurturing an appreciation for local identities. Cosmopolitan citizens see themselves as part of the diverse, interrelated tapestry of cultures throughout the world. Beyond this, cosmopolitan citizens believe in a shared responsibility for the lives of others, regardless of national or political boundaries (Banks, 2008; Hansen, 2008).
Banks (2008) argues that educators should help students understand the complex interconnected world in which they live, and that this interconnection will continue to be a dynamic and evolutionary process. Global citizenship also involves taking action, reaching out, and taking a stand on global as well as local issues. Citizenship education should prepare students to part of the active process of being a global citizen. Education should help students understand that their fates are “intimately tied to those of people throughout the world” (p. 135).

International organizations such as the United Nations and its specialized agency UNESCO have developed definitions incorporating themes of interconnectedness, interdependence, and action. In the UNESCO document *Global Citizenship Education: An Emerging Perspective* (UNESCO, 2013) the report contends the term is a metaphor or ethos:

Global citizenship does not entail a legal status. It refers more to a sense of belonging to the global community and common humanity, with its presumed members experiencing solidarity and collective identity among themselves, and collective responsibility at the global level. (p. 3)

Furthermore, the document states that global citizenship requires action. According to the report, global citizenship should “generate actions and engagement among, and for, its members through civic actions in the public domain to promote a better world and future” (p. 2). The United Nations’ website for the Academic Hub on Global Citizenship states that the term global citizenship encompasses “the social, political, environmental,
or economic actions of globally-minded individuals and communities on a worldwide scale” (2014).

In the U.S. educational system, the National Council of Social Studies (1982) proffered the overarching definition of global citizenship as “the efforts to cultivate in young people a perspective of the world, which emphasizes the interconnections among cultures, species, and the planet” (p. 1), though this delineation does not outline or prescribe specific outcomes. The standards have also consistently called for a social studies curriculum that prepares students for an increasingly global age (NCSS, 2010), though the standards offer no metric for measuring awareness, tolerance, global responsibility, or interconnectedness.

**Operationalization of Global Citizenship for This Study**

For my study, I have chosen to use the definition as stated on the United Nations’ website for the Academic Hub on Global Citizenship. While some argue that the United Nations is itself a hegemonic institution (Clark, 2011; Zajda, 2011), comprised primarily of Western scholars and researchers and often used to support Western ideals, the definition supports diversity and encourages educators to move away from the more hegemonic practices traditionally associated with Western institutions. Moreover, the definition, while simplistic in its raw form, indicates the complexities of the responsibilities of global citizens.

The recently adopted United Nation’s Secretary-General’s Global Education First Initiative (2012) includes three major aims, the third being to “foster global citizenship”
Global citizenship is an umbrella term for the social, political, environmental, or economic actions of globally minded individuals and communities on a worldwide scale. The term can refer to the belief that, rather than actors affecting isolated societies, individuals are members of multiple, diverse, local and non-local networks. (UNAI, 2014)

In response to the initiative, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), a specialized agent of the UN, sought to expand the definition of global citizenship and used the term metaphor as a pivotal term. Global citizenship can be seen as an ethos/metaphor, rather than a formal membership (Tawil, 2013), and I believe that the introduction of the term metaphor is significant. Using global citizenship as a metaphor aids in circumventing the controversial issues of space and contested political boundaries related to defining the term. Metaphor allows individuals to move beyond the traditional concept of citizenship as defined by a political entity operating within specific politically formulated state borders. It also aids in connecting global citizenship back to the concept of an overarching umbrella term that includes social justice, human rights, equity, and action; all of which are policies of the UN and voiced in documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (United Nations, 2014). Therefore, aligning global citizenship with UN documents can aid in providing an actionable guide to deploying global citizenship –
given that some critics refer to the term as being overly vague, or fear its use for economic gain and continued reinforcement of the status quo (Michael Byers, University of British Columbia and Sparks as cited in Parker & Camicia, 2009).

The core principles of human rights first set out in the UDHR, such as universality, interdependence and indivisibility, equality, and non-discrimination, have been reiterated in numerous international human rights conventions, declarations, and resolutions. Today, all United Nations member states have ratified at least one of the nine core international human rights treaties, and 80 percent have ratified four or more, giving concrete expression to the universality of the UDHR and international human rights. Most of the world’s countries have ratified the UDHR, though it is not a legally binding document, and violations do occur. However, given that the 193 UN member states represent every region of the world, and that it is a body that is diverse ethnically, racially and religiously; the document, along with the pursuit of global citizenship education as stated by the Secretary-General’s Initiatives, opens inclusive dialogue and discussion at the international level. Following the Secretary-General’s Initiatives, the UN Academic Impact project held two forums addressing global citizenship education, the first in Bangkok in 2013, and the second in Paris in 2014 (UN Academic Impact, 2013; 2014). In June 2015, a seminar, “Global Citizenship Education for a Just, Peaceful, Inclusive and Sustainable World” was held at the UN Headquarters in New York City (UN Web TV, 2015).
A recent UNESCO white paper (Tawill, 2013) discussing the definition of global citizenship draws theoretically from Appiah’s (2008) work, in which he calls global citizenship *cosmopolitanism*, is based on the legitimacy of the principle of universality (connected to universal human rights). Appiah expresses universality in terms of entitlement and obligation:

> Every human being has certain minimum entitlements – many of them expressed in the vocabulary of human rights, and that is also the obligation of every human being to do his or her fair share in making sure that everybody gets what they are entitled to. (2008, p. 95)

Going further, Appiah states that a cosmopolitan asks, “Am I doing my fair share to make sure everyone has the chance at the dignified human existence that we are all entitled to?” (p. 95).

**Criticism of Global Citizenship Education**

While many scholars in social science and education point to global citizenship education as an important and necessary tool in educating future citizens (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Schweisfurth, 2006; Myers, 2006; Torres, 2009), the concept is not without criticism. A notable recent debate of the veracity, practicality, and even anti-patriotic message(s) of global citizenship (often termed cosmopolitanism) took place in the volume *For Love of Country* (Nussbaum, 2002), a collection of academic responses to Nussbaum’s call for a more cosmopolitan educational system in the volume’s introductory essay. The scholars critical of Nussbaum’s stance on cosmopolitanism
argue that global citizens have no geographic place, and that the idea of being a citizen without a concept of space is unable to bring together people for a common cause (Barber 2002). Barber (2002) also argues that being cosmopolitan is too ethereal and unrealistic, because individuals see commitment and citizenship as something personal and concrete (i.e., elections, changes in one’s community). Putnam (2002) agrees and continues to argue that, at best, engaging students in a local or national form of citizenship is difficult enough; but attempting to engage them at a global level, which is rather abstract, will be a Herculean as well as unfruitful task. Putnam concludes that educating for global or cosmopolitan citizenship would leave students adrift without foundation (2002).

Putnam (2002) further argues that the nation state provides a framework for civic equality and human rights. The nation state remains an important and irreplaceable political machine for groups and individuals seeking recognition or collective rights and/or change. Those involved in movements rely upon the national constitution and the spirit of the document to address and convince the public of the validity of their cause. Since a global citizenry lacks such a vehicle, the idea of educating students to that end lacks a foundational mechanism to promote change and human rights.

Mitchell and Parker (2008), Parker and Camicia (2009), and Rapoport (2009) have recently explicated the criticisms of global citizenship in concise terms and categorical organization. Critics point to the ambiguous and often conflicting definitions of global citizenship (Rapoport, 2009). Since there is not an agreed upon definition, researchers use the term loosely and tie it to a variety of ideas and ideals. It is just this
ambiguity that Spark (as cited in Parker & Camicia, 2009) addresses as “globaloney” (p. 43), arguing that globalization is not a “concept of set of events, but a discourse” (p. 43). Within discourse, meaning is dynamic and active. The discourse begins to shape the idea or concept, and can eventually take on powerful political implications (2009). Sparks claims that the term can take be used in partisan manner to justify free trade, privatization, and tax cuts (as cited in Parker & Camicia, 2009).

Another criticism is that global citizenship education undermines patriotism to the nation state, and therefore to the structures that provide the foundation and governance of a nation (Rapoport, 2009; Corry, 2006). Citing Armstrong (2006), Rapoport delineates the author’s caution in embracing the elements of global citizenship that are not universally accepted. Recent examples include attempts to ban the International Baccalaureate (IB) program in the United States (Walters, 2006; Robelen, 2012). The IB is an international curriculum whose mission statement and curriculum promotes concepts of global citizenship, defined as being tolerant, inclusive, and interconnected (IBO, 2014). In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, a school district banned the International Baccalaureate (IBO) after officials condemned it as "un-American" and Marxist (Walters, 2006). More recently, in 2012, the state of New Hampshire sought to ban the IB, stating that it “indoctrinates students” (Robelen, 2012).

In addition, educators and scholars question the practicality of global citizenship education (Davies, 2006; Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005; Rapoport, 2006; Myers, 2006). The numerous frameworks within which global citizenship has been presented are not
reflected or positioned in current school curriculum. When global citizenship is taught, the topic is presented as secondary and lacking depth, and Rapoport (2006) contends that U.S. educators’ attitudes toward global citizenship education is cautious at best (2006). In fact, Myers (2006) concluded that even global education/citizenship programs considered exemplary “at best approximate the goal of developing national citizens with some relativistic understanding and awareness of the rest of the world” (p. 389).

Response to Criticism: The Road to Global Citizenship Education

Globalization affects everyday life, and everyday life, in turn, affects globalization and its process (Ray, 2007). Dynamic, complex, and even maligned as a myth, globalization has come to the forefront as an important element in education and educational research (Merryfield 2000; 2009; Myers, 2006; Ray, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Zajda, 2011). An obvious example is the attention given to the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). Educators and policymakers look to academic achievement measurements by PISA to provide support for or to augment arguments against educational programming, curricular, as well as educational structures, and polices (Zajda, 2011).

While some U.S. policy makers argue for a more national instead of global curriculum, they still address globalization, albeit from a nationalistic point of view (Myers, 2006). The connection between globalization, education, curriculum, and policy is arguably economic. Often, educational processes are “seen as a producer of goods and services that foster economic growth” (Zajda, 2011). The pursuit of knowledge for its
own sake or for developing skills for critical inquiry, as well as education that addresses social justice, tolerance, and human rights have been marginalized or abandoned for a curriculum focused on efficacy, productivity, and competiveness/high stakes testing (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Zajda, 2011).

While social scientists, economists, and educators debate the definition of globalization, Zajda (2011) states that developing a definition of globalization is not as significant as educational systems understanding the consequences of and developing a response to globalization. Citing Dervis (2007), Zajda asserts that globalization has “created winners and losers in education and societies globally” (p. 147). Globalization is not a linear or generalizable phenomenon; instead it is dynamic and is “expressed in particular histories and political configurations” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. x). The ever-increasing policy-steering by transnational organizations and transnational companies threatens to homogenize educational policy around the world and to support a hegemonic Western agenda (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Zajda, 2011). The importance of education involves students being free to develop their own understanding of the world, their own culture, and to be able to filter their learning through lived experiences (Dewey, 1938; Noddings, 2006). When educational practices are aligned to hegemonic powers, whether transnational companies or international economic policies, they limit the opportunity for individuals to develop a critical worldview (Boix-Mansilla & Gardner, 2007; Zajda, 2011).
Drawing on reports from the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), Zajda (2011) points to growing educational inequities around the globe. He argues that in some respects, globalization has brought greater awareness of educational inequities, but it has also contributed significantly to the inequities. Referring to the transnational companies, and various trade and finance policies, Zajda argues that international interests have overtaken educational policy around the world, while local interests are ignored (2011). Boix-Mansilla and Gardner (2007) address the same concerns and conclude the answer lies in developing a sense of global consciousness and sensitivity in teachers, and thereby addressing the issues with students in the classroom (2007). Other scholars (Braskamp, Braskamp & Meerrill, 2009; Deardorff, 2006) point to the need for teaching intercultural skills and being diligent in addressing these skills alongside “cognitive, social, emotional, and digital skills” (Sussmuth, p. 197).

Educators are challenged to address the aforementioned global issues as well as others across the curriculum and educate for a more informed citizenry in cross cultural awareness, inequities, and social injustice (Boix-Mansilla & Gardner, 2007; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Sussmuth, 2007; Zajda, 2011). More support for such a curriculum has been evidenced in recent research and educational researchers point to global citizenship education as an important contribution to the process (Banks, 2008; Kirkwood-Tucker, 2009; Merryfield, 2000; 2009; Myers, 2006; Noddings, 2005a).

**Teachers’ Conceptualizations of Global Citizenship**
Studies relating to teachers’ conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education in the United States are limited (Myers, 2006; Rapoport, 2010). In the past decade, academic discussion has increased (Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005; Davies, Harber & Yamashita, 2005; Hogeling, 2012; Leduc, 2013; Leeenders, Veugelers & De Kat, 2008; Yamashita, 2006). In particular, three studies (Rapoport, 2010, 2013; Myers, 2006) provide insightful case study analysis.

Rapoport (2010) conducted a qualitative study with six Indiana high school teachers in order to investigate how the teachers conceptualize global citizenship and what aspects of the current educational system hinder the instruction of global citizenship education. The researcher contacted the state department of education and teachers were purposefully chosen based on three criteria: international experience, five years of classroom experience, and an interest in incorporating international perspective into their instruction. Of the eight names provided, six agreed to participate in the project. The researcher then provided the participants with 12 open-ended questions. The questions were intended to guide the semi-structured in-depth interviews three to four weeks later.

These findings correspond to other studies Abowitz and Harnish (2006) and Meyers (2006). While the teachers did not use specific terms such as global citizenship or cosmopolitan citizenship, they incorporated concepts related to these ideals into their lessons. All teachers expressed the importance of global awareness and the integration of global dimensions in all aspects of the curriculum, but did not directly address the global, or draw attention to it. Also, the researcher concluded that it was unclear if the teachers
had a clear definition of global citizenship or had a clear rationale for incorporating the ideals into class instruction. A significant point is that some teachers expressed concern that if they used terminology related to globalization or global citizenship in the classroom that the local community may react negatively. Another significant finding indicated that the teachers were concerned about their own knowledge and preparation. Therefore, while acknowledging the importance of global awareness and understanding responsibilities to the global community, the teachers lacked the confidence and content knowledge to fully and critically address and incorporate the concepts into their instruction (Rapoport, 2010).

A follow up study by Rapoport (2013) of four participants identifies key issues in the conceptualization of global citizenship and implementation of global citizenship education. Teachers who participated attempted to challenge their students to respond to national and global issues using a critical and inquiring attitude, which they identified as being part of global citizenship. While the teachers frequently addressed international issues in the classroom and attempted to include global and international perspectives, none of the teachers used the term global citizen or global citizenship. Instead, Rapoport recorded that the teachers relied on the following terms: globalization, interdependence, global market, tolerance, global environment and international law. The author concludes that the teachers felt discomfort using the term global citizenship in the classroom. Another important finding is that the teachers conceptualized global citizenship through their own experiences and course of study; therefore the term lacked a cohesive meaning or definition for them. While the teachers recognized the importance
of global citizenship as part of their instruction, they lacked the proper training and support. Additional findings reported the teachers’ responses indicated three rationales for teaching global citizenship: a US-centered or US-loyal perspective, global citizenship as an extended national citizenship, and global citizenship as a means to critically look at and reevaluate the role of one’s own country. Within these rationales, the teachers encouraged critical thinking, yet also promoted the advantages of U.S. democracy and the lack of democracy and freedoms in other countries (Rapoport, 2013). These findings indicate a more Western-centric, albeit well-intentioned, conceptualization of global citizenship education.

In a related study, Myers (2006) conducted research in which he compared what he identified as two exemplary secondary programs that dealt with global issues and themes. The schools were purposefully selected based on nominations of 18 educators from a Midwestern university and non-governmental organizations with a focus on global issues. The purpose of the study was to explore the current state of global citizenship education in the US. Interviews with teachers and a student focus group from each school were conducted and data such as curricular materials, course syllabi, and assignments were collected. The findings reflect that neither program challenged the traditional nationalistic view of the nation state. Further, the findings indicate that both programs utilized curricula that lacked up to date analysis of globalization and global studies. The programs also focused more on multiculturalism of the US than on global cultures and diversity. The researcher concludes that the data collected supported the “reality of the U.S. education system at best approximates the goal of developing national
citizens with some relativistic understanding and awareness of the rest of the world” (p. 31). Also, even though a global perspective was introduced, the concept of global citizenship was not fully explored nor articulated (Myers, 2006).

While these studies focused on practicing teachers’ perceptions, they did not involve cross-cultural interaction. Merryfield (2000; 2003) contends that the experience of cross-cultural interaction is crucial in developing conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education. The introduction of cross-cultural interaction between practicing teachers provides a foundation for the development of global citizenship awareness as well as an environment to explore aspects of global citizenship education (Harshman & Augustine, 2013).

Cross-Cultural Interaction

Scholars point to the necessity for educators to develop intercultural sensitivity in an increasingly global society (Bennett, 2008; Deardorff, 2006; Merryfield, 1995; 2000a; 2000b; 2003; Perry & Southwell, 2011). Educators must have intercultural competency to prepare the children of today, who will increasingly be interacting with diverse cultures locally as well as globally (Myers, 2006; Merryfield, 1995; 2000a; 2000b; Perry and Southwell, 2011). Research indicates that teaching abroad programs or studying abroad programs increase global awareness, sensitivity to diversity, and an appreciation for diversity (Dasen, 1992; Merryfield, 2000a; 2000b; 2003; 2008), all attributes of a global citizen. However, since study abroad programs are often costly and educators may not be able (or desire) to take advantages of working abroad due to financial or familial
constraints, other options to develop intercultural competency among educators must be explored. Technology and social media provide a variety of options for cross-cultural interactions. Virtual face-to-face synchronous as well as asynchronous cross-cultural interaction studies indicate positive outcomes for increased sensitivity to cultural diversity, perspective taking, and critical thinking (Bonk, Appelman & Hay, 1996; Daniels, Berglunce & Petre, 1999; Merryfield, 2003; Sunal & Christensen, 2002).

Merryfield (1995; 2000a; 2000b; 2003; 2007) has conducted extensive research in cross-cultural interaction in order to develop global mindedness among educators. Her studies focus on incorporating what she terms cultural consultants (2003) to interact with pre-service and practicing teachers who are enrolled in education classes at Ohio State University. Cultural consultants are individuals who live in the community or abroad, but due to their lived experiences and research provide viewpoints that challenge the cultural norm as well as provide cultural perspectives to which the U.S. educators may not be exposed (1995; 2003; 2007). Only the studies most relevant to my proposal are included in this overview of literature.

Merryfield (1995) argues that to develop competent teacher educators and practitioners in the area of global education, there must be three components: cross-cultural experience, scholarly knowledge, and the ability and desire to work together to gain and to reflect upon information. She points out that for global education to be effective, the curriculum must be adapted to meet the “contexts of communities, schools or specific-subjects such as social studies” (1995, p. 20). An analysis of a program at
Ohio State University (OSU) provides positive indications for intercultural interaction among pre-service teachers (1995). The program involved globally oriented teacher educators who organized a curriculum centered on cooperative learning, extensive field experience, simulations and role playing, approaches to controversial topics, and multiple perspectives. The teachers brought a unique combination to the program since they had all lived and worked abroad, or they had international expertise in some capacity. The outcomes for the pre-service teachers included: the development of a perspective consciousness, awareness of interconnectedness and how actions have influence globally, sensitivity to differences, questioning of the bias or hegemony of resources and materials, and recognition of and the ability to deal with complex issues of teaching an increasingly diverse student body (Merryfield, 1995).

Another two-year study (Merryfield, 2000a) focused on the efficacy of cross-cultural, asynchronous online threaded discussions to develop a global mindedness. The participants were graduate students in social studies and global education classes. Merryfield recruited other participants (as cultural consultants) through various departments on campus and community resources. These cultural consultants were people of color and people from other countries who lived within the area. For Merryfield, the use of cultural consultants insures diversity of “race, ethnicity, national origin, language, religion and worldviews” (p. 505).

The findings complemented previous studies that indicate that when students participate in online forums, they engage in discussions that are more in-depth than the
discussions that normally occur in face-to-face class interactions. Merryfield also found that students were more likely to engage in discussions of controversial topics, and the findings pointed to less marginalization of minorities, with fewer discussions controlled by the white middle class students. The author concludes this type of discussion can bring marginalized voices to the center of discussion and respectfully introduce ideas and concepts not often experienced, thereby leading to a greater global perspective (2000a).

One of Merryfield’s (2003) studies included 22 cross-cultural consultants from other countries trained in intercultural skills and 92 US teachers from five different social studies graduate courses. The study took place over a period of two years and utilized an asynchronous online discussion forum. The cross-cultural consultants challenged “American mainstream assumptions and western views of the world” (p. 148). The interactions between the students and the cross-cultural consultants took place over an online discussion board. Online discourse and assignments were analyzed and coded for emergent themes. Findings indicated that the interaction diffused triggers of difference. Students’ work indicated an increased depth of study and meaningfulness since they had more time to reflect and respond than in a traditional classroom setting. Merryfield concludes that the results created a community of diverse learners with connections to a larger world, and heightened world mindedness (2003).

Harshman and Augustine (2013) reported on a similar cross-cultural interaction study that included 126 International Baccalaureate teachers from more than 30 countries. The asynchronous interaction was conducted in online discussion forums. Participants
weighed in on topics during three, two-week sessions. The topics provided by the researchers revolved around conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Prompts provided were: (a) What does it mean to be globally minded? and (b) How do you conceptualize and teach global citizenship education? The authors reported that their findings indicated teachers developed new understandings about open-mindedness, a sense of interconnectedness, and cross cultural learning experiences (2013).

This current research study seeks to add to the scholarly discussion by providing another window through which to view the efficacy of global citizenship education. The study provides a different perspective because the U.S. participants are practicing teachers in a traditional U.S. elementary school; are not part of an international organization such as the International Baccalaureate; and they are not part of any specific program of study, such as global awareness, a master’s program, or a pre-service methodology course. The participants from the Egyptian school vary in nationality and educational background, though all are certified teachers. Similar to the cultural consultants in previous studies (Merryfield 2000; 2003), the elementary teachers at the Egyptian school can offer the experience of having worked and lived abroad, as well as different cultural perspectives as it may relate to their nationality.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

This mixed methods study utilized a survey in order to purposefully select U.S. teachers for an online forum in which they discussed specific topics with teachers from an international school in Egypt. Each U.S. teacher was considered an individual case study. The purpose of this study was twofold: (a) to explore teachers’ attitudes regarding global citizenship education in elementary schools, and (b) to investigate the impact, if any, of intercultural interaction between the elementary school teachers in the U.S. and the elementary school teachers in Egypt, specifically in terms of the U.S. teachers’ conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education. I focused on the conceptualizations of five U.S. teachers, how those conceptualizations developed or did not develop, and the value that the U.S. teachers placed on global citizenship and global citizenship education. Current research on global citizenship education remains focused on pre-service teachers or practicing teachers enrolled in graduate programs. I sought to explore an under-researched area related to working practicing teachers in public elementary school settings.

Research Questions

The central research question is:

1. How, if at all, does cross-cultural interaction enhance U.S. teachers’ awareness and conceptualizations of global citizenship?

The sub research questions are:
2. How do practicing U.S. teachers conceptualize global citizenship?
3. At what level of importance do U.S. teachers place global citizenship instruction?
4. What resources and strategies/practices do U.S. teachers use for global citizenship instruction?

**Mixed Methods**

For this project, I employed a mixed methods design consisting of a survey with an embedded case study (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). U.S. participants were purposefully chosen via the results of the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS) (Morias & Ogden, 2010). Following a pre-interview, the participants posted comments to an online discussion forum.

The use of both quantitative and qualitative data during the first half of the twentieth century was most commonly associated with research in cultural anthropology and sociology (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). While not termed “mixed methods,” these studies used both quantitative and qualitative methods, and later scholars in the social science field would explore and explicate the use of multiple methods to enhance or triangulate (Bouchard, 1978; Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966 cited by Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007). Though not new, mixed methods research is receiving renewed attention as scholars call for more in-depth and more complete educational research (Johnson & Onwegbuzie, 2004; 2007). Following the adoption of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), quantitative empirical research
provided significant data to inform legislation. However, as argued by Johnson and Onwegbuzie (2004), quantitative data alone elucidates only a piece of a complex phenomenon. Research using a variety of methods is necessary to identify successful and meaningful educational strategies and interventions (Raudenbush, 2005).

Pragmatism is the primary philosophical underpinning for mixed or multiple methods research (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011) and is often closely aligned with constructivism (Blackburn, 2005). The primary focus of pragmatism is cause and effect. Thinking and action work together toward a final outcome. Knowledge is dynamic and intrinsically intertwined with the “sociology of knowledge” (Noddings, 2005b, p. 58). Pragmatism embraces the concept of pluralism, democracy in education, and more useful ways of thinking, yet does not dismiss empirical research (Danforth, 2008; Hyslop-Margison & Strobel, 2008; Rorty, 1982; Sutinen, 2008). Therefore, pragmatism relates well to the mixed methods approach: “Mixed methods research is, generally speaking, an approach to knowledge (theory and practice) that attempts to consider multiple viewpoints, perspectives, positions, and standpoints (always including the standpoints of qualitative and quantitative research)” (Johnson, Onwegbuzie, & Turner, 2007).

Researchers use mixed methods research for specific purposes such as triangulation, exploration, or explanation (Bryman, 2006; Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). Various scholars in the field of research have contributed to the literature explicating the purposes of mixed methods. Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989) identified five overarching reasons, while Bryman (2006) provided 16 rationales (18 if one considers the
categories *unclear* and *other*). Yet both sets of reasons are subsumed into more easily explicated purposes:

- A need exists because one data source may be insufficient
- A need exists to explain initial results
- A need exists to generalize exploratory findings
- A need exists to enhance a study with a second method
- A need exists to best employ a theoretical stance
- A need exists to understand a research objective through multiple research phases (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011, pp. 8-11).

In fact, more than one rationale may be employed to support the use of mixed methods (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011; Bryman, 2006). For example, a researcher may seek to use mixed methods to explore a specific phenomenon and also intend for the mixed methods to inform the process of the study (2011).

A researcher’s questions, as well as his or her epistemology/ontology, drive the choice in methodology. The nuances of global citizenship as a construct or phenomenon are intricately part of one’s culture, psychology, environment, and perceptions (Appiah, 2008; Merryfield, 2000; 2007; Myers, 2006). Therefore, using a mixed methods approach will provide more breadth and depth, thereby resulting in more complete
information and a clearer picture (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011) of teachers’ conceptions regarding various dimensions of global citizenship education.

In this study, I used a mixed methods research design to explore elementary teachers’ development of global citizenship and global citizenship education awareness, as well as the teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship during a cross-cultural interaction project. While Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) provide formats for specific types of mixed methods research, their work is not inclusive of all possible designs. Therefore, drawing on their work, I created the following design to provide an overview of the study:

![Figure 1. Design of Global Citizenship Education Study. This figure illustrates the study process from beginning to end.](image-url)
Global Citizenship Scale

I began the study with a quantitative survey of elementary school teachers from seven upstate elementary schools on global competencies using the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS) (Morais & Ogden, 2011). I used this survey to guide the selection of participants with low, medium, and high scores for potential participation in the cross-cultural interaction portion of my project. The GCS has been validated in the United States, but not on an international scale (2011). The survey provides a score indicating the level of global citizenship based on three primary dimensions: social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement (2011). These dimensions are parallel to the UN definition of global citizenship and each sub-dimension addresses aspects of the UN definition.

I surveyed the participants of this study using a validated subdivision of the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS) (Morais & Ogden, 2011). Morais and Ogden (2011) conducted a review of the literature surrounding global citizenship in order to develop a definition for global citizenship, as well as constructed a scale by which to measure global citizenship. Their meta-analysis revealed that global citizens generally possess global competence, engage in governmental issues, and are socially responsible (Morais & Ogden, 2010). These findings led to the development of the scale. Multiple procedures and processes have determined the reliability and validity of the GCS. The results indicated strong reliability, but upon the second administration and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) indicated that the estimated parameters were statistically significant.
except in two second-order dimensions (Social Responsibility and Global Civic Engagement), and in two first-order dimensions (Involvement and Political Voice). The researchers concluded that the scale provided educators with an instrument that aligns with the three primary dimensions of global citizenship as reflected in scholarly reviews (Morais & Ogden 2011).

**Initial Development and Validation of GCS**

Validity is the extent to which an instrument or items on an instrument measures the concept it is supposed to measure. For example, does item $x$ actually measure or indicate the presence of concept $y$? Reliability of an instrument, on the other hand, indicates whether items statistically and consistently measure the same variables each time (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010). The following discussion outlines the reliability and validity of the GCS instrument.

Following the initial identification of the three major dimensions of global citizenship, the researchers analyzed various scales used for determining the outcomes of study abroad or working abroad (2011). The authors argue that while these instruments measure important attributes of a global citizen, no individual survey existed that measured the dimensions of global citizenship as supported in the literature. Morais and Ogden studied the scales and generated a list of items from 12 of the scales. The 12 scales they used for assistance in generating the items were:

- Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy Survey (Howard & Gilbert, 2008)
• Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (Moely, Mercer, Ilustre, Miron, & McFarland, 2002)

• Civic Measurement Models (Flanagan, Syvertsen, & Stout, 2007)

• Core Indicators of Engagement (Lopez, Levine, Both, Kiesa, Kirby & Marcelo, 2006).

• Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley & Meyers, 1992)

• Global Beliefs in a Just World Scale (Lipkus, 1991)

• Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006)

• Global Mindedness Scale (Hett, 1993)

• Global Proficiency Inventory (Braskamp, 2008; Braskamp, Braskamp & Merrill, 2008)

• Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, Bennet, & Wiseman, 2003)

• Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994)

• South Pacific Studies Abroad Survey (Tarrant, 2008)

Experts then reviewed and refined the items, and administered the final product to students at five Penn State campuses. The researchers collected a total of 346 questionnaires, and conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the data, which indicated where the survey needed to be refined. The Cronbach alpha for the retained items under Social Responsibility was .70; Global Competence was .61; and Global Civic Engagement was .92. Since desirability for Cronbach Alpha is > .4, the results indicate strong reliability. Further reliability testing using a Sycamore-Brown split-half reliability
The values of the Sycamore-Brown reliability coefficient range from 0 – 1. Therefore, .91 indicates strong reliability (2011).

A series of CFA confirmed the findings of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), with a sample size of 310 respondents. Due to the small population size, the researchers were very conservative in their criteria they set for measurement. These criteria included: (a) a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom less than 2, (b) two incremental indices and non-normed fit index greater than or equal to .90, (c) a standardized root mean square residual smaller than or equal to .07, and (d) a root mean square error of approximation smaller than or equal to .07. The CFA indicated that a 10-factor model was optimal for the data. Figure 2, below, illustrates the final measurement model.
Figure 2. Morais and Ogden’s Global Citizenship Scale. The figure illustrates the final measurement model. Reprinted with permission (Morais & Ogden, 2011).

The final results indicated that instrument reliability was statistically significant for two dimensions. The model illustrates the reliability of the dimensional structure in assessing global citizenship. The dimension of Global Civic Engagement loaded significantly (.99) on Global Citizenship as well as Global Competence (.77). Even
though the link between social responsibility and global citizenship is not statistically significant, the overall fit was acceptable, given the model. Neither the elimination nor the inclusion of the dimension affected the overall reliability, and since the review of literature indicated social responsibility as an important dimension of global citizenship, the dimension was retained (Durate B. Morias, Personal correspondence, June, 2014).

Researchers have used both qualitative and quantitative approaches to determine the validity of the GCS. Morais and Ogden conducted group interviews whose results supported the proposed scale. A second administration of the GCS took place with 288 students and the results “revealed that the 30-item, higher-order, 10-factor Global Citizenship Scale … had a desirable fit with the data” (p. 458). However, the parameter estimates related to the primary dimensions were not all statistically significant, leaving only Global Competence as statistically significant for validity. For this study, I did not use the overall GCS score to determine the continuum scores of the participants. As the only valid dimension is global competency, this was the only section that I chose to administer (Appendix B). While research indicates that all three dimensions are significant components of global citizenship, the limitations of the instrument make it difficult to adequately measure all dimensions.

I chose eight U.S. elementary school teachers, representing the continuum of the GCS scores related to Global Competence, to participate in the cross-cultural interaction project. However, only five were able to participate. I sought a range of GCS scores in order to provide the best possible maximum variation sampling (Creswell & Plano-Clark,
Maximum variation sampling seeks to provide participants “who are expected to hold different perspectives” (p. 174) on the phenomenon being studied.

**Case Study Design**

In determining the usefulness of a case study for the qualitative part of the study, I sought to identify or choose what was to be studied within a bounded system (Stake, 2000). Case study researchers use a variety of different terms to address the types of case studies undertaken (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). For instance, Stake identifies three different types of case studies: the intrinsic case study, the instrumental case study, and the collective case study. The qualitative portion of this study follows a *multiple* (Yin, 2003) or *collective* (Stake, 2000) case study design. For the purpose of this study, I use the term collective case study to describe my design. A collective case study design allows the researcher to study and analyze each teacher’s response to cross-cultural interaction as an individual case. Collective case study design provides the structure for compelling and robust evidence. Stake refers to the efficacy of collective case studies as individual cases in a collection (in this study the individual teachers) that are part of the investigation of a common phenomenon (in this study, the results of cross-cultural interaction) (2000).

I chose a case study approach because it allowed a more in-depth exploration (Merriam, 1998) of teachers’ conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Also, my questions reflected the criteria of Yin’s (2014) discussion of case study relevancy: “The more your questions seek to explain some present circumstance (e.g., how or why some social phenomenon works), the more that
case study research will be relevant” (p. 4). Yin also explains the case study is best suited for questions that “require an extensive in-depth description of some social phenomenon” (p.4). In seeking to determine the teachers’ conceptions and value of global citizenship and global citizenship education, the desire was to “understand [a] complex social phenomenon” (p. 4) within a real-life situation. The case study approach also provided a unique opportunity to explore the research questions using a wide variety of sources (Yin, 2008) such as interviews, forum postings, documents and other artifacts collected.

I chose to pursue qualitative research in order to investigate a particular phenomenon within the natural environment and the perspectives of the participants. I collected multiple data sources such as interviews, artifacts, and responses to an online forum in order to triangulate and support findings. Philosophical assumptions undergird the qualitative research (Merriam, 1998; Paul, 2005). These assumptions guide the researcher to an overall worldview that guides their ontological, epistemological, and methodological beliefs (2005). Socio-cultural theory provided a theoretical framework that complemented this study and my assumptions regarding knowledge development, my philosophical view of education, and the overall exploration process.

**Theoretical Framework**

Socio-cultural constructivist theory maintains that knowledge and truth are constructed within the context of social interactions and environmental influences (Bornstein, 2010; Paul, 2005). The roots of socio-cultural theory are attributed to
Vygotsky (1972), an early 20th century Russian psychologist whose work “has figured prominently in American psychology” (p. ix) and teacher education since the early 1960s. Vygotsky’s emphasis on social and cultural factors in an individual’s development (1972) influenced Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 1986, 2005) ecological model and Super and Harkness’ (1996) theory of the developmental niche. The core focus of these developing theories is the interaction between the individual, the environment (geographical, physical and psychological), culture, and social influences (Gardiner & Kozmetsky, 2011). The process of interaction between the individual, environment, culture, and society is dynamic and ongoing, extending beyond childhood and into adulthood (2011). The nature of cross-cultural interaction and the exploration of outcomes based on the interactions within this study rendered socio-cultural theory a particularly suitable framework for my analysis (2011).

The baseline attitude of the U.S. teachers regarding global citizenship education, as measured by the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS) (Morais & Ogden, 2011), is the result of their socio-culture environment and the influences within that context. By introducing a new dimension of cross-cultural interaction to their environment, the familiar may be challenged, resulting in the development of different notions of global citizenship education. In this section, I provide an overview of mixed method design, an extensive discussion of the GCS, and proposed data collection and analysis processes.

**Online Discussion Forum**
I used asynchronous communication via a discussion forum board for this project. Asynchronous communication occurs in delayed time and does not require simultaneous participation (Johnson, 2006). Common technology associated with asynchronous communication or instruction includes various online discussion groups such as chat rooms, discussion forums, and blackboard discussion groups. On the other hand, synchronous communication occurs in real time, requiring simultaneous participation by all interested parties (2006). Google Hangouts, Skype, instant messaging, and other face-to-face technology are commonly associated with synchronous communication.

The use of asynchronous communication for the majority of the project is supported by several practical and theoretical aspects. Egypt is seven hours ahead of the East Coast; therefore, the seven-hour time difference between the East Coast and Egypt makes synchronous discussion inconvenient. When most of the U.S. participants are completing their day at work, in Egypt the time is close to midnight. Requiring synchronous communication would obviously be inconvenient, and this can result in reduced participation and negatively affect the research project (Williams, Watkins, Daley, Courtenay, Davis, & Dymock, 2001; Johnson, 2006). I attempted to schedule an initial synchronous meeting of participants, but failed due to time differences, differences in weekend holidays, as well as lack of agreement among the U.S. teachers. The use of synchronous interaction to support asynchronous discussions provides a sense of social presence, and increases asynchronous interaction and collaboration (Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2009; Oztok, Zingaro, Brett & Hewitt, 2012). This format is often termed hybrid (Skylar, 2009). Using initial synchronous interaction aids in building a sense of community,
responsibility to engage in the online discussion, and vested interest in the online project (Oztok, Zingaro, Brett & Hewitt, 2012).

The online discussion format for peer-to-peer interaction is a powerful and effective method to build interactivity, share information, gather information and foster collaboration (Williams et al., 2001). Participants can read other group members’ postings and have time and unlimited space to synthesize and organize ideas (2001). Part of the project’s success lies in the comfort level of the participants as they discuss their views and share ideas. Meeting asynchronously defuses the social discomfort often associated with face-to-face meetings and allows for unrestrained participation (Johnson, 2006; Williams, et al., 2001). Participants are more likely to express their ideas without fear of negative response or judgment (Luppicini, 2007). Global citizenship, global citizenship education curricula, and the question of implementing any global citizenship education are currently subjects of debate among educators (Harshman & Augustine, 2013; Myers, 2006), and providing a space in which the topics can be discussed freely is vital to gathering reliable data.

Further, my research required the teacher participants to reflect and provide thoughtful responses to the prompts. Research indicates that asynchronous discussions foster responses that are more in-depth and thoughtful than responses produced in synchronous discussions (Williams, et al., 2001; Johnson, 2006). A study by Meyer (2003) found that participants in asynchronous discussions took extra time for reflection and spent more time formulating responses. This extra time for consideration of the
prompt increased understanding and resulted in more thorough discussions (Meyer, 2003). Studies suggest that the high level of cognitive processing required for asynchronous discussions optimizes the participants’ responses and results in more complex and critical thinking (Aviv, Erlich, Ravid, & Geva, 2003; Javela & Hakkinen, 2002; Meyer, 2003). As participants explore the discussion threads and critically engage with the prompts, the resulting discussion will be richer and provide more complete data for the project (Luppicini, 2007).

As I was a research novice, I did not foresee the length of time required to secure the university’s Internal Review Board (IRB) approval for the research. Initially the study was to take place from November through February. However, the IRB approval process took over two months, and the board did not issue approval until the second week of February. After obtaining IRB approval, I distributed the survey immediately, but response was slow, and I was unable to conduct pre-interviews until late March.

Prior to the cross-cultural interaction portion of the project, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the U.S. participants, which I recorded and later transcribed for analysis. The pre-interview also served to collect background information about each participant in order to provide rich, in-depth description (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2014; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). I also elicited information relating to their views on global citizenship and global citizenship education. These questions, which were intended to determine their familiarity and knowledge of the concept, provided a baseline for reference as the forum progressed. I also asked participants were also asked to rate the
value of global citizenship education on a scale of 1 to 10. Question 7 afforded me the chance to follow up on any information by asking the participant to elaborate on specific details, or ideas, they mentioned in the earlier part of the interview. I added two additional questions related to their experience with the online forum to the informal post-interview. See Appendices C and D for the entire pre- and post-interview protocols.

GCS Survey Results

I used the GCS survey primarily as a means to choose participants for Phase 2 of the study. I distributed the survey to seven schools. A total of 37 teachers responded, and their years of experience ranged from 1 to 43 years. Fourteen teachers ranged from 1 to 10 years teaching experience. Five teachers ranged from 11 to 20 years, and 16 had more than 20 years of teaching experience. The majority of the respondents, 92% (34) were female, the remaining 8% (3) were male. The majority of respondents were white, at 92% (34), and 8% (3) were African American. When asked how many times they had traveled outside the US, 22% (8) participants said that they had traveled once, 22% (8) had traveled between 2 and 5 times outside the US, 3% (1) had traveled 8 times, and 3% (1) had traveled outside the US 10 times. The remainder had not traveled outside the US. About a quarter, 24% (9) of the teachers reported being at beginner level in a second language, 14% (5) said intermediate, and 3% (1) said advanced. The remainder reported no knowledge in a second language.

The teachers also responded to 13 questions related to global competence. When asked if they were confident they could thrive in any culture or country, 11% (4) strongly
agreed, 35% (13) agreed, while 29% (11) disagreed or strongly disagreed. The remaining nine teachers (24%) self-reported as neutral. Two questions related to adapting when interacting with individuals from a different background or culture: 8% (3) strongly agreed they unconsciously adapted behavior and mannerisms when interacting with other cultures, 57% (21) agreed, 24% (9) remained neutral, and 11% (4) disagreed. When asked in a related question if they adapted communication style to other people’s culture, 11% (4) strongly agreed, 62% (23) agreed, 16% (6) chose neutral, and 11% (4) reported they disagreed.

When asked about their ability to communicate in different ways with people from different cultures, 11% (4) strongly agreed, 50% (18) agreed, 14% (5) remained neutral, 19% disagreed, and 6% strongly disagreed. Being well informed about global issues is a criteria for global competency, and 8% (3) reported that they strongly agreed to being well informed, 47% (17) agreed that they were informed, 22% (8) were neutral, and 22% (8) disagreed.

The survey also addressed beliefs related to their ability to mitigate global issues. Teachers also responded to the prompt “I know how to develop a plan to help mitigate a global environmental or social problem,” and 5% (2) strongly agreed, 27% (10) agreed, 32% (12) remained neutral, 32% (12) disagreed, and 3% (1) strongly disagreed.

Participants responded to the belief they can make a difference on world’s most worrisome problems, 3% (1) strongly agreed, 39% (14) agreed, 28% (10) chose neutral, 25% (9) disagreed, and 6% (2) strongly disagreed. When directed to react to their belief
they are able to mediate interactions between people of different cultures, 3% (1) strongly agreed, 35% (13) agreed, 27% (10) stated neutral, 32% (12) disagreed, and 3% (1) strongly disagreed.

With regards to ability to influence others to care about global issues, 38% (14) agreed they were able to do so, 54% (20) reported neutral, and 8% (3) disagreed. 27% (10) strongly agreed they welcomed working with people with different cultural values, 57% (21) agreed, 14% (5) were neutral, and 3% (1) disagreed. With regards to feeling comfortable expressing their views about a global problem in front of a group, 11% (4) strongly agreed, 28% (10) agreed, 22% (8) remained neutral, 36% (13) disagreed, and 3% (1) strongly disagreed. A follow up survey item stated, “I am able to write an opinion letter to a local media source expressing my concerns over global inequities and issue. 5% (2) strongly agreed, 49% (18) agreed, 24% (9) stated neutral, and 22% (8) disagreed.

Choice of U.S. Participants

I distributed 52 surveys, and 40 were returned. Of the 40, only 34 were completed, resulting in a return of 65% completed surveys. The GCS scores ranged from a high of 57 and a low of 34. The range of scores was 23. The highest possible score for the GCS section used is 62. The mean score was 42 with a standard deviation of 6. However, scores of the twelve teachers who agreed to be considered for phase two of the study only ranged from 36 to 56. A cluster affect was found between 36 and 42 for the three “lowest” of these scores.
The initial intent was to choose participants with a wide spectrum of scores. Yet, individuals in the lower range did not agree to be part of phase two of the study, forcing me to choose from scores between 36 and 56. At this time, I took other demographic information into consideration, including racial diversity, teaching position, distribution between schools, knowledge of languages beyond English, and experiences abroad. The U.S. teachers that I chose for the study are listed in the table below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>GCS Score</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Resource 2-5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Woodall-Parkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Resource 2-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>Pierpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Woodall-Parkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pryce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the thirteen teachers who had agreed to Phase Two were black. All others were white. While I could not find definitive data from the SCDOE, the percentage of black instructors in the six participating schools was approximately 1%, based on discussions with school principals. The percentage of black population of the county is 13.2%. I selected two black teachers for the study. Both brought unique a perspective to the study. Magdalene was a former board member of the National Teachers Association (NEA). Her total score was 54. The other, Jacqueline, had traveled outside the United States three times, and she also stated that she was fluent in two languages other than English. Her total score was 54.2. However, prior to the beginning
of the study, Magdalene declined to participate due to health reasons, and within the first two weeks of the study, Jacqueline withdrew due to her academic workload.

The remaining teacher participants were all white. Beyond scores, the purposeful sampling took into account their self-reported knowledge of language, trips outside the US and current teaching position. For example, four resource teachers volunteered to be considered for phase two of the study; however, to ensure a range of classroom teaching experiences, only two resource teachers were chosen. Studies indicate the knowledge of a language beyond English and travel abroad influences individuals’ perception of global citizenship (Schattle, 2008). Therefore, it was important that I selected participants based on a broad range of reported language knowledge and travel experience. With regards to language, none reported advanced knowledge; therefore I was only able to select from a sample that self-reported zero, beginning, and moderate knowledge. Only one, Caroline, reported a level of language knowledge beyond the beginner level. Also, only one participant, Mary, reported having no language knowledge beyond English.

I also considered the number of trips (from zero to five) that participants had taken outside the U.S. Cathy, a resource teacher, scored 36 on the GCS survey, the lowest score of the group. She reported a beginner’s knowledge of Spanish and three trips outside the US. The highest scores, following the resignation of Jacqueline and Madeline, were those of Caroline and Leigh, who each scored 43. Caroline reported five trips outside the US and a moderate knowledge of Spanish. Leigh traveled only once outside the US and noted a beginner’s knowledge of French. The final two participants, Jackie and Mary, scored 40 and 41, respectively.
Finally, I must acknowledge that the loss of the black teachers is a severe limitation for the study. Effective global educators have the ability to see the world from a dual perspective. Double consciousness is integral to developing an understanding of other worldviews (Merryfield, 2009). White teachers do not develop the ability to see the world from the mainstream, as well as from the margins until leaving North America and working/living abroad (2000a; 2009), while lack teachers often develop a double consciousness during childhood because of their experiences of being on the “periphery of society, to be looked at as an outsider” (2009, p. 226). The lack of people of color in the study limits the critical perspective they may bring to the discussion of citizenship and equity between peoples of different backgrounds and cultures.

**Schools and Location Context of U.S. Participants**

The focus of the study was the attitudes and conceptions of the five participating U.S. teachers. The teacher participants were drawn from seven public elementary schools that are part of two separate school districts located in upstate South Carolina. Most of the teachers employed by the schools are long-time residents of the area. Nestled near the “Golden Corner” of South Carolina, the area features numerous lakes, fishing tournaments, river tubing, hiking trials, campgrounds, and other outdoor recreation facilities. Recognized as a conservative area within a noted “red state” (Politico, 2014; South Carolina Voter Commission, 2014), residents commonly display the U.S. flag and Christian symbols or messages in their yards and on their automobiles. The area in which the schools are located is primarily rural, but within 45 minutes of a medium sized urban
There are four institutions of higher learning nearby: one four-year state university (referred to in this study as Central University), two private religiously affiliated four-year institutions, and one state two-year technical college. Two of the participating schools are near a city village with a population slightly over 3,000. All are Title I schools with class sizes averaging from 13 to 19 students depending on grade level. Both school districts have experienced a steady Hispanic enrollment growth over the past decade, and subsequently an increase of English Language Learners (ELLs) (South Carolina Department of Education, School Report Cards, 2014).

Pierpont Elementary and Lafayette Elementary are located in the same school district, closest to the city village, and are 3.8 miles apart. Large oak and cedar trees line the streets of the village that is noted for its numerous 18th and 19th century building structures (South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 2015). The village, which is on the National Registry of Historic Sites, hosts numerous festivals and craft fairs on the town square, which dates to 1790. The area surrounding the two schools has more than 12 historic sites, including two plantations.

Approximately 415 students from Kindergarten through Grade 6 attend Pierpont Elementary, while Lafayette Elementary serves 417. Both schools exceed the district average of 48% free and reduced lunch, with Pierpont at 78% and Lafayette at 53%. While the majority of students are white, Lafayette reports 10% black students and 3.8% Hispanic, and Pierpont reports 30% black and 2.6% Hispanic students. Both schools have less than 2% of the students self-reporting as Asian/Pacific Islanders or Asian
(South Carolina Department of Education, School Report Cards, 2014). The average household income for the area is $23,660 compared to the national average of $53,046 (Spearling’s Best Places, 2014).

Taylors Creek Elementary is the smallest school within the same district as Pierpont and Lafayette. Nestled in between fields of hay and green pastures, at the farthest, most rural corner of the county, Taylors Creek Elementary serves 284 students in Pre-K through Grade 6. 64% of the students receive free and reduced lunch. While the population of the nearby town of Taylors Creek is over 3,000, only 17% are of school age. The majority of the residents are between the ages of 35 to 74. The majority of the students at Taylors Creek Elementary are white (92%). The rest of the students are black (5%), multiracial (1%), Asian/Pacific Islander (1%), Hispanic (1%), and Hawaiian or other (1%) (South Carolina Department of Education, School Report Cards, 2014). The average family income in the area is $41,442, significantly below the national average of $53,046 (Spearling’s, Best Places, 2014).

The other four schools, Calhoun Park, Pryce, Sycamore, and Woodall-Parkinson are located in an adjacent school district and share similar demographics. While these schools serve approximately 1/3 of the more rural area of the school district, they are located within close proximity to each other and nestled around the small towns of Parkinson, Woodall-Parkinson, and Waynesville, which have a combined population of 4,871. Driving between the schools, a motorist will pass multiple cow and sheep farms as well as long stretches of two-lane highway through wooded areas. These rural schools
serve Pre-K to Grade 5 and are located within ten square miles of each other, but serve a widely dispersed population surrounding three nearby small towns. An estimate of the average family income for the area is difficult to determine as the area sprawls over many miles and includes many remote areas. However, the average family income for the primary nearby town is $42,461, which is also significantly below the national average of $53,046 (Spearling’s, Best Places, 2014).

The two largest schools are Pryce Elementary and Calhoun Park Elementary, only four miles apart with attendance zones bordering those of Sycamore and Woodall-Parkinson. The schools serve an area surrounding Waynesville, which was once known for its healthy springs and developed into a popular health resort with the arrival of the railroad in the mid 1800’s (SCIWAY, 2015). The Civil War proved disastrous to the resort, and it never regained its pre-war popularity. Eventually, the town relied on nearby cotton mills for economic survival. Again, the demise of the cotton mills forced residents to seek employment elsewhere; however, since the town is positioned near a major interstate, the residents easily commute to jobs in nearby urban areas (2015). Pryce Elementary serves almost 600 students from Pre-K to Grade 5. Most of the students identify as white (74%) or Hispanic (12%). Only 10% of the students identify themselves as black, and multiracial at 4%. Over 60% of students receive free or reduced lunch. Nearby Calhoun Park Elementary has a population of 637 students of which 57% receive free or reduced lunch. The school has the largest Hispanic student population of the seven schools (7%). Like the other schools, the majority student population is white.
(86%). The black student population is low (4%) as well as the multiracial population (3%) (Zillow, 2014).

Approximately two miles northeast of Pryce is Woodall-Parkinson Elementary. Like Pryce and Calhoun Park, with a student population of 528 students, Woodall-Parkinson has a larger Hispanic student population (5%) than black student population (3%), with a majority white student population (91%) (Public Schools K-12, 2014). More than 53% of the students receive free and reduced lunch. Finally, five miles away is Sycamore Elementary. Sycamore Elementary has approximately 508 students, with 51% receiving free or reduced lunch compared to the districts overall average of 35%. The student demographics reflect 84% white, 9% black, and 4% Hispanic. Approximately 3% of students are reported as multi-racial.

Choice of Teachers in Egypt, Demographics and Context

This study seeks to explore one aspect of a growing and complex academic debate surrounding global citizenship and global citizenship education by focusing on teacher’s cross-cultural interactions via a discussion forum and how might that interaction develop or influence their notions of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Merryfield coined the term cultural consultants in her research of cross-cultural interaction between pre-service teachers and/or Master’s degree-seeking teachers with educators from abroad or practicing outside the United States. Merryfield (1995; 2000a; 2000b; 2003; 2007) has conducted extensive research in cross-cultural interaction in order to develop global mindedness among educators. Her studies focus on incorporating
what she terms cultural consultants (2003) to interact with pre-service and practicing teachers who are enrolled in education classes at Ohio State University. Cultural consultants are individuals who live in the community or abroad, but due to their lived experiences and research provide viewpoints that challenge the cultural norm as well as provide cultural perspectives to which the U.S. educators may not be exposed (1995; 2003; 2007). This study used her notion (idea) and invited participants from an international school in Egypt to be the cultural consultants in the discussion forum with the teachers from the United States.

I chose the teachers in Egypt from the American International Academy (AIA), through my ties with the elementary principal and school superintendent. The American International Academy (AIA) in Egypt is located in an area that, until less than 10 years ago, was a desert approximately 22 miles from downtown Cairo. The area, now known as New Cairo, has mushroomed into several mini-cities with gated compounds, high-end shopping malls, 5 star hotels, and exclusive dining. The desert still exists, but is dotted with green oases from which spring high rise apartment buildings (called flats), private clubs and gardens. While only 22 miles from the center of Cairo, the drive requires an hour due to the heavy traffic.

AIA recruits teachers from around the world, but its primary focus is to recruit US certified teachers since the school, which is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSA), promotes an American curriculum. Other accreditations include those from Council of International Schools (CIS) and authorization by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) to offer the International Baccalaureate
(IB) Diploma. AIA high school students are offered the opportunity to earn either an American Diploma or an IB Diploma. The IB program is limited to Grades 11 and 12.

A breakdown of the nationalities all of the school’s teachers includes nine countries, and is listed below:

- United States - 88
- Canada - 14
- Egypt - 30
- Trinidad & Tobago - 1
- Lebanon - 2
- United Kingdom - 4
- Cyprus - 1
- France - 2
- Ecuador - 1

The elementary school also has 42 teacher’s assistants; all are Egyptian nationals.

Following discussions with the superintendent and elementary school principal, the principal sent an email inviting teachers to participate in the study. Ten teachers responded, and all were invited to participate. I traveled to Egypt and met with the volunteering participants. During our meeting, I explained the study, the online discussion forum, and collected demographic data. Deena, a 25-year old third year teacher, participated in only two forum topics. During the study, Deena was teaching full time and working on an additional degree in secondary education. Two other teachers, Angelina and Bob, contributed to only one discussion forum topic each. Angelina and
Bob were first year teachers at AIA and reported the demands of their schedules and class preparation in a new position hindered their ability to participate regularly. The other seven participated in all four forum topics.

Of the 10 participants, 8 had US citizenship and 2 had dual citizenship. All 10 participants were fluent in English. Deena and Danielle had dual citizenship in Egypt and the US. Deena was born in Egypt to Egyptian parents, but her father had U.S. citizenship, and therefore she had dual citizenship. Danielle, a 21-year veteran teacher, married an Egyptian and gained her Egyptian citizenship through marriage. Danielle had been teaching in Egypt for 11 years. Angelina described herself as half-Iraqi, half-American, with U.S. citizenship. When we discussed language fluency beyond English, Angelina explained that she lived abroad extensively (including living and studying in Tanzania, Kenya and Croatia) and spoke Arabic fluently. Angelina had also taught one year in Thailand prior to her position at AIA. Deena described herself as fluent or advanced in Arabic and French, while Danielle describe herself as moderate in Arabic, and fluent in French.

Glinda taught in the United States for 16 years and had taught in Egypt for 1 year. Born in Puerto Rico and raised in both the unincorporated territory of the US and mainland US, she reported her first language as Spanish and English as her second language. She also self-reported a knowledge of Italian at an advanced level and of French at an intermediate level. Scarlet who was in her 12th year of teaching explained she knew only phrases in other languages and was beginning her second year at AIA. Her teaching experience at AIA was her first experience outside the US. Bob and
Patience also stated they knew phrases in other languages, but were only fluent in English. Bob, however, had taught five years outside the US prior to his position at AIA. He spent three years in Abu Dhabi, two in Thailand, and was in his first year as a teacher at AIA. Patience reported AIA was her first experience teaching outside the US, and was in her second year there after teaching 28 years in the US.

Kat, Stephanie and Addy had a combined 111 years of teaching experience. Stephanie and Addy had each taught 42 years. Kat reported 27 years teaching experience. They all laughed when asked how often they had traveled outside the US, and looked at each other, then said in unison, “More times than I can count!” They each had lived outside the US for a significant amount of time.

Stephanie explained she had taught outside the US for 14 years. Her previous teaching assignments were in Germany, Nigeria, China and Guatemala. She was in her first year at AIA. Stephanie said that she knew phrases in all the native languages in each country she had taught, but had an intermediate knowledge of Spanish. Addy stated that she had been teaching outside the US since 1992 and listed Vietnam, Germany, Kuwait, England, and Egypt as her ports of call. She listed knowledge of Vietnamese and Arabic at the beginner level, but German and Italian at the intermediate level. Kat said, “I’ve taught so many places, I can’t list them!” She reported to have lived and taught outside the US since 1983, mostly on the African continent. She had been at AIA for two years, and listed beginner knowledge of Kiswahili. The chart below provides an overview of the participants from the international school in Egypt.
Table 2

Demographic Information and Teaching Experience of Teacher Participants in Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teaching Experience/Years</th>
<th>Language other than English Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addy</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina</td>
<td>US (self-described as half Iraqi)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>US/Egypt</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deena</td>
<td>US/Egypt</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glinda</td>
<td>US (Native of Puerto Rico)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlet</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementing the study

For the implementation of the online, cross-cultural peer-to-peer interaction study, I grouped the 5 U.S. elementary teachers with 10 teachers from the American International Academy (AIA) in Egypt. The participants used asynchronous message boards or forums to share photos, ideas, and lesson plans, and I posted discussion topics for each of the four meetings. I selected discussion topics (Appendix B) based on the scholarly review of global citizenship education literature. Topics included (1) the definition of global citizenship, (b) the efficacy of global citizenship education, (3) implementing global citizenship education, and (4) a final open topic based on what the teachers wished to post and discuss related to global citizenship education (Adler, 2011; Brigham, 2011; Davies, 2006; Feeley, 2013; Leduc, 2013; Merryfield, 2007; ProjectExplorer, 2014). All cross-cultural interaction took place within the discussion.
board. The participants wrote posts reflecting on the prompt topic and contributed responses to discussions on the groups’ discussion threads. The use of reflective blog posts provides a means to draw upon participants’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences as the participants self-reflect, analyze, and respond without constraints or the risk of unintentional intervention by the interviewer (Adler, 2011; Yang, 2009).

Once I posted a new topic on the forum, I sent emails to all participants. Total postings of the U.S. teachers and the teachers in Egypt ranged from 13 to 21 for each topic. Topic 1 had the most postings, with 21, and the most views at 183. Topic 2 postings numbered 19 with 122 views. Topic 3 had 3 110 views and 20 posted comments. Topic 4 had the least postings at 13, as well as the least views, 83. I asked the U.S. teachers to post at least twice for each topic. However, they did not consistently adhere to this request. All posted twice in Topic 1, except Mary who posted only once. Topic 2 generated more activity: Leigh and Cathy posted 3 times each, and the remaining U.S. participants posted 2 times each. In Topic 4, only Cathy posted more than once, and her second posting was related to acknowledging the efficacy of Caroline’s suggestion. In general, the posts by the teachers in Egypt were lengthier and contained more specific references to global situations and media reports. For example, following the first posting I made the table below.
Table 3

Comparison of Total Postings Between Participants in the US and Participants in Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Context</th>
<th>Word Count Initial Posting</th>
<th>Word Count Follow up Posting</th>
<th>Name/Context</th>
<th>Word Count Initial Posting</th>
<th>Word Count Follow up Posting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathy/US</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Danielle/Egypt</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline/US</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Kat/Egypt</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie O/US</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Deena/Egypt</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glinda/Egypt</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addy/Egypt</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patience/Egypt</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarlet/Egypt</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susannah/Egypt</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I conducted the study, I was conscious of Glesne’s (2006) identification of a “participant-observation continuum” (p. 49) that extends from “mostly observation to mostly participation” (p. 49). The lowest level on the continuum is observer, which implies no interaction with participants, who do not realize that they are being observed. The next three levels are observer as participant, participant as observer, and full
participant. My role was observer as participant. My interaction with participants was limited to encouraging participant response to the posted discussion board.

Throughout the project, I maintained a researcher’s journal to record my thoughts, impressions, ideas, and interpretations of the project. I also used the journal to record my observations as to which aspects of the project were going smoothly, and which aspects were presenting difficulties (Merriam, 2002; 2009). Plagued by the concern that the participants would forget to read and respond to additional comments made on the forum, I sent frequent emails to the participants to encourage them to respond to updated posts.

**Data Analysis: Qualitative**

I employed a thematic data analysis, which is the most widely used method in qualitative research (Glesne, 2006). As Glesne states, thematic analysis is a progressive process of developing major code clumps to sort the data before breaking the major codes down into subcodes. The codes themselves are themes or categories, which highlighted “something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (Braun & Clark, 2008, p. 82). I also followed the step-by-step process of category construction, described by Merriam (1998) and known as the constant comparative analysis method. I analyzed the discussion forum responses for themes, and coded them based on this emergent, constant comparative process (Glesne, 2006; Merriam, 2009) and I conducted data analysis simultaneously with data collection. In order to make sense of the story being told, I found it necessary to do this constantly, as “coding is a progressive process of sorting and
defining and defining and sorting” (Glesne, 2006, p. 152). Each day, I reviewed the postings, made notes, and coded comments based on existing themes. If a new theme developed, I created a new folder in Nvivo and coded the comment within that folder. I also compared comments from the different teachers to determine similar themes or topics. Once a forum topic closed, I consulted with an additional expert in the field for inter-rater reliability.

I began by individually coding the interviews using Nvivo (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011; Welsh, 2002) as my foundational primary data source, followed by constructing themes. A list of initial themes was compiled along with specific examples and reasons to support the themes before reorganizing or clumping themes together. During this process, I asked an additional expert in the field to review the interviews and code for comparison (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). For example, in the pre-interview, all five U.S. teachers mentioned technology as an aspect of global citizenship. Later, they referred to technology as a tool or strategy to use in global citizenship education instruction. Therefore, we moved technology to the subcategory of resources. During this process, some of the themes never became salient in participants’ conversations. For example, in the initial first forum posting, a teacher from Egypt mentioned gender equity. We listed this as a theme of global citizenship and global citizenship education; however, none of the five U.S. teachers followed up with comments, nor did they ever refer to gender equity over the course of the forum. As another step in the coding process, I added quotes from each interview to support the themes.
Next, with the help of a social science scholar, I individually coded the other data sources, including reflections, uploaded resources, media, and any other uploaded archival material. Again, we made a list of themes and compared these themes to our initial list, looking for similarities and differences between all data sources by adding examples and quotes to our initial list of themes. The process of coding the data sources provided more detail and balance to the data (Merriam, 2002; 2009). As we worked through the responses to each topic, we looked back at the pre-interviews and also across the discussions, and reflected on whether or not responses were influenced by the cultural consultants. We also reviewed any resources that were uploaded by participants; however, all resource materials were provided by the teachers in Egypt. The U.S. teachers did not provide specific resources, however, they did make suggestions as to how technology might be used as a means to interact with people in other countries, or to explore different cultures. Cathy proffered the idea of a project she called *Kid Speak*, in which children reflect on specific topics.

Our process speaks to the process of validating themes and codes. Themes are validated through triangulation and the use of multiple data sources (Glense, 2006). I conducted the final semi-structured interview with the U.S. participants following the last cross-cultural forum session. I recorded, transcribed, and coded each interview as previously described. Following the last interview, I reviewed and analyzed all of the data for reliability and validity.

In reporting the results of the study, I tagged all of the data using the following
system: Pre-Interview; Post-Interview, Survey Responses, Topic 1 Response, Topic 2 Response, Topic 3 Response, Topic 4 Response, and Resources. I coded additional themes and topics as they emerged during the project and added them to Nvivo. I arranged the additional codes in separate folders within Nvivo and cross-referenced them with the initial tagging system.

**Researcher Bias and Subjectivity**

I had a varied experience growing up, beginning in a predominately white, rural, small town in upstate South Carolina. I spent my adolescence in a predominately black area, where I often was one of four or five whites in classrooms of approximately 30. I attended and graduated from high school in an affluent area near the southern coast. I also married an Egyptian and spent over twelve years living abroad. My personal experience and discussions with many people in the US during my years in Egypt had often consisted of my trying to correct a misconception about the Middle East. Therefore, I recognized from the outset my possible bias in assuming that the U.S. participants lacked awareness and interest in global issues. In order to address this concern, I constantly questioned myself when reviewing the posts. “Was I looking at the posting objectively, or was I unconsciously assuming a lack of awareness or interest?” Another step I took was to avoid filling in the silence during the interviews with my own words. I patiently waited for the participants to find their own words and made a concerted effort not to guide their responses. Likewise, I did not provide specific feedback on comments made in the online forum. I wanted to make sure I heard their
words and that I did not influence their opinions or comments. Other attempts to minimize researcher bias included having a colleague serve as an inter-rater reliability checker, member checking, and providing quotes from participants to support the emergent themes. Throughout the research process, I sought to maintain objectivity and an open mind.

**Credibility and Trustworthiness**

A study’s design is a significant aspect of the credibility of a research project (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011; Yin, 2014). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) trustworthiness of a study involves four areas: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Within each of these areas are specific steps for the researcher. Within credibility, the author mentions six steps, of which I used four: (1) persistent observation, (2) triangulation, (3) peer debriefing, and (4) member checking (1985).

The purpose of persistent observation “is to identify those characteristics and elements in the situation that are most relevant to the problem or issue being pursued and focusing on them in detail. If prolonged engagement provides scope, persistent observation provides depth” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 304). I addressed this step by reading the posts daily, taking notes on the posts, and making preliminary coding. Triangulation involves collecting various forms of data in order to provide a better understanding of the phenomenon and to provide support for developing themes and codes (1985). I addressed this by conducting pre- and post-interviews, collecting all responses to the forum topics, and requesting artifacts, lesson plans, and/or documents.
used as resources in the classroom. I conducted peer debriefing by holding post-coding meetings with a colleague in the Social Studies department. Following each posting, he and I met and compared our coding and theme development. I conducted member checking during the post-interviews, when I met with each U.S. participant and, as part of our interview, I asked for confirmation of interpretations and conclusions I had noted based on their comments.

Coming into the study, I admit to a bias in assuming that the U.S. teachers lacked an understanding of global issues and global citizenship. Having worked as a teacher in both South Carolina and Egypt, I had gone through the process of first believing myself globally-minded, then having the experience of living the experience of a minority, and realizing how limited my global perspective actually was. Therefore, I anticipated a similar moment of realization for the U.S. teachers. The study was borne out of a personal desire to provide empirical research to bring awareness to the dearth of multiple perspectives in the field of education. In order to address this bias and to ensure greater credibility, I maintained a research journal documenting my thoughts and ideas. The journal helped remind me to word questions carefully, to seek to interpret discussions with an open mind, and to seek out colleagues in the graduate school to discuss concerns with my bias. Also, using a colleague to help with coding aided in my maintaining an open mind.

Transferability refers to the ability to generalize findings to similar settings (1985). I provided rich, full descriptions of participants and context of participants in the
US and Egypt in order to provide an in depth picture of the participants, and to create a frame from which to evaluate the transferability to other situations and people. Meeting regularly with my colleague in the Social Studies department served to provide inter-rater reliability and met the criteria for external audit required to evaluate the accuracy of the findings and interpretation. In order to meet the criteria of confirmability, which is the degree to which the findings accurately reflect the participants’ responses in contrast to the researcher’s bias (1985), I clearly addressed my possible bias by stating my worldview, perspectives, values and beliefs.

I transcribed, reviewed, and input the data from each participant interview and every participant post into Nvivo, which was the digital repository that I used to store and organize the information. In an attempt to address reliability and dependability, I incorporated multiple Nvivo options such as use of word count, term search, and graphing of similar responses. My colleague reviewed all data and we discussed inconsistencies. I provided each participant with copies of the transcriptions, and I followed up with face-to-face discussion to confirm understanding and accuracy.

I worked in the local school districts as part of my graduate assistantship responsibilities. Having this insider experience aided in collecting a rich and thick description of the schools, the community, and upstate area. In order to address the challenges of trustworthiness and transferability, I made sure to note in-depth information across each case and school community within this study. While qualitative data is not
considered transferable, a rich description provides the opportunity for the usefulness of the research in a similar setting.
CHAPTER FOUR: INDIVIDUAL CASE REPORTS

Yin (2014) describes the goal of multiple case studies is “to build a general explanation that fits each individual case, even though the cases will vary in their details” (p. 148). Each U.S. teacher in this study represents a case study, and though they participated together in an online forum, they each brought unique perspectives, culture, and conceptions to the forum. The overview of each case takes into consideration these factors and responses as they progressed throughout the project. Chapter Five will provide overall themes and findings across cases.

Cathy

Cathy, a resource teacher at Woodall-Parkinson Elementary School, is a long time resident of the area. Her childhood was spent in a small, isolated town in the Sandhills section of South Carolina, known primarily for its tobacco production. She chose a large upstate university, Central, after high school, and graduated with a degree in elementary education. While she has worked in the same upstate district for 31 years, her first two teaching positions were at other schools. She also earned two Master’s degrees, both from Central University as well. She completed National Board certification in 2010. A mother of two adult children, Cathy contends that all children have potential to learn and that an educator should tap into the individual student’s interests and goals as a strategy to guide them to success (Cathy, pre-interview, April 7, 2015). She reported a beginner’s knowledge of Spanish and explained she traveled three times outside the US (Cathy,
GCS, March 2015). However, those travels were limited to cruises in the Bahamas and Cayman Islands. Due to her work with English Language Learners (ELLs), Cathy expressed a passion to better understand other cultures and stated she felt learning about the cultures of her ELLs could aid her instructional strategies (Cathy, pre-interview, April 7, 2015).

In Cathy’s view, student engagement and motivation are key elements of instruction. She stated that she believed that every child was capable of learning and that teachers must seek out the interests of the child and use strategies and lessons that reflect those interests. At the time of the study, the 58-year-old instructor had taught for 31 years as a resource teacher at Woodall-Parkinson. She contended that her experience with ELLs had piqued her interest in participating in the study. Cathy explained that getting to know about the cultures of her ELLs and integrating that knowledge into her lessons had helped her become a better instructor (Cathy, pre-interview, April 7, 2015).

In her initial interview, Cathy explained that she conceptualized global citizenship as people “learning to get along,” and “learning to communicate in some fashion or other.” In the survey, she identified her lack of knowledge of other cultures and of global issues, as well as her inability to adapt to different cultural situations. This is reflected in her interview; when she was asked about global citizenship education, Cathy haltingly said:

Where people collaborate… not just the teachers, but the administrators, where everybody’s working as a collaborative team to reach out to the students and to
understand what needs to align in the future in terms of not just commerce but industry and taking care of the environment and those kind of things.

She further explained that educators should gain understanding of global situations, work together, and then create lessons to better prepare the students for the future. Cathy felt strongly the school environment should run like a community. She endorsed the idea of educators collaborating and sharing ideas related to global awareness (Cathy, pre-interview, April 7, 2015).

By the final prompt, Cathy spoke more confidently and without hesitation about her views of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Global citizenship, she stated in the post-interview, was important and hinged upon people across the world having an understanding that they need to work together to make the world better. She elaborated and added that collaboration should address world poverty and environmental issues as well as educational initiatives. When she discussed global citizenship education, she referred to fellow forum participant Caroline’s point of view. Within the final post, Caroline stated that global citizenship education would include three elements: students would be able to demonstrate a knowledge of different cultures and values; students would have the ability to explain why it is important to have knowledge of and respect for other cultures; and finally, students would be able to discuss objectively times in “our world’s history where a lack of knowledge of another culture led to war or added conflict” (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015) In her own final post, Cathy expressed agreement with Caroline’s prescription (Cathy, Topic 4, May 21, 2015).
Both Cathy’s post-interview and comments in the forum discussion offer evidence of growth in Cathy’s conceptualization of global citizenship education. When she discussed the importance of global citizenship education in the second forum topic, Cathy said that she thought that technology could be an effective tool in implementing the topic into the curriculum (Cathy, Topic 2, April 20, 2015). She also expressed a belief that global citizenship education could be added to the elementary Social Studies curriculum, with the goal of teaching students about other cultures and the lives of children in other cultures (Cathy, Topic 2, April 28, 2015). After reading other participants’ comments, Cathy followed up with several additional points. She agreed when other forum participants said that adding yet another topic into an already challenging curriculum presented difficulties for educators. However, she argued, “We have to revamp to meet the changes…to keep up with our changing times” (Cathy, Topic 2, April 28, 2015). In the pre-interview, Cathy could not envision how global citizenship would be taught, but in a later discussion on the forum, she suggested that implementing a project-based study in Social Studies, culminating in a certificate of completion, could make the concept of global citizenship more valuable in the eyes of the students. She also discussed one specific activity she called Kid Speak:

I do a program called Kid Speak that I invented. It engages the whole school, including parents, in writing about topics on current events or general questions about life’s events. Sometimes the questions are about life, feelings, citizenship, etc. I think of a question, once a month, and type it onto half-sheets of plain white paper for all students and parents in grades K-5 to
respond to. This could easily be altered to include more global questions.

(Cathy, Topic 3, May 12, 2015)

In her final post, Cathy explained how the forum had influenced her conceptualization of global citizenship, as well as that of other participants (Cathy, Topic 4, May 21, 2015). She felt the collective discussions served as a catalyst to invoke an evolution of ideas related to global citizenship and global citizenship education. During the same post, Cathy elaborated on the belief that educational leaders and scholars needed to “regroup and give students what they really need to be successful.” She emphasized the need for students to think critically and have the opportunity to engage in open inquiry within the classroom. This can be accomplished by providing students with alternative views. In summary, she expressed that while it was obvious the teachers were diverse in background, and educational experiences, they came to share a common belief in the importance of preparing students for a more interconnected world (Cathy, Topic 4, May 21, 2015).

Leigh

Leigh grew up in South Carolina in a small Piedmont town approximately one and a half hours from her current school of employment. She earned an undergraduate degree in elementary education from an upstate Christian university. Later, while working at Woodall-Parkinson, she completed a Master’s degree in education at another nearby upstate Christian university (Leigh, pre-interview, March 27, 2015).
Caring for children and meeting their individual needs has guided Leigh’s teaching philosophy. Leigh had taught at Woodall-Parkinson for seven years, and had taught for two at another upstate elementary school. At the time of the study, she was in her fifth year teaching Grade 4. She also taught Grade 3 at Woodall-Parkinson, and Grade 3 at another elementary school (Caroline, pre-interview, April 7, 2015). She studied French in high school and college, but reported only a beginner’s knowledge. She had traveled once outside the US, when she took a cruise to the Bahamas (Leigh, GCS, March, 2015).

The youngest of the participants, Leigh had grown up in a town of 8,490 residents. She said that leaving her hometown to attend university had opened her world to diversity and new ideas. She credited the diverse population at university, as well as the fact the university openly encouraged exploration of other cultures, as important in developing her respect for other cultures. In her pre-interview, Leigh explained that global citizenship was knowledge of other cultures as well as promoting respect of others. She further stated that global citizenship education included educating children to place the needs of others above their own. This idea of promoting the needs of others is evident in her teaching philosophy as well. She stated that in order to learn, children need to feel respected and valued: “Children need to feel important in the classroom” (Leigh, pre-interview, March 27, 2015).

Prior to responding to the first forum topic, Leigh admitted that she searched online and researched global citizenship: “When I think of global citizenship I think of caring about the whole more than self. When I looked online, many people felt the same
way about this definition.” Leigh went on to state that citizens of the United States are taught to focus on themselves and their own successes and failures, while ignoring the rest of the world (Leigh, Topic 1, March 27, 2015).

Leigh participated frequently, sometimes two or three times in a single forum post. She expressed her doubts that global citizenship education could be implemented in the classroom due to the current standards and emphasis on high-stakes testing. She explained that time was a major factor and expressed the view that global citizenship education belonged in higher grades, not elementary. Leigh mused during her first posting for Topic 2 whether global citizenship education belonged in elementary or higher grades (Leigh, Topic 2, April 22, 2015). Leigh, like Jackie in her pre-interview, pointed out her students lacked a grasp of their own local geography. She attributed this to their low socio-economic status in a rural environment. She stated that global concepts were “out of their realm of understanding” (Leigh, Topic 2, April 22, 2015). Leigh continued to explain in her posting that the topic would be best for older students “when their brain is more capable of thinking outside their small town life” (Leigh, Topic 2, April 22, 2015).

She obviously read the forum discussions and followed them closely. In her post-interview, Leigh explained that she thought carefully about her responses. She explained she was highly engaged by the other participants’ postings, particularly those of the cultural consultants in Egypt:
I think the forum was really neat how it started off as such a general question and it went into such detailed answers. I like how it went into specific ideas, and, how people posted, beliefs that I've never thought about, because they are from somewhere else. I liked how people would actually speak back and forth. It wasn't just an idea, but other people would comment, and be able to ask questions about what somebody else put if they did want to do one of the activities. (Leigh, post-interview, June 4, 2015)

Leigh’s self-score of 43 on the GCS survey was one of the two highest scores of the participant group, indicating a level of global awareness and global citizenship that is above the average of 40. Yet, at the end of the study, she admitted that while she thought she had entered the project with a clear conceptualization of global citizenship and global citizenship education, the forum discussion had opened her mind to new ideas and concepts (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015). In her final discussion forum posting, Leigh acknowledged the forum had convinced her that global citizenship education could be integrated into the classroom, as well as changed her mind about using it in elementary schools (Leigh, Topic 4, May 16, 2015). When I asked if the forum influenced her conceptualization of global citizenship education, Leigh responded in the affirmative:

Now, that definitely has changed! At first I was thinking well it's so hard to fit everything in far as our standards. We're teaching multiple subjects, and I'm thinking that’s a great idea, but where is it going to go. And some of the people had some really good examples, as far as where to teach it. Not just Social Studies, but I think that would be a good place to start. Even with maps in the
room, and when you talk about a different country, discussing how those people live, how those children learn. Even incorporating small video clips to show the students the way people learn in other countries. (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015)

In the post-interview, Leigh pointed out examples of a project that she had done with her students. Students were allowed to choose a country and create a brochure highlighting specific predetermined criteria set by the teachers. Even though the project had been part of the end-of-year activities for the past three years, she explained the forum added to her enthusiasm for the project. The project was intended to meet standards, but following standardized testing as an end-of-year project, it had filled a period in which the teachers and students were tired and not engaged. Leigh explained that she now saw the potential importance of the project. “I saw it in a different way than before” (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015).

Caroline

When the study began, Caroline was in the middle of her eighth year at Sycamore. She taught math, reading, and writing to Grade 5 students (Caroline, GCS, March 2015). Prior to teaching Grade 5, she taught Grade 3 for six years. She spent her first two years as an educator teaching a Grade 2 class in central Florida, near Orlando. The 35-year-old described herself as aware of global issues and said she recognized the importance of knowledge beyond the local. She grew up in a rural dairy area near Boston and attended school in Lexington, an affluent area outside Boston. Following graduation, she moved to South Carolina and earned an undergraduate degree in elementary education from
Central University. Following her two years in Florida, Caroline returned to upstate South Carolina, secured a position teaching Grade 3 at Sycamore (where she had completed her student teaching), and subsequently earned a Master’s degree in education from a nearby Christian university. Caroline described herself as having a moderate knowledge of Spanish and noted her knowledge of the language was heightened while working with a large Hispanic population in Orlando. The teaching experience in Orlando, along with her own personal secondary education experience, heightened her awareness of diversity and her desire to understand individual uniqueness and culture. Her travels included five vacations outside the US: one trip to British Columbia, two separate cruises to Bahamas and Mexico, a week in Aruba, and a nine-day holiday during which she visited London and Rome (Caroline, pre-interview, April 7, 2015).

In the GCS survey, Caroline self-identified as being comfortable with people of other cultures, was confident that she could adjust to another culture, enjoyed working with people of other cultures, and was also confident in her ability to work with people to raise awareness and understanding. Her GCS score of 43 was one of the highest, matching Leigh’s score of 43 (Caroline, GCS, March 2015). Her pre-interview underscored her feelings of confidence in adjusting to and understanding different cultures. “I think it’s important for us to learn how to respect each other, even with our differences, and learn how to find a common meeting ground in a common place,” Caroline stated. This belief tied directly to her teaching philosophy, in which she emphasized the importance of developing personal relationships and personal knowledge of students in the classroom as a key to facilitating mutual respect between student and
teacher, which in turn, will result in a more engaged student (Caroline, pre-interview, April 7, 2015).

In her pre-interview, Caroline spoke a great deal about how her own education in a multi-cultural school shaped her views. Even though her home was in a rural area, her mother taught in a more affluent district and exercised her option to take Caroline into that district. Caroline explained that bussing was initiated in the district and parents outside the district could actually sign an agreement so their children could be bussed in throughout K-12. She described the environment colorfully. Some children came from rough neighborhoods, then the locals who were “good old Italian and Irish Catholic,” with an increasing population of Indians and East Asians. During Grade 3, the Jewish population had risen to such a level that the school began to recognize Jewish holidays. One of her favorite classes was a world religion class during ninth grade. “I loved, loved, loved learning that, because they emphasized the religions that were at my high school.” This experience fed her continued emphasis on recognizing, having knowledge of, and respecting individual cultures and differences (Caroline, pre-interview, April 7, 2015).

Caroline’s two-year teaching experience near Orlando, Florida also had a significant impact on her teaching philosophy, as well as on her global outlook. Caroline explained that when she was in her Grade 2, her class had five Caucasian children; the other students were black, Hispanic, Puerto Rican, and Mexican. She pointed out the significance in recognizing the uniqueness of Hispanic, Puerto Rican, and Mexican ethnicities. “In our [American] minds, we naturally think, ‘Okay, Hispanic…’ and we will naturally group them, which we shouldn’t do.” In her words, the time in Florida,
“was a very eye-opening experience,” and a defining period of her teaching career. Beyond recognizing cultural differences, the years in the Florida school drew her attention to issues of extreme poverty and immigration, and how the two are linked:

There are people that are poor. But then you go and you start teaching in a community and you almost become part of the poverty, and you know it’s a completely different experience. Oh, this is poverty.” But until you actually see it on a day-to-day basis, where you have kids that cry the day before spring break, that cry right before summer vacation. School vacations are not exciting times. They did not want to go away from school because the neighborhood was so unsafe the kids couldn't play outside. Gang involvement started in the third grade. It was like a very tough area. I think people kind of put poverty aside. They don't understand what it entails until you actually go out and kind of live amongst it for a little while and how great those kids are and how much love that they need and how much support that they need. (Caroline, pre-interview, April 7, 2015)

For Caroline, teachers modeling respect for cultural difference was key to global citizenship education. Caroline stated:

I think it’s important for kids to learn that just because somebody is of a different race or religion or creed that doesn’t make them any less an individual. I think a lot of that starts from the teacher modeling and showing we can all live together and respect one another. (Caroline, pre-interview, April 7, 2015)
She carried this idea throughout the forum discussion and into the final interview as well. On the forum, she elaborated upon her ideas and explained that teachers, as well as school administrators, set a climate in the classroom and school-wide:

    It would be the individual teacher's responsibility (and could also be the responsibility of the school as a whole, as all schools have climates as well) to teach it through modeling how we respect one another's differences and the knowledge of diversity. (Caroline, Topic 3, May 7, 2015)

    While she often mentioned and agreed with other participants that standards and rigid curriculum requirements limited the ability to introduce global citizenship, she pointed out that teachers should take on the responsibility and blend it into their daily teaching. After she read other responses, Caroline posted her support of Cathy’s Kid Speak project idea. Caroline agreed that using a writing prompt could be easily introduced in reading or social studies and used as a tool to explore global citizenship. She also pointed to technology as a means to engage students in global projects as well as a means to offer an opportunity to connect students across the globe in discussions (Caroline, Topic 3, May 14, 2015).

    In her final interview, Caroline mused over the impact the forum made on her ideas and conceptions of global citizenship and global citizenship education. She didn’t feel the forum had changed her ideas, as she had already valued global citizenship and global citizenship education, but it heightened her awareness of incorporating global citizenship education into the daily classroom.
I felt like it [the forum] made me aware. I was aware of it [global citizenship] because it was something that was on my mind, yet I became more aware of opportunities within my school day to take moments and take learning opportunities, to model and show global citizenship within my classroom. (Caroline, post-interview, June 3, 2015)

**Jackie**

Jackie earned dual undergraduate degrees, one in early childhood and the other in elementary education at a university in Massachusetts. Her subsequent marriage and husband’s relocation to South Carolina brought her to the upstate. She completed a Master’s program in learning disabilities at Central University while working at the university in the learning services department. After earning her Master’s degree, she began work as a resource teacher. One of the more outspoken of the U.S. participants, in the pre-interview, Jackie quickly voiced her concerns regarding the limitations her students experienced due to their environment and socio-economic status (Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015). When asked about her philosophy of education, she stated, “Not everyone learns the same way, and it’s not always just cookie cutter.” She went on to explain students required guidance to find their own learning processes, as well as continued support for their individual style of learning. The 43-year-old mother of two, she taught all subjects as a resource teacher to 34 students from Grade 2 to Grade 6. A 17-year veteran teacher in the same upstate area, she often contrasted her learning experience in the New York school system with the learning experiences of her students. She believed that her students in South Carolina had not had as much exposure to
diversity as she had experienced at their age. Furthermore, Jackie believed that her students and their parents were more prone to prejudices towards people of color and/or people of different cultures. Her travels outside the US included a vacation to Mexico in 2002, one to the Bahamas in 2012, and a childhood vacation with her parents to Canada (Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015). She also considered herself a beginning learner in Spanish (Jackie, GCS, March 2015).

In her pre-interview and her first post, Jackie said that she thought that technology and the use of technology could be a means of teaching global citizenship. A 17-year veteran resource teacher, Jackie initially explained that global citizenship meant connecting with people via technology, such as Skype. Her conception of global citizenship education followed suit:

I would just envision, but I don’t think we can do this, but reaching out to maybe a school in [another country] throughout the year, touching base with them somehow through the internet. (Jackie, Topic 1, April 8, 2015)

She strongly expressed her opinion that global citizenship education was a topic better suited to middle or high school students, and not for elementary education. Jackie noted that children attending her school lacked adequate knowledge in geography, struggled with the awareness of neighboring states, and lacked awareness of nearby towns:

I think it would be very interesting for our younger students to talk to someone, but I don’t know if they, especially our younger ones, would
understand that that person was within our world because they just don’t have a good sense of geography. But I think our high school students could learn a lot from them. (Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015)

Returning to her discussion of the elementary-age children she continued to explain:

They have a hard time even knowing where Georgia is [located]. Some of these students here have not been outside [the] county. They just don’t go that far, because they feel there’s just nothing there for them. They may go on a field trip and that may be the only time they go to [another] county.

(Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015)

While Jackie gave herself high marks on the GCS survey with regards to her ability to adjust to other cultures and her enjoyment of working with diverse groups of people, she self-scored low in her ability to guide others to better awareness of differences. On the survey, she also indicated that she didn’t feel confident expressing views about global situations, nor of informing others about global issues. During the forum and post-interview, she tied this belief to the cultural environment of the local community:

It's difficult to talk about different religions. It's difficult to talk about ethnic groups, and the needs of others. [Discussion of diversity is] more difficult down south than it is up north because you don't have the different ethnic diversity as you do, you know, up-even [in] Virginia. (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015)
While all of the U.S. participants mentioned the limitations of their students’ ability to grasp global ideas due to the local cultural environment, Jackie and Leigh held firmly to the belief that, due to the rural culture of their students, global citizenship education would be more appropriate at the middle and high school level. In forum Topic 3, when participants were asked to envision global citizenship education, Jackie contended that she could possibly see it in a “supportive role to many areas of studies,” but “not on the front burner.” Beyond the students’ limitations, she explained that strict curriculum standards and high-stakes testing made it impossible to implement global citizenship education at the elementary level (Jackie, Topic 3, May 4, 2015).

Even though she maintained the opinion her students could not understand global citizenship in her post-interview, she agreed global citizenship education could be valuable at the elementary level (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015). By the end of the post-interview, she appeared to have talked herself into a conundrum. While contending her particular students may not have the ability to understand global concepts, she hesitated near the end of the interview and said that global citizenship would be beneficial, but did not know where or how. She indicated that she valued the importance of global citizenship education and gave it a value of 8 out of 10 in the post-interview. Jackie also noted that participation in the forum had expanded her definition of global citizenship:

> I will admit when I first started this discussion I was thinking global citizenship was more how do we conduct ourselves throughout the global
virtual world…since then, I realize I was wrong. This is more of learning about the needs, current events, and ideas of our global community. (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015)

Mary

The final participant, Mary, had a distinctive background in several ways: first, she was originally from the North East, and second, her husband served in the military. She explained that his job and his experiences in overseas deployment to Afghanistan, Iraq, and Japan had heavily influenced her opinion and ideas about the world and global issues. Prior to his military career, she and her husband relocated to Atlanta, Georgia where he completed his Master’s degree. Later, they relocated to upstate South Carolina for the warm climate, educational opportunities for their daughter, and the affordable standard of living. After settling in the area, she completed an undergraduate degree, then a Master’s degree in education (Mary, pre-interview, April 6, 2015). She has taught at Pryce Elementary for the entirety of her 11-year teaching career (Mary, GCS, March 2015). Mary had experience teaching resource and Grade Three. At the time of the study, she taught Grade Four. Her personal teaching philosophy centered on the importance of education and her belief that education prepares one for survival in the world. “It’s the one thing no one can take from you,” she stated in the both the pre-and post-interview. In her pre-interview, Mary said that she considered herself to be globally-minded, and pointed out that even though she had not traveled outside the US, she was well traveled within the country and had experienced a variety of cultures (Mary,
pre-interview, April 6, 2015). She indicated that she spoke no other language other than English (Mary, GCS, March 2015).

Mary stood out from the other participants in her initial pre-interview as possessing a great passion for human rights, equity, and global awareness. Though other participants had mentioned that they thought that being aware of others’ cultures was important, Mary went to great lengths to describe her emotional passion for global awareness, which she attributed to her husband’s time overseas in the military.

I think when he went to Iraq, I understood different things about the world, and how things work. I realized how important it is that we watch what’s going on, and we understand cultures. Just as an example, with him being there, I looked at the female, dilemma in Iraq. I understood that the Taliban looked at women as very low-class. We had a neighbor that was in the Army, and he said, ‘Well, look at what we’ve done to elevate women in these countries.’ I understand that because we are there, and we stabilized the country, that women have been elevated. But what is going to happen to them when we walk out? Who’s going to care for them when we walk out? Have we given them enough time to get their feet underneath them? Or, when we leave, will they be back in the same situation? So, have we put a Band-Aid on the situation, and not fix it? (Mary, pre-interview, April 6, 2015)
She also lamented the status of current standards and high-stakes testing. Mary, like her colleagues, noted the restrictive time limitations in the classroom, due to the strict requirements to teach to the standards: “We need to have global education, but finding the time to do it is the largest problem” (Mary, Topic 2, April 23, 2015). She indicated that technology could be a partial answer to the challenge. Mary explained that the low socioeconomic status of most students, as well as the limited budget at the district level inhibited the students’ opportunities to travel or see beyond their local environment. However, with the implementation of one-to-one iPads, she argued that technology could be the tool to create a more globally minded school (Mary, Topic 2, April 28, 2015).

Mary’s GCS score was 42, one of the three highest in the project. She was also the only participant who placed the value of global citizenship education as a 10 in her pre- and post-interview. Yet, just as Leigh had noted about herself at the end of the project, Mary also explained that the discussion forum had significantly influenced her initial conceptualization of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Referring back to her initial interest in participating in the study, at the end of the forum, Mary said that she believed in the importance of global citizenship education, a statement that she echoed in the post-interview. As the forum progressed, Mary said that she had developed an enhanced awareness of the true significance of exposing students to global citizenship, especially for students similar to those in her classroom within demographically low socio-economic rural communities. Mary expressed deep sadness over the situation: if the students did not understand the scope and size of their state or country, how could she
begin to introduce more global concepts? Reflecting on her state of mind in the post-interview, she said: “Then I thought, these kids should be communicating with kids in Kenya, and kids in Europe! We have the technology, and the ability to engage with others globally” (Mary, post-interview, June 2, 2015). She stated that she firmly believed this type of interaction could change lives, and thereby, provide a more positive future. She lamented the status of current standards and high-stakes testing. Mary, like her colleagues, noted the restrictive time limitations in the classroom, due to the strict requirements to teach to the standards: “We need to have global education, but finding the time to do it is the largest problem.” She indicated that technology could be a partial answer to the challenge. Mary explained that the low socioeconomic status of most students, as well as the limited budget at the district level inhibited the students’ opportunities to travel or see beyond their local environment. However, with the implementation of one-to-one iPads, she argued that technology could be the tool to create a more globally minded school (Mary, Topic 4, May 12, 2015).

This analysis indicates that the U.S. teachers valued global citizenship education and agreed their students would benefit from a more global curriculum. While they did not always agree on the definitions of global citizenship or global citizenship education, or what form global citizenship education should take, most pointed to technology as a tool addressing global citizenship in the classroom. Also, the teachers pointed to the challenges of incorporating global citizenship education in an already crowded and demanding standards-based curriculum.
CHAPTER FIVE: CROSS CASE FINDINGS

An important aspect of multiple case study analysis is looking beyond each individual case and seeking emergent themes across the cases (Yin, 2014). During the forum, I noted similar responses in my notes and went back to cross-reference using the constant comparative method (Merriam, 1998) to detect any emerging themes. With the help of a research assistant, I transcribed and coded the interviews on an ongoing basis during the course of the study. I scrutinized each entry on the discussion forum for specific terms, themes, and topics, and recorded additional themes and topics that emerged as the process continued. A Social Studies scholar helped me code the interviews and discussion forum topics, though we worked separately in order to test inter-rater reliability, which was high, above 94%, for each coding session.

Seven overarching themes emerged from the interviews and discussion forum that are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

*Discussion Themes and the Related Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Related Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global citizenship education is important. In the post-interview, all</td>
<td>RQ3: At what level of importance do U.S. teachers place global citizenship instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants scored it at levels of 8 – 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Though the participants felt it was important, they found a dichotomy</td>
<td>RQ3: At what level of importance do U.S. teachers place global citizenship instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between what they found was important and what they felt the district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the standards felt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as important. The limitations placed on teachers by standards and high-stakes testing were key to participants’ view of the feasibility of global citizenship education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The U.S. teachers conceptualized global citizenship as being respectful and tolerant of others, and global citizenship education as incorporating this message within studies of other cultures and places in an effort to address issues of intolerance, violence, environment and poverty.</strong></th>
<th>RQ2: How do practicing U.S. teachers conceptualize global citizenship and global citizenship education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global citizenship education should be taught within the context of the social studies.</strong></td>
<td>RQ2: How do practicing U.S. teachers conceptualize global citizenship and global citizenship education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While standards limited the integration of global citizenship education, the participants argued the use of technology as a tool to incorporate global citizenship education if afforded time to do so.</strong></td>
<td>RQ4: What resources and strategies/practices do U.S. elementary teachers use for global citizenship instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary students in the rural setting of upstate South Carolina lack the ability to grasp global concepts, such as global citizenship, due to their low socio-economic status, isolation in a rural community, and limited travel.</strong></td>
<td>RQ2: How do practicing U. S. teachers conceptualize global citizenship and global citizenship education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The discussion forum influenced the US teachers to reconsider and develop their conceptualization of global citizenship and global citizenship education (but not teaching as a whole).</strong></td>
<td>RQ1: Does cross-cultural interaction enhance U.S. teachers’ awareness and conceptualizations of global citizenship?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of Global Citizenship Education

In the post-interview, all U.S. participants placed the importance of global citizenship education high; between 8 and 10. This finding correlates with other studies conducted with teachers related to global citizenship education (Harshman & Augustine, 2013; Leduc, 2013; Myers, 2006). While some had placed it within this range at the pre-interview, their terminology changed when discussing global citizenship in the post-interview and also reflected stronger convictions. For example, in the pre-interview Cathy rated global citizenship high (9.5) and stated, “I think it’s a good thing. It is important to help us learn to align better in commerce and industry” (Cathy, pre-interview, April 7, 2015). In the post-interview she spoke strongly and without hesitation, “I’d give it a 10.” She elaborated, “I feel strongly about it. I think it's something that's real important. With the world as it is right now I think people need to understand different people, where they come from, and their ideals” (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015). Cathy’s final response indicates a broader conceptualization of global citizenship and global citizenship education.

Mary responded similarly. While in the initial interview she stated that global citizenship education was “probably a 10,” in her final interview she used more forceful language. Mary stated that global citizenship education would be a definitive educational goal for her to work toward. “I think it's becoming more and more important for our students, and for our…actually I think that it's important for everybody!” (Mary, post-interview, June 2, 2015). She gave it a 10 and went on to say she felt it would become a 10 within society as well.
During Leigh’s post-interview, she discussed at length the need to prepare pre-service teachers for instruction of global citizenship education (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015). This is particularly interesting, as none of the forum participants ever mentioned pre-service teacher preparation. Her comments aligned with educational scholars’ call to better prepare teachers to instruct students with a broader, more globally-aware curriculum (Banks, 2004; 2008; Goodwin, 2010; Merryfield, 2000a; 2000b). Leigh’s score remained an 8 from pre- to post-interview. However, she also spoke more forcefully and energetically in the post-interview: “I think it's really important. [Global citizenship education] would be really interesting, and I feel like it needs to be something that's taught in college to future teachers” (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015).

In the pre-interview, Jackie rated the importance of global citizenship education at a 6 (Jackie, pre-interview, June 4, 2015). The post-interview, she rated it at 8. She also pointed out that she was no longer sure that global citizenship education belonged only in middle or high schools. Reflecting on her opinion, she said, “I guess I don't know. Now, that I'm thinking about it I don't know how it would or where it would fit. But, I think it's important [to incorporate global citizenship education] somehow, somewhere” (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015). In summary, the teachers agreed that global citizenship and global citizenship education was important, which was reflected by their use of strong, decisive language in expressing their views.

**What is Global Citizenship Education?**
The teachers’ conceptualizations of global citizenship education focused primarily on education for tolerance and respect. While some of the U.S. participants moved from the idea that global citizenship education included possessing knowledge of other cultures, to the idea that the concept included mutual respect of cultures, their ideas regarding the purpose of global citizenship education remained basic or elementary. All five U.S. participants mentioned tolerance or respect in the final interview as well as in Topics 3 and 4 on the forum. Educational scholars consider this conceptualization to be low-level global citizenship awareness, lacking the critical stance that is considered necessary to better prepare and inform students (Banks, 2008; Davies, 2006; Leduc, 2013). Jackie stated in the final forum:

I will admit when I first started this discussion I was thinking global citizenship was more how do we conduct ourselves throughout the global virtual world…since then, I realize I was wrong. This is more of learning about the needs, current events, and ideas of our global community. (Jackie, Topic 4, May 16, 2015)

Making reference to her own specific students in the post-interview, Leigh commented that she thought that global citizenship education entailed “Letting these children know that other people don't live the same way” (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015).

However, by the conclusion of the forum discussion around Topic 3, several of the U.S. teachers conceptualized global citizenship education in a different manner, alluding to the idea that lives around the globe are intertwined and interdependent, as in
the UN definition of global citizenship, though the teachers did not flesh out this topic within the forum. Cathy discussed the opportunity of global citizenship education to reduce poverty and intolerance, and to build better understanding between people of different cultures:

Governments worldwide should put more effort into protecting the earth and human life. It means that we should all work together to solve hunger and resolve the problems that impact poverty. Many global beliefs that people have probably formed from the mainstream news media which oftentimes is untrue. (Cathy, Topic 4, May 19, 2015)

In the post-interview, Mary made a comment that reflected several remarks she had made within the forum, “I believe that if [our students] get to know someone's culture and beliefs at an early age maybe our children can make the world a safer place.” She elaborated in her post-interview. “Because you have a lot of people [in the US] that have stereotypes about certain countries, about certain people [but] if they learn about them, then they become less afraid. [People from other countries and cultures] become less intimidating” (Mary, post-interview, June 2, 2015).

Caroline also focused on global citizenship education as tool to reduce poverty and to encourage the development of mutual respect. She took umbrage that the word tolerance was so often used in the field of education when discussing different cultures. She explicitly explained that tolerance and respect are significantly different. Caroline stated that respect involved being aware that one person’s values had as much validity as
another’s, while tolerance reflected an attitude in which U.S. citizens see themselves as superior. Therefore, she said that she believed that modeling respect was fundamental. She stated:

    Global citizenship education would be teachers doing role modeling, or simulations in the classroom with different cultures and *how to act and how to be aware*. And even if you aren't aware of certain things, being able to respect each other’s differences on equal footing. (Caroline, post-interview, June 3, 2015)

While Caroline, Cathy, and Mary allude to a more collective sense of responsibility at the global level, as well as a sense of common humanity as outlined by UNESCO (2014), they stopped short of explicit explanations of how global citizenship education can promote actions to address the issues of inequality and injustice. Banks (2008) refers to the need for students to become *deep citizens* (p. 136) in order for them to take action. If educators are not at this level of deep citizenship and lacking knowledgeable of the processes of actualizing global citizenship, then they are ill prepared to guide students for a more critical global inquiry (Banks, 2008; Leduc, 2013; Merryfield, 2000). While the participants recognized the opportunity to broaden students’ awareness through global citizenship education, they didn’t have a clear of understanding of how to include global citizenship education into the content of their daily lessons.

**Curriculum and Standards**
Though they were not asked to which area of study global citizenship education belonged, throughout the discussion forum and interviews, the U.S. participants frequently remarked that Social Studies would be the most appropriate venue for global citizenship education instruction. This assumption is common among educators (Davies, 2006; Myers, 2006; Rapoport, 2013; Zong, Wilson, & Quashiga, 2008), however, some education scholars argue for a more cross-curricular approach (Brigham, 2011; Davies, 2006; Rapoport, 2013; Schattle, 2008). By the end of the project, several of the U.S. teachers began to see the possibility of expanding the concept beyond social studies.

The teachers in Egypt agreed that Social Studies was the obvious choice, however, several pointed out various ways that global citizenship can be incorporated across the curriculum. Danielle, one of the teachers in Egypt, posted ideas and resources for integration in art, drama, ELA, and music. Another teacher in Egypt, Deena, explained how she incorporated global citizenship education in literacy, and Patience, also a teacher in Egypt, explained the need of global citizenship education in mathematics by exploring global markets and currencies. By the end of the forum, Mary, Leigh, and Caroline agreed.

Leigh pointed out that global citizenship education could be incorporated in literacy and ELA:

Not just social studies, but that would be a good place to start. Even with maps in the room, and really going over when you talk about a different country how
those people live, how those children learn. Even choosing a story that has a setting in a different culture (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015).

In the final forum response she noted:

I have learned there are many ways to place global citizenship into a regular education classroom. I appreciate all of the ideas on how to place importance of other cultures in student knowledge and learning. It's great to hear ideas from people around the world (Leigh, Topic 4, May 16, 2015).

Caroline felt that the focus of global citizenship education should begin with modeling:

It would be the individual teacher's responsibility (and could also be the responsibility of the school as a whole, as all schools have climates as well) to teach it through modeling how we respect one another's differences and the knowledge of diversity across the curriculum. If we model it, practice it, and explain to the children in our daily teachings and stories why we treat people the way we do, it will be easier for them to follow suit in respect for one another (Caroline, Topic 3, May 7, 2015).

Even though Mary felt the primary focus of global citizenship education would be in social studies she acknowledged, “I think that global education needs to be integrated into all classrooms. As the world is getting smaller and smaller due to technology our children need to understand the cultures and traditions from around the world” (Mary, post-interview, June 2, 2015). Cathy continued to believe social studies was the best fit for global citizenship education: “I just see a real need to incorporate global citizenship
into social studies. If the [state department and policy makers] can come up with some standards for incorporating that into social studies, our children would be better prepared” (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015). Jackie’s final interview reflected a growth in awareness and the value of global citizenship education, but remained uncertain as to where the best fit would be in the curriculum (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015).

The discussion of whether global citizenship education ought to be part of Social Studies or included across the curriculum often included comments related to standards and high-stakes testing. I noted such comments throughout the study within each forum topic and in the pre- and post-interviews. The comments related to standards were negative in nature. The participants bemoaned the lack of global citizenship in the standards, and continually stated that the required standards were so time consuming they did not have time for any other content. Similar findings have been noted in previous studies (Davies, 2006; Goodwin, 2013; Myers, 2006; Rapoport, 2013). Jackie commented on the overall academic atmosphere:

Right now we are in the midst of testing ACTAspire, Pass… I hate to say it but the regular ed teachers are going to cover the core subject areas which are being tested. Global citizenship education is not on these tests. It is something students need to know, however it is not on the front burner. (Jackie, Topic 3, May 4, 2015)
Others lamented the same issue with standards and high-stakes testing. The U.S. teachers repeatedly said that standards have the effect of hampering the teachers’ ability to introduce global citizenship education. Following a discussion on the forum, Caroline stated:

It is really difficult to fit all of the standards we are legally required to teach as it is, let alone to teach additional topics. Since we don't have curriculum for it, and it's not something that we're legally bound to teach…it makes it difficult.

(Caroline, Topic 3, May 7, 2015)

In the final forum topic, several teachers expressed the hope of improving the standards or that they could use some of the ideas mentioned in the forum in their classrooms to integrate global citizenship education into their day. Adding a final hopeful note, Mary wrote, “I do agree that we barely have time to fit in the current standards that we teach, however, if we could figure out a way to add it a little at a time I think that it would [be possible]” (Mary, Topic 3, May 12, 2015).

Cathy and Leigh also pointed to the standards as containing unnecessary curricula. During the post-interview, Leigh told of how teachers at Woodall-Parkinson often discussed their dissatisfaction with the standards: “A lot of this stuff is not necessary in our standards. If [the state department of education] could actually replace some of that with global education it would be good for the students” (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015).
Cathy went further, and in her final posting on the forum, said that children were the victims of the myopic focus on the standards:

Our society has changed so much that now our kids are suffering the effects of bad standards without enough emphasis on general knowledge about our system of government and the important links between systems of governments. I agree that we need students to learn to become good citizens and know about the world they live in. They don’t have the drive to do this on their own. Our educational leadership needs to regroup and give students what they really need to be successful beyond science and math, and that is an awareness and understanding about who they are, where they come from, and how to distinguish facts in history through inquiry, listening, and discussing world situations and cultures in a classroom setting. We need our students to think about their thinking. As they learn about their own government and citizenship, they are better able to compare and contrast other governments and their citizens, evaluate how to get along, and grow as global citizens with goals to solve problems and encourage environmental health and peace. (Topic 4, May 21, 2015)

While discussing the focus on high standards teaching, Jackie made a comment that reflected the attitudes of all of the U.S. participants toward that topic. She said that the status of global citizenship education, while important in the minds of the participants, “is not on the front burner,” when teachers plan lessons and instruction, and
that the required standards and the pervasive demand for instruction in support of high-stakes testing take precedence (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015).

**Resources and Strategies**

Three of the U.S. participants stated that the lack of emphasis in the standards on global citizenship education resulted in their not having any resources or strategies with which to teach global citizenship. “If it’s not part of the standards, teachers are not going to teach it,” Leigh stated (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015). She explained that she, and the other U.S. teachers on the forum, probably did not have resources required to teach global citizenship, because global citizenship is not emphasized in the standardized curriculum. Mary and Cathy agreed with Leigh. During their post-interview, they also stated that their lack of resources and lesson plans for implementing global citizenship education were directly related to educational policies and curricula that prioritize the standards at the expense of other subjects. Cathy said, “I’d like something concrete at the elementary level (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015).” Mary said, “Currently, I do not have any resources that I use in my classroom for global citizenship. I really wish that I did” (Mary, Topic 3, May 12, 2015).

Across the four topics in the forum discussions, the U.S. participants peppered their responses with references to the use of technology as a tool or resource in global citizenship education. While they did not offer specific lesson plans or specific strategies, their ideas included connecting U.S. students to students in other countries for
the purpose of learning about other cultures. Leigh explained that with the expansion of
the internet, using technology to facilitate global connections could be an easy process:

Technology is an amazing tool that we do not usually think of for this
purpose. Since our district is one-to-one with iPads, we should be able to do
great things with that technology that would educate our teachers and kids
about the rest of the world and how they communicate. (Leigh, May 5, 2015)

Discussions in both Topic 2 and Topic 3 underscored the teachers’ belief that using
technology to connect students around the world would be the best strategy to incorporate
global citizenship education into the classroom. Caroline explained her point of view: “I
feel it is important for teachers to educate our youth by connecting them to others around
the world and teaching tolerance. This could be done through pen pals and Skyping”
(Caroline, Topic 2, April 20, 2015). Cathy agreed and added, “Since technology can
easily be accessed, students can learn about each other using different [digital media]
tools that can be integrated into the curriculum” (Cathy, Topic 2, April 20, 2015) The
participants also emphasized the need to use technology to allow students to
communicate with others the world, not merely as a research tool for finding information.
“I think that actually seeing and talking to other children from different countries would
be the way that I would like to incorporate global education,” Patience, a teacher from
Egypt, stated during the Topic 3 discussion (Patience, Topic 3, April 21, 2015). Leigh
supported Patience’s idea:
With all of our technology, and 1-to-1 initiatives, we should be able and willing to set up some form of communication which would give our kids a real life experience instead of a text to read about other cultures (Leigh, Topic 3, April 23, 2015).

The many references to incorporating some form of cross-cultural experience into the classroom via digital technology prompted me to investigate the possibilities and logistics of implementation. An elementary school teacher in Missouri routinely engages her first grade classroom in cross-cultural interactions through a project called KnowGlobe (Boss, 2013). The students enthusiastically participate and gain a new awareness of other cultures. Other programs available to educators include The Interactive Educational and Resource Network (iEARN-USA), the Center for Interactive Learning and Collaboration (CILC), and Epals. Each program provides resources, protocols, and partnerships to aid in making connections that are effective in building bridges between cultures.

When I investigated these resources more closely, I found that the feedback from educators that was documented on each of the programs’ websites supports the study participants’ ideas related to the use of technology in the classroom. Utilizing such collaborative resources in the classroom can deepen children’s understanding of others outside their local community (Boss, 2013). A community devoted to the use of digital media for social learning, EdWeb (2015) explicates the advantages of collaborating with teachers around the globe, and how connecting classrooms around the world can increase motivation, curiosity, and critical thinking in students, echoing the idea that repeated
Exposure to new cultures, ideas, and places can “become interesting, not threatening” (Schwartz, November 19, 2012).

**Efficacy of Global Citizenship Education in a Rural Setting**

One theme, relating to the efficacy of global citizenship education in rural elementary schools versus rural high schools, emerged during the pre-interview (Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015; Mary, pre-interview, April 6, 2015), and Topic 2 posting (Leigh, Topic 2, April 22, 2015). Two U.S. teachers, Jackie (pre-interview, March 24, 2015) and Leigh (Topic 2, April 22, 2015) mentioned their concerns with regard to their students’ abilities to grasp global issues, and initially suggested that global citizenship education would best be taught in middle or high school, rather than elementary. Mary also mentioned in her pre-interview the challenges of introducing global citizenship into her elementary classrooms for similar reasons; however, she did not waiver in her belief that it should be attempted (Mary, pre-interview, April 6, 2015). Jackie and Leigh cited their students’ lack of travel, a general suspicion of anything or anyone different from their usual experiences, and a lack of interest in events beyond those they perceived as directly related to themselves as evidence that global citizenship education would be better suited to older students:

Some of these students have not been outside the county. They just don’t travel that far because they, and their families, do not believe there is anything there for them. Pointing out Scotland on a map is one thing, but for them to understand
completely that is on another continent; they just don’t have the ability. (Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015)

In Topic 2, I asked the participants to discuss the efficacy of global citizenship education and how they would envision global citizenship education in their own curriculum. The first two posts from teachers in Egypt indicated their support for cross-curricular integration of global citizenship education. Following these remarks, Leigh posted a remark that echoed the opinion expressed by Jackie in her pre-interview. She specifically stated that the concept “seems to be outside their realm of understanding” (Leigh, Topic 2, April 22, 2015). Beyond this, she expressed a need for her students to have a better understanding of local geography.

I don't know that elementary school would be the place [for global citizenship education]. Our children should learn their surrounding geography such as their town, county, country and continent. Many students have not been out of their county. It's really hard for them to understand geography on global terms. (Leigh, Topic 2, April 22, 2015)

Studies relating to citizenship, global citizenship, and international education in schools within a rural community are few (Feinberg & Doppen, 2010; Lee, 2006; Waterson, & Moffa, 2015). However, the literature supports the concerns of Leigh and Jackie (Lee, 2006, Waterson & Moffa, 2015; Weible, 1983). Studies indicate that educators face unique challenges in rural schools such as conservative beliefs that oppose non-traditional concepts and ideas. (Waterson & Moffa, 2015). While rural communities
vary, they often share common traits such as racial homogeneousness, poverty, isolation, and lack of contact with diverse peoples (2015). These traits, along with other complexities within rural communities, often result in negative stereotypes of people outside the community, particularly internationals. Pushing students and parents to embrace a more global and inclusive view can create tension and “confrontations with rural traditionalism and family-first values” (2015, p. 133).

Utilizing a rural-sensitive (p. 138) purposeful framework in integrating global citizenship education can be effective in rural communities and schools. Rural contexts, while presenting limitations, also provide unique opportunities for teachers to know parents personally and develop relationships beyond school. Once these relationships are forged, the parents perceive the teacher as less threatening, which opens the opportunity for the teacher to introduce global citizenship education without opposition (Waterson & Moffa, 2015).

**Discussion Forum’s Impact on Conceptualization**

All five of the U.S. participants agreed that participating in the forum had either heightened or developed their conceptualizations of global citizenship and global citizenship education. These findings support those of other studies of cross-cultural interaction projects (Harshman & Augustine, 2013; Merryfield, 1995; 2000a; 2000b; 2003; 2007). Merryfield (2003) points out that cross-cultural interaction challenges “American mainstream assumptions and western views of the world,” (p. 148) and increases global awareness and meaningfulness.
The teachers often spoke of global citizenship and global citizenship education as being the same topic, and in our post-interviews, they did not discern between the two. When I asked questions about global citizenship, they usually began their responses by discussing education. For them, the two were intertwined. Leigh explained her feelings about both:

Before [the forum] I thought about [global citizenship] more as respecting other cultures. But now that we've gone through the blogs and hearing other people, I like how it's a lot more relatable as far as towards education with global citizenship. Learning about others in the classroom I see [global citizenship and global citizenship education] intertwines naturally in the education system. (Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015)

However, the U.S. teachers’ conceptualizations did not change to include the more complex issues of equity, the effect of transnational companies on local cultures, nor the idea of the interconnectedness of people around the world; these attributes are cited by scholars as being important in the conceptualization of global citizenship (Appiah, 2008; Banks, 2008; Merryfield, 2000; 2003; Schattle, 2008). Though the teachers often mentioned that the forum had changed their views of global citizenship, the post-interviews indicate that most of their conceptualizations remained tied to the area of knowledge of and respect for other cultures. Cathy addressed her evolving conceptualizations of global citizenship this way:
Since I've been through this process [the discussion forum] and everything I think that the world needs to open up more for children to learn about other systems of government, and I think they need to …compare and contrast other systems of governments, and learn about the people of the world. I really liked reading everybody else’s dialogue, and then going and thinking about how [their comments] changed my thinking about the importance of [global citizenship] education. (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015)

Jackie explained how the forum had altered her conceptualization from the belief that global citizenship and global citizenship education centered on using technology as a tool to connect to others, to a more complex phenomenon: “I guess learning, and reading on the forum and listening and talking to others it was more of learning about the world and topics that involve other citizens around the world” (Jackie, post-interview, June 4, 2015). Her response echoes Merryfield’s (2003; 2007) findings that cross-cultural interaction creates a community of learners with connections to a larger world and increased world mindfulness.

While Jackie did not discuss the complex aspects that scholars associate with global citizenship, she did achieve an increase in world mindedness. World mindedness is a growth process in which individuals begin to “appreciate the viewpoints, experiences and worldviews of others” (Merryfield, Lo, Po, and Kasai, 2008, p. 7). Jackie’s comments relating to her growing awareness that global citizenship included environmental issues as well as learning about the needs of others around the globe indicates she has begun the process of becoming world minded.
Four of the U.S. participants and eight of the teachers in Egypt asked to continue with the forum after the conclusion of the study, without a moderator. Mary explained that she felt that the interaction helped her visualize global citizenship education more clearly and provided her with concrete examples of how global citizenship education could be implemented into a busy school day (Mary, post-interview, June 2, 2015). Making similar comments, Caroline stated, “The forum provides a place for us to meet and exchange ideas and learn from each other” (Caroline, post-interview, June 3, 2015). Cathy and Jackie also agreed that continuing with the forum would be beneficial. Cathy said, “I enjoy the discussion and am so interested in seeing other people’s ideas. It’s really eye-opening” (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015). This supports Merryfield’s (2003) summary of her studies with teachers enrolled in graduate classes who experienced cross-cultural interactions. Merryfield explained that after the course was completed, many of the people in her course continued to communicate within the on-line community (2003).
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

And before you finish eating breakfast in the morning, you’ve depended on more than half the world. This is the way our universe is structured, this is its interrelated quality. We aren’t going to have peace on Earth until we recognize this basic fact of the interrelated structure of all reality. (Martin Luther King, Jr., 1967)

The purpose of this study was to explore intercultural interaction between teachers in the United States and Egypt, and to investigate if the interaction changed the conceptualizations of the U.S. teachers of global citizenship and global citizenship education. While evidence indicates that the conceptualizations did change, the research also led to other discoveries beyond the teachers’ conceptualization of global citizenship and its value in the classroom. Two U.S. teachers, Jackie (pre-interview, March 24, 2015) and Leigh (Topic 2, April 22, 2015), mentioned concerns with the ability of their students to grasp global issues, and initially suggested global citizenship education would best be taught in middle or high school, rather than elementary. The two questioned the ability of their students to grasp the concept of global as well as their students’ ability to grasp geographic locations beyond their own communities, due to their socio-economic backgrounds and limited experiences outside their communities. The U.S. teachers also questioned the legitimacy and practicality of additional curricula outside the canon of standards set by the state. Finally, this research provides evidence that the teachers in Egypt, serving as cultural consultants, intertwined more global issues and more classroom resources into their responses than the U.S. teachers did in their responses.
While this evidence suggests heightened value for global citizenship and global citizenship education, the findings suggest the need to address the lack of understanding of global citizenship and the misconceptions of global citizenship education among U.S. educators. Even though most self-reported a global awareness on the GCS, the U.S. participants developed a new conceptualization which they reported in their final postings and post-interviews. The findings also highlight U.S. educators’ inability to recognize or address global issues within the context of global citizenship education. The U.S. educators did not include specific references to global events or situations when discussing global citizenship, yet the teachers in Egypt often referred to real time global events in their postings and as support for their ideas. While some scholars suggest more staff development in this area, or point out that raised awareness among educators can achieve the goal of integrating global citizenship education into the curriculum (Banks 2004; Noddings, 2005a; Myers, 2006), the findings suggest that neither professional development, nor an intentional campaign, are sufficient means to address the lack of understanding of, or deficit of value associated with, global citizenship and global citizenship education.

In order to address students’ perceptions of human differences and respect for other cultures, educators require a background in the pedagogy of intercultural competence (Bennett, 1993; Merryfield, 2003) and an awareness of how the perceptions are formed. Individuals develop worldview perceptions from their personal experiences, education, and cultural environment (Bornstein, 2010; Gardiner & Kosmitzki, 2011; Merryfield, 2003; Scattle, 2008). In order to understand the interconnectedness of different cultures,
respect for people different from oneself, and the role of power and equity, individuals must develop perspective consciousness (Hanvey, 1976; Merryfield, 2000b, 2003; Willinsky, 1998). Hanvey (1976) delineated perspective consciousness as consisting of awareness that one’s view of the world is not globally shared, that one’s worldview is shaped by influences that often escape one’s consciousness, and that people of other cultures possess profoundly different views of the world (1976).

Current perspectives on global citizenship education state that educators need to develop a more critical stance, which Merryfield (2009) refers to as double-consciousness. While educators require a global perspective, the critical perspective includes understanding two worldviews, challenging positions of hegemonic power, “highlighting dissonance between identity and contexts of power” (2009, p. 226). A more critical perspective consciousness involves taking responsibility for the role that individuals, communities, and nation states have played internationally (Cogan & Grossman, 2009). Preparing a globally minded teacher is a challenging task that will require input from specialists in the field of comparative education, challenging institutional policies such as traditional subject curriculum, and increased opportunities for educators to interact with cooperative and joint academic explorations with universities and global organizations (2009).

**Beyond the scope of the students**

Half of the U.S. teachers questioned the abilities of their students to grasp the concept of global, as well as their students’ abilities to grasp geographic locations beyond
their own communities, due to their socio-economic backgrounds and limited experiences outside their communities. The U.S. teachers in this study taught in Title I schools in rural areas in upstate South Carolina, and the average family income of their students ranged from $23,660 to $42,461, well below the national average of $53,046. All the U.S. teachers mentioned issues related to their students’ abilities to grasp the term global and the nuances related to the term, as well as their students’ limited geographic knowledge. The concern centered on the lack of knowledge most of their students had relating to place. The teachers explained that many of the children had not been to the nearest city, which is about 45 minutes away. They also pointed out that many didn’t realize the state’s boundaries, the location of nearby states, or the breadth and make-up of the US, much less possess the awareness/knowledge of nation states on other continents. Three teachers (Jackie, Jennifer, and Mary) discussed the financial limitations of the families that their school serves. They believed that the financial limitations did not allow their students the opportunity to travel beyond their local communities. Based on classroom discussions and interaction with their parents, the teachers reported that the families had little appreciation for literacy, history, and/or issues beyond their immediate homes or communities. To illustrate their point, the teachers pointed to the locals’ veneration of NASCAR heroes and the commonly held, commonly expressed belief that President Obama is Muslim, and then of overt racial bias and prejudices. Even though the U.S. teachers did not mention racial violence, they referred to self-regulated segregation (Jackie, pre-interview, March 24, 2015; post-interview, June 4, 2015; Leigh, post-interview, June 3, 2015). The teachers pointed to this segregation as representative
of the communities’ inability to accept others whom they perceive to be different. As a whole, the U.S. teachers felt that global citizenship education would be met with opposition from the students and their parents. However, the teachers all eventually came to the consensus that there was a real need for global citizenship education. In fact, Cathy pointedly stated, “This is vital for our students and community. I think if we work together [administrators, teachers, and district] we can effectively introduce it [global citizenship] into the school day” (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015).

The excuse that certain students lack geographic knowledge, have ingrained biases, or come from families that do not support a more global view, actually underscores the need to introduce global citizenship into the curriculum as early as possible. Gradually integrating global concepts into the entire curriculum should be a priority in the U.S. educational system (Waterson & Moffa, 2015). As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, an awareness of others is essential for developing world mindedness and the skills necessary to address current and future local, national, and global issues.

As discussed in Chapter Five, rural communities are uniquely difficult environments for teachers hoping to introduce non-traditional ideas. Therefore, teachers in these communities often avoid introducing controversial subjects, and also avoid encouraging critical inquiry, for fear of eliciting negative reactions from parents and the larger community (Rapoport, 2010; Waterson & Moffa, 2015). Teachers worry that introducing ideas beyond the conservative and traditional local views may be interpreted
as unpatriotic, or viewed as an attempt to undermine traditional and community values (2010). Teachers, as members of the community, may want to avoid such conflict and confrontation, or they may feel that efforts to introduce new ideas are a waste of time because they think their students are ill-equipped to comprehend the information. Yet global citizenship education is particularly needed in these isolated pockets. I believe that educators must face these challenges in order to provide students living in rural communities access to local, national, and international political forums. Global issues, whether economic, political, or social, have tangible implications for the lives of rural citizens, and teachers have the responsibility to provide both traditional and non-traditional information in order to endow their students with an informed voice, which can encourage them to become actively involved in the democratic process. I believe teachers can be sensitive to local traditions while introducing their students to diversity. Global citizenship education can empower students and arm them with alternative points of view, so they can make informed decisions, rather than ones based on narrowly-formed biases and prejudices.

Outside the Canon

The passage of No Child Left Behind in 2001 made high stakes testing of paramount importance in public education (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012b). States, districts, schools, and teachers make curricula decisions based on the standards and the mandated testing, resulting in emphasis on Math and English Language Arts (ELA) (Center on Educational Policy, 2008; Evans, 2004). Elementary teachers consistently marginalize
subjects in order to focus on areas associated with funding and/or testing (2008; Heafner & Fitchett, 2012a).

The U.S. teachers, long accustomed to stringent state curricula requirements, questioned the legitimacy and practicality of additional curricula outside the canon of standards set by the state. They pointed to the already standard heavy curriculum and expressed doubt as to whether they would have the time required to integrate curricula related to global citizenship. During the post interviews, several U.S. teachers explained that they had gained new knowledge and ideas for integrating global citizenship education, but often followed up by expressing the difficulty involved convincing teachers to include global citizenship ideas.

Over 20 years ago, the United States National Governors Association report proposed that international education (1989) should become “part of the basic education of all our students, and teachers must know more about international issues” (Cogan & Grossman, 2009, p. 240). While standards give a nod to global knowledge, the knowledge is only referenced 23 times in the South Carolina social studies standards, but relates primarily to the influence of the US in global trade. Global interconnectedness as it relates to interconnected responsibilities of peoples, communities, and environment are delineated as standards in two elective courses, World Geography and Economics (South Carolina State Department of Education, Standards and Learning, 2015). A survey of state standards (Rapoport, 2009) found only two states whose standards address the term global citizenship. While the more recent Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
includes language calling for global competence, the initial adoption of the CCSS in 48 states has dropped to 42 (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2015); South Carolina is among those states that rejected the CCSS. More states are expected to follow, due to its highly politicized and often misunderstood standards (Felton, 2015; Richmond & Zinshteyn, 2014). The lack of global citizenship emphasis in standards ignores the very nature and value of global citizenship education in a period of increased global tensions, which require a more informed citizenry learning about the world rather than remaking it in the image of the US (Gaudelli & Heilman, 2009).

The U.S. teachers believed that they and their peers were overworked and tied to the pre-existing education standards, and that unless the concept of global citizenship education was added to the standards, teachers would not make the effort to include the concept in their classroom. Education for global citizenship continues to be an add-on rather than a standard practice (Myers, 2006). Teachers in South Carolina lack the curricular justification, and under the pressure to teach to the required standards that are tested, even those teachers who value global citizenship education would opt to teach the more important material (Leigh, post-interview, April 22, 2015; Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015). This opinion is supported by a 2009 study, “What is not tested, is not taught” (Rapoport, 2009 p. 105). Therefore, standards must be re-assessed and re-aligned to support global citizenship education in order to see any noticeable incorporation of the concept into the daily curriculum.

During the post-interview, I asked the teachers whether they thought that specialized professional development could promote the use of global citizenship
education among educators. The U.S. teachers adamantly rejected the idea of professional development. Several explained that in the current atmosphere of high teacher accountability, with heavy emphasis on high stakes testing, teachers would be resistant to stray from the standards based canon. Their suggestion was to add global citizenship to the standards.

Creating dialogue between educators using the online forum could add to a better understanding of the concept and provide an impetus for curriculum changes. Policy makers, legislators, educators, and scholars in curricula development must seek to develop curricula that better prepare citizenry for a less ethnocentric view of the world that do not encourage the “view of the United States as exceptional and set apart from global affairs” (Gaudelli & Heilman, 2009, p. 2668). Cross-cultural interaction can reduce preconceived ideas of inferiority, misconceptions of religious beliefs, and misinformed ideas based on media or social bias. The online forum also allows for open discussions about sensitive topics such as race, equity, power, and hegemonic practices. Through open and critical discussions, educators can develop a sense of empathy, curiosity, and open-mindedness to new ideas. Obviously, the participants in this study had differing views on global citizenship education: some were very passionate about it, while others were more musing or deliberate in their treatment of the idea, though none of the participants mentioned any feelings of discomfort or embarrassment around the topic. Therefore, this indicates that an online, cross-cultural interaction can reduce the fear and discomfort of ambiguity and unfamiliar ideas. Furthermore, this study took place over a period of 8 weeks. More continuous and lengthier interaction has greater
potential to produce increased conceptualization and value for global citizenship education.

**Increased Conceptualization and Value**

The cross-cultural interaction increased teachers’ conceptualizations of global citizenship education and increased teachers’ value for global citizenship education. The discussion forum responses and the post-interview sessions indicated that U.S. teachers gained broader perceptions of global citizenship education. For example, even though Jennifer self-graded herself highly on global citizenship, she acknowledged in the post-interview that she had grown in her perception. She explained that she didn’t realize that the scope of global citizenship should include a sense of mutual responsibility, the shared responsibility of the environment, and the idea of mutual value, as opposed to tolerance or respect for different cultures.

While most teachers expressed value for global citizenship in the pre-interview, the post-interview responses reflected an increased sense of value of global citizenship education. Several of the U.S. teachers said that the intercultural interaction provided by the forum had heightened their awareness of the value of global citizenship education, and indicated that they had integrated more global citizenship discussion into their lessons than they had in the past. These findings suggest that there needs to be more research into the area of cross-cultural interaction between practicing teachers. Global citizenship education is an increasing phenomenon in education around the world (Brigham, 2011; Schattle, 2010; Zong, 2009), and to turn a blind eye to the value of this
kind of education increases the risk that U.S. students will be ill-prepared, both economically and altruistically, to participate in an increasingly globalized world. Students require skills to interact effectively with people from around the world, as well as to take action to address the local and global challenges of inequity, power, and ecological concerns. Yet studies indicate that teachers are not well prepared to address global issues in the classroom (Merryfield, 2000 a, b). The implications of this study suggest that there are clear advantages to cross-cultural interaction between teachers.

The asynchronous model of cross-cultural communication provides a safe environment for teachers to express their points of view, to question the viewpoints of others, and to engage in debate about sensitive topics. The structure of the online forum allows educators time to scroll through previous comments and to reflect on the ideas expressed, as well as to opportunities to explore resources as they are introduced on the forum. In this study, participants shared and discovered a wide array of experiences and conceptions of global citizenship. This democratic forum of exchange can serve as a model for future research in the field of preparation for pre-service teachers, as well as offer meaningful alternatives for professional development of practicing teachers.

Cross-cultural interaction should not be limited to educators only, and the teacher participants in the study often mentioned using technology to connect students. Cross-cultural interaction can aid in developing global awareness among elementary students (Grant, 2006). Cross-cultural interaction fuels curiosity, engagement, and dispels stereotypical myths (Grant, 2006; Schwartz, November 19, 2012). Today, social media
affords educators many options, synchronous and asynchronous, to introduce their students to their peers around the world. Numerous websites and organizations offer resources and support to teachers who are willing to explore cross-cultural connections and can help guide students in studies of the interconnected relationships around the world. By connecting students around the world, cultural difference becomes less threatening and students are able to develop cross-cultural interpersonal skills and respect for the variety of people around the globe.

**Limitations Imposed by the Connected World**

Though cross-cultural interaction in an online forum has the capacity to provide U.S. educators with greater resources for learning about and expressing their own opinions on global citizenship education, there are limitations to comments and discussion that take place online. Over the course of my research, I noticed that the U.S. teachers’ responses were often posted later than those of the teachers in Egypt, and were less detailed and specific. I assumed that the delay and lack of detail in the responses were related to time constraints of the U.S. teachers, because the project took place during the busy months of high stakes testing and end-of-year events. However, in the post-interviews, the U.S. teachers explained that the lags reflected the extra time they had taken to contemplate the prompts. Leigh and Cathy stated that they wrote their responses in a separate word document, reviewed the response, and edited before posting. This information raises several questions: were the U.S. teachers possibly concerned that their responses might go viral and inflict damage to their reputations in today’s climate of accountability?
Were they concerned that their responses would be exposed to other educators in the school, or to the administration? As I discussed in the review of the literature, global citizenship education is a highly politicized topic (Corry, 2006; Rapoport, 2009). New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Texas policy makers have questioned and challenged the concept of global citizenship and how the education of global citizens might undermine national interests (Robelen, 2012; Texas Freedom Network, 2015; Walters, 2006). A review of literature found only one study about global citizenship education in a rural environment (Waterson & Moffa, 2015), and those findings indicated negative stereotypes of people outside the community, particularly internationals. Pushing students and parents to embrace a more global and inclusive view could possibly be seen as creating tension and “confrontations with rural traditionalism and family-first values” (2015, p. 133). The U.S. teachers may have carefully edited their responses out of concern for community reaction. Another fact that may have complicated the issue of response concerns South Carolina as a Right to Work (RTW) state (Collins, 2014), so teachers do not have a recognized union representation. The practice is highly contentious and evidence indicates that individuals working for state agencies in RTW states are concerned that their positions are not protected, and if they openly participate in controversial discussions, their job may be compromised (2014; Tuccille, 2012).

These constraints aside, there are real benefits to be gained from cross-cultural interaction. As I discussed earlier, technology and social media provide a variety of options for cross-cultural interactions. Virtual face-to-face synchronous as well as asynchronous cross-cultural interaction studies indicate positive outcomes for increased
sensitivity to cultural diversity, perspective taking, and critical thinking (Bonk, Appelman & Hay, 1996; Daniels, Berglunc & Petre, 1999; Merryfield, 2003; Sunal & Christensen, 2002). Findings indicate that when participants engage in online forums, they are willing to engage in ways that are more in-depth than the discussions that normally occur in face-to-face class interactions (Merryfield, 2003; Oztok, Zingaro, Brett & Hewitt, 2012;). Merryfield (2000a) also found that students were more likely to engage in discussions of controversial topics, and the findings pointed to less marginalization of minorities, with fewer discussions controlled by the white middle class students. The author concludes that this type of discussion can bring marginalized voices to the center of discussion and respectfully introduce ideas and concepts not often experienced, thereby leading to a greater global perspective (2000a). While these studies indicate that online forums create democratic and safe environments, researchers will need to further investigate study participants in asynchronous and/or synchronous discussions, specifically with educators in rural, RTW areas, to uncover the concerns that teachers experience in participating in possibly controversial discussions. Though the forum protocol in this study ensured privacy and anonymity, teachers may have had concerns that their viewpoints and discussion responses could become public.

Intertwining Current Global Issues and Resources

The teachers in Egypt, who served as cultural consultants providing alternative perspectives, intertwined specific global issues into their responses and resources. The U.S. teachers made general references to world poverty and the global environment, but did not mention specific countries or current events. The teachers in Egypt seemed to
have a greater sense of the interconnectedness of the world. Their discussions often referred to our global responsibility to others, which is a key element of global citizenship as expressed in many of the definitions of global citizenship education (Banks, 2008; IBO, 2014; Merryfield, 2000b; 2009; Myers, 2006; Oxfam, 2015; Scattle, 2008; UNESCO, 2013; United Nations, 2014).

The teachers in Egypt also provided the forum with a number of specific resources, including websites, lessons, and activities. Throughout the forum, Danielle provided five websites that specifically targeted global citizenship education resources and lesson plans. She also provided four links to international current events and suggested that teachers explore these in the classroom and relate to global citizenship. Kat expressed the belief that students need to be informed and active global citizens. She advocated websites related to the earthquake in Nepal, provided educational resources about Nepal, and posted Nepali greetings that she hoped the teachers would use in their classrooms to encourage interest. In her second online forum posting, Kat emotionally called on the other participants to see the importance of global citizenship education:

There are between 8,000-12,000 homicides each year in America and even more suicides. Guns remain on the streets. Number of people who died from ebola in the USA last year is 2. Do I want to get ebola? No. Do I want to be shot and killed? No. Which one do you think is more likely to happen where you live? I live in Africa and I think I am more likely to get shot and killed in random violence in the USA, whilst visiting, then getting ebola from West Africa! Where
is the terror? Knowledge is power. It is not us vs them. It is us with them. It is them with us! We need to educate our young people to be thinkers and not followers. (pers. comm. March 5, 2015)

Previous research in cross-cultural interchange indicates that most study participants became more aware of, sensitive to, and sought out knowledge about global events as result of such interactions (Dill, 2013; Gardiner & Kosmitzki, 2011; Merryfield, 2003; 2009; Scattle, 2008. Scarlet, one of the teachers in Egypt originally from the US, explained how her experiences in Egypt taught her that she was not as tolerant as she had once professed, and had broadened her awareness of the sense of privilege that she had, though she was not aware of it before living abroad. Though this study did not see a significant growth among the U.S. participants in terms of incorporating more global connections into their discussions, the impact of the cultural consultants’ responses and ideas led to more open-mindedness and greater conceptualizations of global connections by the U.S. teachers.

**Context: Rural Elementary School Teachers**

The participants in this study were elementary teachers in rural, upstate South Carolina. A search of the literature did not produce any studies about the conceptualizations of global citizenship or global citizenship education with practicing U.S. elementary teachers. The search elicited several studies of high school teachers or high school teachers enrolled in graduate level global studies
(Merryfield, 2000a, 2000b, 2003, 2007; Myers, 2006; Rapoport, 2010; Rapoport, 2013). The context of this study possibly influenced certain outcomes, particularly the question whether global citizenship education instruction belonged in elementary or high school. Further research in the area of citizenship education in the preparation for elementary and high school teacher programs could provide insights into the teachers’ perceptions of age-appropriate placement. Also, studies referenced in the review of literature took place in more urban environments. The rural setting of the elementary school played a vital factor in the opinion of Leigh, Jackie, and Mary. The usual homogeneity of rural communities, higher poverty levels, and suspicions toward people different from themselves, results in challenges for teachers quite unlike those in urban settings.

**Moving Forward with Global Citizenship Education**

The debate and research in global citizenship and education is no longer a newcomer in the world of academia: Hanvey completed seminal work in this area during the 1970’s, and Merrifield and her colleagues at Ohio State have addressed global citizenship education in various studies for over two decades. Research supporting the value of global citizenship exists (Noddings, 2005a; Merryfield, 2000b, 2003, 2009; Schattel, 2008), and organizations around the world support, promote, and provide global citizenship education programming (CILC, 2015; Oxfam Education, 2015; UNESCO, 2013; UNICEF Canada, 2014). Yet the implementation of global citizenship education has been slow to find its way into mainstream public school curriculum. What needs to
be done to ratchet up the pressure? Some argue that global citizenship education has the realm of research-based theories into the practices practice; however, given the amount of attention global citizenship education has received over the past 30 years the question arises, has the research become stagnant? Another significant point in the discussion includes the IB Program, whose foundation lies in global citizenship education and has grown in the US and internationally; yet the hesitancy continues.

The teachers uniformly rejected the idea of additional professional development; however, the context of South Carolina’s educational situation may well have influenced their notion of what professional development entails. In mid-March 2014, the South Carolina Board of Education pulled the rug out from under the common core, replacing the curriculum with new standards written by a team of South Carolina educators. This politically charged development took place shortly after a much-ballyhooed state-mandated adoption of the Common Core in South Carolina, which entailed extensive training in the schools, and numerous professional development hours training teachers in the Common Core standards. Frustration overflowed among the state’s teachers. To make matters more complicated, during the time of my post-interviews, teachers and principals were not sure what standards they would be teaching the next year, and had only been told at the last minute which standardized tests would be used to assess the students that year. The choice of using a standardized test with which they were unfamiliar also added to their frustration, and compounded their lack of faith in the use of professional development for beneficial outcomes.
Organizations promoting exchange between teachers and between students abound (Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 2015; Connect All Schools, 2015; Epals, 2015; Oxfam Education, 2015), yet someone must be the point person in shouldering the task of convincing the administration and other teachers to invest in the process. Conversations with teachers are sporadically peppered with terms like “over worked’ “no time” “physical exhaustion” “mental exhaustion.” In this current climate, teachers do not appear to be motivated to make additional efforts toward a more global classroom, even when they recognize the benefits. They put the onus on the district, policy makers, or legislature to put global citizenship education in the standards. Again, while we can argue if the content is required by standards, the content is more likely to be taught; yet again, who will take the time to lobby for such changes and inclusion?

One implication is that the catalyst for change must come from institutions of higher education. At my current institution of study, a professor and her undergraduate students organized a program to connect local U.S. high school students with high school students in Mexico. The program, Activa tu Speaking, is a joint endeavor between the U.S. high school and the Preparatoria #19 of the University of Guadalajara in Zapopan, Jalisco, Mexico, the result of a partnership with the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Embassy in Guadalajara, the Mexican state and the International Research Exchanges Board (IREX) (M. Warner, personal communication, November. 20, 2015). The IREX is a Washington, D.C.-based public policy organization committed to international education through innovative programs and teaching methods. Margaret Warner, the project director, explained that students connect via online technology, and the benefits of
the program include that students gain a new respect and appreciation for the variance of beliefs and values inherent in a diversity of cultures, as well as to advance the understandings of the realities of various situations of life and work within a global society (M. Warner, personal communication, November 22, 2015). This program serves as an example of organizing and implementing a cross-cultural interaction project for the undergraduates at the University of Guadalajara.

Introducing pedagogy that embraces cross-cultural interaction as a method of developing global citizenship education programs into the pre-service curriculum at institutions of higher education may be the alternative to including it in the standards. Higher education institutions are embracing global citizenship and global learning, including global concepts, in their mission statements, and are promoting cross-cultural exchange (Hovland & Schneider, 2011). Pre-service teacher programs that focus on broader global concepts have been developed and implemented by education experts in the U.S. and Canada (Appleyard, & McLean, 2011; Merryfield, 2009; Stachowski, L. L. & Sparks, T. (2007). Yet a review of the literature indicates a dearth in studies investigating how these programs influence the participants’ actions once they are in the classroom and under the pressure of the daily responsibilities, as well as the looming accountability for preparing students for high stakes testing, and the limitations inherent in district policies. Future research should not only investigate the perceptions and conceptions of pre-service teachers, but also continue to follow these teachers into the field to determine how their exposure to global education influences their classroom instruction.
Closing Thoughts for Future Research

I used the GCS (Morias & Ogden, 2010) to guide the selection of individuals with low, medium, and high scores to act as participants in the cross-cultural interaction portion of my project. I sought a range of GCS scores in order to provide the best possible maximum variation sampling (Cresswell & Plano-Clark, 2010; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The GCS scores ranged from a high of 57 and a low of 34. Even though I offered monetary compensation for participation, individuals in the lower range did not agree to be part of phase two of the study, forcing me to choose from scores between 36 and 56. This limitation opens the door to future research: because those at the lower end chose not to participate, I was unable to gather data for that sampling portion. Did their low score in global citizenship also indicate a lack of interest in the topic to such an extent that the offer of $100 for participation did not sway their willingness to take part in the study? Did the teachers at the lower end of the scale have such a disinterest in global citizenship they could not perceive in value in such a study? Did those at the lower end feel threatened or intimated by the concept? Follow-up using the scale will be necessary to determine possible answers to such questions.

Another limitation involves the limited time for cross-cultural interaction. Due to a delay in IRB approval, spring holidays at the U.S. school and at the school in Egypt, and time required to gather feedback from the GCS meant that the teachers only participated in the forum for eight weeks. Beyond this, due to a conflict with spring holidays at the beginning of the online interaction and the seven-hour time difference
between the U.S. and Egypt, I was unable to schedule an agreeable synchronous meeting. The use of synchronous interaction to support asynchronous discussions provides a sense of social presence, and increases asynchronous interaction and collaboration (Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2009; Oztok, Zingaro, Brett & Hewitt, 2012). As I discussed in Chapter Three, this format is often termed hybrid (Skylar, 2009). Using initial synchronous interaction aids in building a sense of community, responsibility to engage in the online discussion, and vested interest in the online project (Oztok, Zingaro, Brett & Hewitt, 2012). Therefore, future research with practicing teachers should include interaction over a longer period, even as long as the academic year, and include a hybrid of synchronous and asynchronous communication. This future research should seek to determine the level of comfort and security necessary to engage participants in potentially controversial discussions, and if this level of comfort and security on behalf of participants actually increases due to the hybrid model. Other questions for future research in this area of hybrid cross-cultural interaction should include discussions of global citizenship education and the concerns of the concept being unpatriotic or undermining national interests.

**Conclusion**

Cross-cultural online interaction has the potential to disrupt the Western narrative by introducing voices from the world’s people that are often marginalized in the United States, or are not readily available within the current academic climate (Merryfield, 2007). The interaction provides new knowledge that can broaden,
deepen, or change perspectives and conceptions of the content being taught. The new knowledge can help balance the Western-centric message that is so pervasive in the mainstream U.S. educational process. The presence of cultural consultants provides voices and contrapuntal views that serve to challenge hegemonic views and to give participants alternative narratives. Cultural consultants supply competing stories of how history has unfolded within specific contexts and from different perspectives, allowing for the development of a more critical view and heightened worldview awareness.

Students require skills to interact effectively with people from around the world and to take action to address the local and global challenges of inequity and power, as well as environmental and social concerns. Yet studies indicate that teachers are not well prepared to address global issues in the classroom. The implications of this study suggest the advantages of cross-cultural interaction between teachers in an asynchronous online forum.

For teachers, the many advantages of the online forum include convenience, time for reflection, and the opportunity for everyone to respond without time constraints of synchronous discussions. Some people may not feel comfortable expressing views face to face, but an online discussion offers a degree of anonymity that adds to a feeling of personal safety, in that one is able to express ideas openly. The online forum also provides greater choices of topics: participants can respond and follow up on a discussion as a side topic to the main discussion, or can branch off and explore an area of interest,
while still being within the community of the discussion forum. Further, the web
provides participants with information from many sources: links to websites from
different areas around the world, offering a variety of views, provide participants with
opportunities for critical thinking and inquiry that cannot be duplicated within a local
educational context or community. By providing historical and cultural context, teachers
can use the web to guide students in connecting past issues to current global social,
political, and economic concerns.

Educators can use online forums to collaborate on projects, resources, and lesson
plans. For example, a teacher in the US is developing a lesson on the effect of World
War II on the European economy. By connecting to a teacher in Germany, the teacher in
the US can gain a different perspective on this topic. The U.S. teacher can incorporate
resources from the German perspective that will aid students in better understanding the
worldwide ramifications of the war, as well as provide a perspective on the German
people that is more nuanced than the standard portrayal of Germans as enemies of the
Allied nations. In fact, by contrasting how the German school system portrays World
War II with the narrative portrayed in U.S. textbooks, teachers can provide opportunities
for critical inquiry, as well as a foundation for guiding students to see an event from
multiple, often competing, perspectives. Such interaction provides the opportunity to
increase respect and appreciation for the complexities of the interconnected lives of
people around the world:
I believe global citizenship is people across the world developing an understanding about what we need to do to work together to make the world better. I think the responsibility lies in education, and among people with the belief system and desire for mutual exchange and understanding. (Cathy, post-interview, June 3, 2015)
Dear Teacher,

Thank you for participating in this survey. This study is being conducted to help us understand the teachers’ conceptions of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Your truthful and complete response to this survey will provide us with valuable information that will be used to contribute to the research in the fields of curriculum and teacher development programs.

Please be assured that your responses are confidential.

Best regards, Sheliah G. Durham

SECTION A –

1. Identify your school of employment ____________________
2. Number of years at this school _____________________

SECTION B – Global Citizenship

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your abilities to function in the world. Please check the circle that best describes your present thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am confident that I can thrive in any culture or country.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I unconsciously adapt my behavior and mannerisms when I am interacting with people of other cultures.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I often adapt my communication style to other people’s cultural background.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I know how to develop a plan to help mitigate a global environmental or social problem.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am able to communicate in different ways with people from different cultures.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I know several ways in which I can make a difference on some of this world’s most worrisome problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am fluent in more than one language.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am able to get other people to care about global problems that concern me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I welcome working with people who have different cultural values from me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable expressing my views regarding a pressing global problem in front of a group of people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am able to mediate interactions between people of different cultures by helping them understand each others’ values and practices.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am able to write an opinion letter to a local media source expressing my concerns over global inequities and issues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C – Participant Information**

1. What is your sex?  □ Male  □ Female

2. In what year were you born? 19 __ __

3. How many years have you been teaching? __________

4. What is your ethnic background? *(Please check only one)*  
   □ African American  □ Native American  □ Caucasian/White  
   □ Asian/Pacific Islander  □ Hispanic  □ other: __________

5. How many times have you traveled internationally before? ____ times
6. Have you ever studied abroad before?  □ Yes  □ No

7. Please list which languages, if any, you can speak other than English.
   Lang.1: ______________________  Proficiency level: □ Beginner  □ Intermediate  □ Advanced
   Lang.2: ______________________  Proficiency level: □ Beginner  □ Intermediate  □ Advanced
   Lang.3: ______________________  Proficiency level: □ Beginner  □ Intermediate  □ Advanced
   Lang.4: ______________________  Proficiency level: □ Beginner  □ Intermediate  □ Advanced
Appendix B
Discussion Forum Topics

1. Provide your definition of global citizenship.

2. Discuss the efficacy of global citizenship education.

3. How would you implement global citizenship education? What resources would you use?

4. Open topic. Post a discussion topic you wish to explore. Engage in open discussion.
Appendix C

Semi-Structured Pre-interview Protocol

My name is Sheliah Durham and I am a doctoral candidate in curriculum and instruction at Clemson University. This semi-structured interview is part of a research project designed to investigate global citizenship and global citizenship education. Although the findings of this research will be published, your identity will remain anonymous. Each participant will be given a pseudonym (or you may choose your own pseudonym) for the study. This study will involve minimal risk and discomfort. If at any time during the interview you wish to stop you may do so. If any questions make you feel uncomfortable, you are not required to answer them. No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to “not participate” in the interview.

Your consent is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to participate in the entire interview or any part of the interview. Do you have any questions? May we proceed?

Name:

Position:

School:

Years taught:

Interview questions:

1. Tell me a little about yourself.

2. Discuss your feelings or beliefs about education and learning.
3. In your opinion, what is global citizenship?

4. In your opinion, what is global citizenship education? Can you give examples?

5. How do you feel about global citizenship education?

6. On a scale of 1 to 10, rate the value of global citizenship education.

7. Can you elaborate on ____________________? (This will differ from participant to participant based on the individual interview and survey responses).

8. Would you like to add anything?

9. Do you have any questions?

Thank you for participating in the interview. The final results of the study will be made available to all participants.
Appendix D
Semi-Structured Post-Interview Protocol

My name is Sheliah Durham and I am a doctoral candidate in curriculum and instruction at Clemson University. This semi-structured post-interview is part of a research project designed to investigate global citizenship and global citizenship education. Although the findings of this research will be published, your identity will remain anonymous. Each participant will be given a pseudonym (or you may choose your own pseudonym) for the study. This study will involve minimal risk and discomfort. If at any time during the interview you wish to stop you may do so. If any questions make you feel uncomfortable, you are not required to answer them. No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to “not participate” in the interview.

Your consent is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to participate in the entire interview or any part of the interview. Do you have any questions? May we proceed?

Name:

Position:

School:

Years taught:

Interview questions:

1. Discuss your feelings or beliefs about education and learning.

2. In your opinion, what is global citizenship?
3. In your opinion, what is global citizenship education? Can you give examples?

4. Tell me about your experience with the cross-cultural interaction discussion forum.

5. Discuss your feelings or beliefs about education and learning, and how, if at all, they have changed during the course of this project.

6. In your opinion, what is global citizenship education? Can you give examples?

7. How do you feel about global citizenship education?

8. On a scale of 1 to 10, rate the value of global citizenship education.

9. Can you elaborate on ______________________? (This will differ from participant to participant based on the individual interview and survey responses).

10. Would you like to add anything?

11. Do you have any questions?

Thank you for participating in the interview. The final results of the study will be made available to all participants.
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