

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: RESEARCH AND IMPLICATIONS FOR
PRACTICAL APPLICATION IN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SETTING

BY

ELIZABETH MARIE ESSER

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Policy, Organization and Leadership
with a concentration in Global Studies in Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2023

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Teaching Associate Professor Allison Witt, Chair
Professor Linda Herrera
Professor Mary Kalantzis
Professor Yoon Pak

ABSTRACT

Are high school graduates today prepared for the global society they are entering after graduation? With the Covid-19 global pandemic, conversations about climate, inflation, the war in Ukraine, and access to technology increasing daily, evidence of our connection to people around the world is clear. Accompanying this interconnected reality is the call for the next generation to be fully prepared to enter this global society and economy. In addition to the ability to navigate their own location, students today require the skills and competencies to communicate and collaborate with diverse groups of people, think critically about the issues that face our global society, and believe in their ability to enact the changes needed for success and sustainability.

Global education, or internationalization of education, has been present in post-secondary education institutions for decades. However, its inclusion in primary and secondary institutions is still growing. While these institutions recognize the importance of global education, research is still needed to discover and share best-practices and curriculum for grades K-12. This research used case study design to better understand how one K-12, independent, school designed, implemented and assessed a long-standing global studies program.

Findings from participant interviews and document review are given along with the challenges of global education. Finally, implications for K-12 settings are discussed. This adds to, and calls for continued research into best practices for global education in the K-12 school setting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many things led me to pursuing my doctoral degree in global education, but this ultimately would not have been possible without support from many people, in many ways. Through support with giving time and space to learn and work, emotional support to continue on this journey, and classes that challenged my thinking and increased my own learning, I want to thank all of those who have helped contribute to this accomplishment.

First, I would not be here without my family. Thank you to my parents who taught me from a young age that education is important and will lead to many opportunities. My parents' unconditional support and encouragement has been a stable, grounding support throughout my life and I continue to be thankful for their love and foundation. Thank you to my husband, Zac, for agreeing to enter this journey with me. Without his love, support with our children and family, and encouragement, I could not have found the balance between family, work and doctoral student life. Thank you to my current school of employment, Columbus School for Girls (CSG). CSG not only saw the benefit of its employee gaining additional knowledge in the area of global education, but supported this work financially. Thank you to the administrators and co-workers at CSG for the support, encouragement and celebration in every step of this journey.

I would like to thank all of my professors and educators, especially my advisor Dr. Allison Witt, at the University of Illinois. The education I received here truly challenged me to think differently about education and our global society. Beyond introducing me to new concepts and ideas, this education taught me how to find my own answers, take a critical look at education today, and have the confidence to pursue educational change in my own sphere. Thank you to Dr. Witt for your encouragement, guidance and instruction throughout my entire time at U of I.

Finally, I would like to thank the participants in my case study. Thank you to the Director of Global Studies for continuing to collaborate and assist with my many questions and scheduling conflicts, even through Covid. Thank you to everyone at the study school who welcomed me and answered my questions with honesty and patience. I have learned so much from all of you.

Dedicated to Avery and Hannah in hopes of leaving the world they will inherit a little bit better.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: GLOBAL EDUCATION IN THE K-12 SETTING.....	8
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	43
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS	52
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	71
REFERENCES	87
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	98
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM.....	100
APPENDIX C: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER.....	102

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Are high school graduates today prepared for the global society they are entering after graduation? With the Covid-19 global pandemic, conversations about climate, inflation, the war in Ukraine, and access to technology increasing daily, evidence of our connection to people around the world is clear. Accompanying this interconnected reality is the call for the next generation to be fully prepared to enter this global society and economy. In addition to the ability to navigate their own location, students today require the skills and competencies to communicate and collaborate with diverse groups of people, think critically about the issues that face our global society, and believe in their ability to enact the changes needed for success and sustainability.

Globalization or “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas... across borders” has been a topic of conversation and study in higher education for years (Knight, 2015). In addition to consideration of economic and governmental practices, globalization, and internationalization, herein referred to as “global education,” requires increased thought and planning in all levels of education. Much of the research into internationalization and global education has taken place at the post-secondary level despite more calls for students in primary and secondary schools to be more globally prepared. A comprehensive approach to internationalization includes a “commitment and action to infuse international, global and comparative content and perspective throughout the teaching, research and service missions” (Hudzik & Stohl, 2012, p. 66). As schools at all levels continue to increase global education curriculum, further research into comprehensive practices are encouraged.

In the United States, public schooling has served many functions for society. Many assert that educating students with the skills to work in the global economy will result in economic

growth and lead to economic, as well as national, security (CED, 2006; Spring, 2022). Currently, the Common Core State Standards also state, “with American students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). As the United States expands its relationships with other countries around the world, this preparation for the workforce is still evident. Additionally, K-12 schools are increasingly recognizing the need to educate students to be prepared for the global, interconnected world they will be entering. For example, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) includes “Global Connections” in its ten themes of social studies, stating that “social studies programs should include experiences that provide for the study of global connections and interdependence” (NCSS, 2010).

In response to the increased call for global preparedness, several organizations have created frameworks for global education in the K-12 setting. The most popular frameworks include:

- *Teaching for Global Competence in a Rapidly Changing World* by the Asia Society/OECD (2018)
- *Global Citizenship Education* by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2015)
- *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools* by Oxfam (2015)
- *Educating for Global Competence: Preparing Our Youth to Engage the World* by Boix Mansilla and Jackson (2011)

- *Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World: The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework* by Piacentini, Barrett, Boix Boix Mansilla, Deardorff, and Lee (2018)

Despite differing definitions and standards, these frameworks recommend global competencies and skills that all students should acquire through their K-12 studies. These broad competencies and skills include:

- Recognition of global interdependence of humans and human rights
- Understanding of global government structures and connections between different systems and processes
- Awareness of the global economy and its effects on local economies
- Recognition and appreciation of different cultures and perspectives with the ability to communicate effectively across these different cultures
- Critical and creative thinking, conflict management, flexibility and growth mindset, digital literacy, and creativity (Shulsky et al., 2017; Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Oxfam, 2015; Piacentini et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2015).

In the United States, independent, or private, schools have been defining and expanding global citizenship education programs more frequently than public schools, growing this type of programming by 20 percentage points from 2015 to 2019 (National Association of Independent Schools, 2019). This difference is most often attributed to these schools' ability to create curriculum and teach students *independently*, without the pressure of state standardized testing.

Study abroad and international travel experiences still play a large part in global citizenship education. In the most successful versions, these experiences allow students to take part in truly experiential education, navigating diversity, experiencing cultures different from

their own and taking part in a global societal experience. Due to the believed benefits of travel, secondary schools have begun to offer short-term study abroad trips to students to increase accessibility to these experiences. Short-term study abroad is often a single semester, or few-weeks trip tied to a semester course.

Alongside increased discussion and resources for implementation, there remains much criticism and confusion around the application of global education in the K-12 setting. Those attempting to practice global education note challenges in several areas. In a survey on principals' perceptions of global competency offerings in their schools, Reimers (2009) found three prominent "constraints to developing global competency in the respondents' schools: a lack of agreement on the definition of global competency among teachers, global competency not being a priority for teachers, and insufficient opportunities for students to develop global competency" (The Reality in School section). These areas include the vague definitions throughout global citizenship education allowing many differing applications, a lack of specific global educational standards, global education as privileged education, and a lack of teacher preparation and knowledge.

The first challenge facing global citizenship education is in the name itself. There is a lack of concrete understanding of the terms associated and various ways global education theory is practiced. Though there is seemingly great agreement on the need to change education to address increased globalization and interdependence as well as incorporate more global aspects of curriculum, there is little consensus on the definitions of the terms used, much less the specific curriculum and pedagogy involved. Throughout the research, many terms are often used interchangeably to denote the inclusion of a global component in curriculum. Some of these terms include global connections, global citizenship, global education, internationalization,

cosmopolitanism, international studies, multicultural education, and global studies. This lack of clarity and definition leads to schools teaching and using global citizenship education in many different, often contradictory, ways (Goren & Yemini, 2017; Oxley & Morris, 2013).

One of the biggest critiques of global citizenship education practice thus far is that it often “rests on a view of onward economic development of Western countries” rather than increasing equality and participation worldwide, continuing the privilege of some students and privileging the education of those students with higher socio-economic status (Mannion et al., 2011, p. 450; Wang & Hoffman, 2016). As Andreotti (2006) points out, without certain education and critical reflection, global citizenship has the possibility to “promote a new ‘civilising mission’ rather than addressing the economic and cultural roots of the inequalities in power and wealth/labor distribution” across the globe (p. 22). In their call for increasing global education in teacher preparation curriculum, the Longview Foundation (2008) asserted that “students in the United States, especially those in low-income and minority communities, leave high school without the knowledge and skills to engage in the world effectively and responsibly” (p. 4). Thus K-12 schools must consider the approach taken when embarking on global citizenship education if it is to truly prepare *all* students for a global society. Finally, one of the largest critiques of the implementation, or lack thereof, of global citizenship education is lack of teacher education in global curriculum as well as critical, culturally competent pedagogy (Ainscow, 2016; Andreotti, 2010; Borrero et al., 2018; Goren & Yemini, 2017; Longview Foundation, 2007; Merryfield, 2000; Rapoport, 2010; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016; Wynter-Hoyte et al., 2019; Yemini et al., 2019).

Adding to these challenges, educators and researchers alike began to call for global education starting at earlier ages, thus expanding and creating global education programs in the

K-12 setting. While this has also been a conversation for decades, there remains little research sharing the effectiveness and reliability of the available resources and content across different school systems. More research on the implementation of the existing programming, international travel, and teacher preparation for global content and pedagogy is needed in order to give a clear direction to global citizenship education in K-12 schools.

Statement of the problem

Global education, or internationalization of education, has been present in post-secondary education institutions for decades. However, its inclusion in primary and secondary institutions is still growing. While these institutions recognize the importance of global education, research is still needed to discover and share best-practices and curriculum for grades K-12. This research used case study design to better understand how one K-12, independent, school designed, implemented and assessed a long-standing global studies program. After reviewing the literature and finding the lack of standards and requirements for public schools in contrast to the presence of global curriculum and programming in many independent schools, a case study design was developed to gain understanding of the research questions in a fully developed and resourced environment. Using the following research questions, qualitative interviews and document reviews were completed to build a rich case description:

1. How is the global studies program at this school organized?
2. What curriculum and experiences are necessary for this global studies program?
3. How is this program implemented and assessed?

Participants in this study were chosen through purposeful, snowball sampling to ensure rich knowledge and description of the program.

The remainder of the study is organized into five chapters, references, and appendices. Chapter 2 reviews the current literature discussing global citizenship education, its theories and application, and its critiques and challenges. Chapter 3 describes the research design and qualitative methodology in addition to the researcher positionality and limitations. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the case study and analysis of data through coding of participant interviews and document review. Implications for K-12 schools, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are discussed in Chapter 5. Finally, references and appendices conclude the study.

CHAPTER 2: GLOBAL EDUCATION IN THE K-12 SETTING

The purpose of this chapter is to examine research and relevant educational literature on global citizenship education. Beginning with discussion of globalization and its impact on society in general, discussion will consider globalization and internationalization concepts in education, global citizenship education frameworks, global education competencies and skills, and challenges to program implementation. While much of the available research has been conducted in institutions for higher education, the focus of this literature review is to use this existing research in relation to K-12 settings, noting where similarities and differences occur.

Globalization

With the increase of technology usage, global economic growth and trade, and ease of mobility for those who can afford to travel, we hear often that we are more connected and interdependent across the globe. Globalization or “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas... across borders” has been a topic of conversation and study in higher education for years and has many different definitions (Knight, 2015). Research and societal beliefs show that our society is more global now than ever before which comes with new challenges and opportunities for all aspects of culture and society.

Globalization and international development typically refer to economic, political and technological concepts. Often, when discussing “developing” countries, it is their economy and technology that are developing compared to Westernized countries (Hamelink, 1999). This development often takes the form of encouraging more capitalist economic practices, Western technology access and usage, and encouragement of a democratic government. The philosophy behind these approaches is like the capitalist “trickle down” theory: an increase of wealth and access to those at the top brings benefits that trickle down to everyone else. However, as with the

trickle-down theory, the spread of technology and capitalism has not increased wealth or well-being of developing countries. As Hamelink (1999) posits, the “global” economy only encompasses “a few rich countries, in particular those belonging to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)” (p. 1). However, global trade and remote work opportunities continue to grow, pushing forward the need for collaborative, equitable practices and decision-making among all countries.

Internet and digital technology access and control also remain a challenge for many countries around the world. Ramesh Srinivasan (2017) points out in the book *Whose Global Village?*, that “ninety-nine percent of the world’s population remains excluded from most decisions made around the future of the Internet and digital technology” (p. 1). Infrastructure and affordability of broadband internet services continue to remain a barrier for developing and least developed countries worldwide (International Telecommunication Union, 2019). While broadband internet services are more available across the globe, “there are twice as many mobile-broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants in developed countries compared to developing countries” (International Telecommunication Union, 2017, p. 3). This gap in usage appears to be due to the disparity in price of usage that exists between developed and developing countries with developing countries sometimes charging “more than 100 per cent of the Gross National Income [...] making it unaffordable for the vast majority of the population” (International Telecommunication Union, 2019, p.60).

Globalization and Internationalization in Education

From the founding of public schooling, education in the United States has had similar goals of “instilling common moral and political values” (Spring, 2022, p. 5). In addition to these goals, starting in the 1880s, public schools became a place to educate the whole child, thus

becoming a “social center” as John Dewey advocated. Schools, Dewey claimed, must “provide a means for bringing people and their ideas and beliefs together, in such ways as will lessen friction and instability, and introduce deeper sympathy and wider understanding” (as cited in Spring, 2022, p. 29). As such, public schooling has aimed to provide an equality of opportunity for students to succeed as well as a place where social disagreements and differences would vanish as children from all different backgrounds mingled in the classroom. Today, we see evidence of these goals when reading many of the national curriculum standards as well as school mission statements. According to the National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies (2010), social studies in schools aims to promote “civic competence – the knowledge, intellectual processes, and democratic dispositions required of students to be active and engaged participants in public life” (p. 9).

In addition to the goal of building community and socialization, a major goal of public schooling in the United States has also been to educate children with the knowledge and skills to take part in the workforce, leading to more economic growth and preparation for the global economy (Spring, 2022). Using human capital theory, politicians and many educational leaders assert that educating students with the skills to work in the global economy will result in economic growth and lead to economic, as well as national, security (CED, 2006; Spring, 2022). Currently, the Common Core State Standards also state, “with American students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). As the United States expands its relationships with other countries around the world, this preparation for the workforce is still evident. As the U.S. Government Strategy on International Basic Education (2018) states, “quality education enables economic

growth sustained democratic governance, more resilient societies, and improved health outcomes and can lead to reductions in conflict and violent extremism” (p. 9). Additionally, the Committee for Economic Development (CED) has continued to advocate for international content in order to “teach our students the importance of working well with other countries to advance our common goals of peace and prosperity” noting the main challenges facing the United States in this area as economic, national security, and our multicultural society (CED, 2006, p. 2). Another current example of this rationale behind global competence can be found in the Pennsylvania Global Competence Curriculum Framework. This framework that appears to combine the Asia Society (2011) domains with Pennsylvania state standards states that,

global competence overlaps the skills and attributes necessary for students to be career ready. Business and Industry have identified key areas of growth for students entering the workforce. These areas include (but are not limited to): being able to collaborate and work as a team, problem solving, communicating effectively to diverse populations, being respectful and tactful, taking initiative, being flexible and open minded, and being able to look at an idea or problem through multiple perspectives. *Building global competence builds career readiness* [emphasis added]” (Crosson et al., 2018).

Throughout many periods in history, this human capital theory has helped to justify additional government spending on schools, expanding Head Start and antipoverty programs in the 1960s War on Poverty, job-training programs, No Child Left Behind and now the READ Act (Spring, 2022; U.S. Government, 2019). However, preparation for the global workplace may overlook many competencies students need as citizens of the world.

As noted previously, we have seen multiple references to the need to educate students about other cultures and countries. As globalization increased, so did the need for more

education about other people and parts of the world. Due to increased conversations about globalization, internationalization and global responsibility, global studies and global citizenship education has been increasingly recognized as a necessity around the world. Therefore, schools at all levels are choosing to internationalize their curriculum. As Knight (2012) notes, internationalization is “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of [post-secondary] education” (p. 29). Though Knight (2012) is speaking specifically to post-secondary education, an increasing number of K-12 institutions are also increasing the internationalization of their curriculum. Education for international studies, intercultural studies, multicultural education, and global education concepts have been present in schools since the 1960s. However, themes and focus areas have evolved (Xanthopoulos, 2005).

In addition to consideration of economic and governmental practices, globalization, and internationalization, herein referred to as “global education,” requires increased thought and planning in education. Schools at all levels worldwide are focusing more on helping to prepare students to live and work in a global society. A comprehensive approach to global education includes a “commitment and action to infuse international, global and comparative content and perspective throughout the teaching, research and service missions” (Hudzik & Stohl, 2012, p. 66). In order to achieve this goal, some countries are starting to include global education standards in their primary and secondary educational requirements in order to develop the skills students need to succeed in the future. For example, in the United States, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) includes “Global Connections” in its ten themes of social studies, stating that “social studies programs should include experiences that provide for the study of global connections and interdependence” (NCSS, 2010). The Education Services Australia

(ESA, 2011) states that global education “emphasises the unity and interdependence of human society, developing a sense of self and appreciation of cultural diversity, affirmation of social justice and human rights, building peace and actions for a sustainable future in different times and places” (p.5).

Regardless of standards, philosophies of education, or requirements, school leaders are aware of the constant growth and change in technology and the instant access students have to people and places all over the world. School leaders, as a result, have heightened responsibility to teach students how to navigate the diverse world at their fingertips. In addition to the standards mentioned previously, other organizations have created frameworks and standards specifically for global citizenship education in the K-12 setting.

Global Citizenship Frameworks and Objectives

There are a few frameworks that have been created to help K-12 schools start to think about how to create, or enhance, global curriculum. The most popular frameworks include:

- *Teaching for Global Competence in a Rapidly Changing World* by the Asia Society/OECD (2018)
- *Global Citizenship Education* by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2015)
- *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools* by Oxfam (2015)
- *Educating for Global Competence: Preparing Our Youth to Engage the World* by Boix Mansilla and Jackson (2011)
- *Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World: The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework* by Piacentini, Barrett, Boix Mansilla, Deardorff, and Lee (2018)

Many educational institutions recognize the different needs and skills necessary for today's global students. Schools are looking to adapt curriculum to address global skills and competencies. However, definition and critical elements of global citizenship curriculum remain nebulous. Currently, different organizations use several different terms for this new internationalization such as global citizenship education, global studies, international studies, and global competence education (Long, n.d.; Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; OECD, 2018; UNESCO, 2015). Though different organizations use different terms, the foundations of these programs have a lot in common. Literature suggests the most common definitions of global studies or global competence reflect the following themes:

- Recognition of global interdependence of humans and human rights.
- Understanding of global government structures and connections between different systems and processes.
- Awareness of the global economy and its effects on local economies.
- Recognition and appreciation of different cultures and perspectives with the ability to communicate effectively across these different cultures.
- Critical and creative thinking in order to solve global challenges and increase sustainability. (Shulsky et al., 2017; Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Oxfam, 2015; Piacentini et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2015).

Overall, themes in these frameworks reflect the cosmopolitan notion that students need to move beyond local citizenship education and start seeing themselves as part of a larger, global community, of which we are all citizens. Regardless of specific wording or emphases, there are many skills and competencies that recur in global citizenship curricular frameworks.

Global Competencies

In order to meet the changing demands of the future, students today need to build knowledge and skills that prepare them to work and communicate with people across the globe (Long, n.d.; Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; OECD, 2018; Shulsky et. al., 2017; UNESCO, 2015). While much of the research shows that global competence should be integrated into already existing curriculum, there is also agreement that in order to truly teach global competence, certain topics and knowledge must be covered (Piacentini et al., 2018; Shulsky et. al., 2017; UNESCO, 2015). According to UNESCO, The Council of Chief State School Officers' EdSteps Initiative & Asia Society Partnership for Global Learning, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), there are certain dimensions of competence for global citizenship. These dimensions include students investigating or learning about the world beyond their locality, understanding and respecting their own perspectives as well as others' perspectives and world views, communicating effectively, and the ability to act in a local as well as global capacity (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Piacentini et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2015). Oxfam (2015) also includes "social justice and equity, peace and conflict, and power and governance" to these competencies (p. 8). Thus, if K-12 schools are going to choose to internationalize their programs and curricula, an essential part of their educational program must build competencies that increase students' ability and confidence to take action beyond the walls of their educational institution.

Research posits that another possible component of global citizenship education is human rights education. Fernekes (2016) found that while global citizenship education and human rights education are very compatible to teach together, there are very few states that include both of these in their social studies or civic education. He proposes that this is, in part, due to the U.S.

traditionally using education to build support for nation-state citizenship. Global citizenship, focusing on human rights across the globe, has received less attention. Several authors have claimed that, along with focusing more on global social justice, schools in the United States need to move to more transformative education that is critical of “naked nationalism” in which citizens have “an unquestioning patriotism and belief in the moral superiority of one’s own nation or culture” (Pike, G., 2014, as cited in Fernekes, 2016, p.50; Spring, 2022). While the major global education frameworks note that students should learn to appreciate diversity and difference, schools also need to recognize that global citizenship and national citizenship interests may conflict. To address the inevitable dissonance, students will need to be able to think critically and draw upon a basic understanding of social justice and human rights principles.

Global Skills

Building on the knowledge learned, certain skills are also included as an important part of a successful global citizenship program. With information readily available at the push of a button, not only do students need to develop skills to evaluate all of the information they are given, they need to learn how to interact with others who are different. These skills include critical thinking and analysis, communication, empathy and perspective-taking, conflict management, flexibility and growth mindset, digital literacy, creativity, and collaboration (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Oxfam, 2015; Piacentini et al., 2018; Shulsky et al., 2017). While some of these skills might be best suited to practice in specific classes or subject areas, most of the skills are important to think about in an interdisciplinary way. Interdisciplinary education is important allowing students to see the connections between academic subjects and life outside of an educational institution. In addition, by learning and practicing these skills throughout their

academic areas, students are able to build more competency using the skills in their everyday lives.

Though there are many similarities between the different frameworks and approaches by various organizations, UNESCO (2015) and Oxfam (2015) include more explicit curriculum frameworks. Curriculum guides for these organizations include suggestions on content for each learning objective, or competency, at different age or grade levels. These curriculum guides allow educators to start to plan for global citizenship education implementation that is consistent across grade levels and gives a better understanding of how global citizenship education is approached within an existing K-12 curriculum. UNESCO (2015) also gives brief suggestions on how to implement global citizenship education through including ten “factors that contribute to successful delivery of global citizenship education” (p. 46).

Global Citizenship Education in Independent Schools

In the United States, independent, or private, schools have been defining and expanding global citizenship education programs more frequently than public schools, growing this type of programming by 20 percentage points from 2015 to 2019 (NAIS, 2019). This difference is most often attributed to these schools’ ability to create curriculum and teach students *independently*, without the pressure of yearly standardized testing. The National Association for Independent Schools (NAIS) created specific “principles of good practice” for global education for their member schools. These practices, much like standards, call for schools to:

1. Demonstrate a commitment to global education and international mindedness through its strategic plan and policy statements.
2. Support and show evidence of learning and teaching that challenges students to expand their perspectives and understanding of the world they live in, including foreign language

acquisition, cross-cultural communication, collaboration, global problem-solving, creative thinking, ethical and empathic decision making, and recognizing different perspectives, among others.

3. Foster a climate of respect for all peoples and cultures.
4. Seek opportunities that promote global awareness, intercultural experiences, transnational exchange, travel, and collaboration for its students, faculty, and administrators.
5. Emphasizes the value of intercultural communication and commitment to ethical action and service locally, nationally, and globally, and at all grade levels.
6. Embrace diversity and promote an environment of inclusivity and belonging for students, teachers, and administrators from a range of cultural, national, religious, and ethnic backgrounds.
7. Support professional learning opportunities for faculty, administrators, and other stakeholders that develop global awareness, knowledge, and understanding (NAIS, 2017).

The Global Education Benchmark Group also provides research, benchmarking and global education standards for independent schools. These standards cover global programming from inception to assessment and include curriculum standards such as:

- Knowledge, skills, and empathic orientation required of global citizenship
- Meaningful international, domestic, and local experiences for students
- World language learning
- Technology and media services that support global learning (Detloff, Nordquist & Sisisky, 2020).

A NAIS survey from 2019 also found that 79% of the schools with global studies programs reported having dedicated staff members running the program (NAIS, 2019). This flexibility in time and resources for additional staff is not often present in public schools. While the challenges created by these differences in staffing and resources will be discussed later, it is worth noting that these could lead to additional discrepancies in global competence between independent and public schools.

Assessment of Global Citizenship

In addition to suggested approaches, content and skills, several of the noted frameworks also address the assessment of learning (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Piacentini et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2011). As in most educational contexts, assessment in these frameworks concentrate on ongoing, formative and summative assessments focused explicitly on global competence. According to the frameworks noting assessment, the information gained from assessing students not only serves to inform the educators what the students have learned, but also assists in student learning. UNESCO (2015) notes the use of a “mix of traditional methods of assessment and of more reflective and performance-based methods, such as self-assessment and peer assessment” (p. 57). Similarly, Boix Mansilla and Jackson (2011) use a case study from an earth science classroom to demonstrate the use of informative feedback, ongoing assessment through teacher observations and discussion, independent student projects and standards accountability. Perhaps the most in-depth assessment of global competence is the PISA 2018 global competence assessment (Piacentini et al., 2018). This assessment, as discussed by Piacentini and others, contains two components:

- 1) a cognitive test exclusively focused on the construct of ‘global understanding’, defined as the combination of background knowledge and cognitive skills

2) a set of questionnaire items collecting self-reported information on students' awareness of global issues and cultures, skills and attitudes, as well as information from schools and teachers on activities to promote global competence (p. 21).

While this assessment appears to give more quantitative data, the authors also recognize the limitation in the assessment's ability to determine student values; the fourth component of global competence according to their framework (Piacentini et al., 2018). Worth noting, however, is the fact that this large assessment was only offered to OECD participating countries.

Study Abroad

Study abroad and international travel experiences still play a large part in global citizenship education. In the most successful versions, these experiences allow students to take part in truly experiential education, navigating diversity, experiencing cultures different from their own and taking part in a global societal experience. Due to the believed benefits of travel and its related curriculum, many schools have begun to offer short-term study abroad trips to students to increase accessibility to these experiences. Short-term study abroad is often a single semester, or few-weeks trip tied to a semester course. Due to the age and development of participants, as well as financial capability, short-term study abroad or international experience are the most viable options to consider in a K-12 setting. While more research is needed, early research shows that these short-term experiences have a similar impact on cultural competence and global engagement when certain quality aspects are met (Lee & Negrelli, 2018; Newstreet & Rackard, 2018).

To prepare students to engage globally across difference in these international experiences, there are some emerging practices that higher education, as well as some secondary education, programs are implementing. Promising emerging practices include: a focus on the

local environment the student is travelling to, knowledge of the culture the student will be entering, a conscious distancing from home, immersion in the local culture, and continued education and reflection on the experience once home. These features are increasingly in higher education to confront academic and volunteer tourism; the practice of recreating one's own culture elsewhere without much learning (Breen, 2012; Donnelly-Smith, 2009). Regardless of length of experience, trips and experiences need to have intentional, highly structured, in-depth learning that takes place before, during, and after the actual trip (Creeden et al., 2016; Donnelly-Smith, 2009; Vanden Berg & Schwander, 2019).

Pedagogical Approaches to Global Citizenship

In addition to including global citizenship curriculum throughout the educational experience, schools at all levels must decide which theory of globalization to follow. Oxfam (2015) states,

all human beings belong to a single human race, share a common humanity and are of equal worth. Hence, they should all have the same basic rights and be treated accordingly. Yet beliefs about the superiority of different groups, and about which groups 'belong' and which do not, continue to be expressed through words, behaviour and systems (p. 6).

As several authors have noted, there is a tension between differing approaches to global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006; DiCicco Cozzolino, 2016; Dill, 2012; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Pashby, Costa, Stein & Andreotti, 2020; Spring, 2022; Xanthopoulos, 2005). While much of this research has taken place at the post-secondary level, these approaches and distinctions between practices are still believed to be applicable to K-12 settings. DiCicco Cozzolino (2016) refers to the differing types as "technical-economic" and "social justice" approaches (p.18). The

technical-economic practice of global education views global curriculum as necessary to keep up with the capitalist competition and global trade rather than create a more socially just global society (DiCicco Cozzolino, 2016). The frameworks noted above all appear to fall into the social justice approach which “encourages deep critical reflection on existing inequalities and promotes engagement and learning not only *about* others, but also *with* them” (Andreotti, 2006). One step further than the social justice approach is critical global citizenship. Critical global citizenship education ensures that global education not “turn a blind eye to historical power inequalities that are embedded in today’s global issues and relations” and refuse to allow globalization to be portrayed as a “natural force, rather than as something that is politically constituted” (Mikander, 2016, p. 75-76).

Most recently, Pashby, da Costa, Stein and Andreotti (2020) provided a meta-review of the types of global citizenship education previously discussed, placing them in relation to liberal, neoliberal and critical “types”. In this review, the authors recognize that the approaches mentioned earlier often fall into more than one type and are, at times, conflated. In their analysis, these authors found that while there is a large consensus that neoliberal approaches to global education are counterproductive to true global citizenship, “neoliberal GCE [global citizenship education] was the most consistently identified, analysed and criticized” (Pashby et al., 2020, p.148). Additionally, they found that many of the “liberal orientations interface and possibly reinforce” neoliberal orientations “rather than significantly challenging them” (Pashby et al., 2020, p. 157). In an attempt to further analyze and provide suggestions for a way forward, Pashby et al. (2020) also analyzed the typologies of global citizenship education in regard to three additional layers: “methodological (the level of doing); epistemological (the level of thinking); and ontological (the level of being)” (p. 158). Using these levels, the authors suggest

that “most approaches [to GCE] are ultimately rooted within the same shared modern ontology (way of being) where existence is defined by knowledge, humans are separated from nature, and a single form of rationality prevails” (p.159). This finding suggests the reason for many types of global citizenship being conflated, or reinforcing neoliberal ideas. Thus, suggesting if global citizenship education continues to be limited by a “modern/colonial imaginary that is inherently violent and unsustainable, and which denies our entangled existence” without exploring different ontological questions, “we might mistakenly conflate decolonial approaches to GCE that challenge the continuity of the modern/colonial imaginary with critical approaches that seek to reform it” (Pashby et al., 2020).

In considering globalization, and globalization of education, it is also important to consider cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism is the belief or practice of being citizens of the world, recognizing that all humans have certain rights simply because they are human (Appiah, 2019; Bayram, 2019; Centner, 2014; Choo, 2018). While some critics of globalization claim that it is a new form of colonialism, which attempts to erase different cultures to create a “global culture,” cosmopolitanism points out that cultures and people have a right to adapt, and change based on new information (Centner, 2014). This approach “requires choosing aspects of cultures that are beneficial and rejecting those that are inhuman or detrimental” (Centner, 2014, p. 32). In addition, though critics of cosmopolitanism claim it does not allow for prioritizing local or national needs, research shows that those identifying as cosmopolitan navigate national and global identity simultaneously, as people navigate other multiple identities constantly (Appiah, 2019; Bayram, 2019). Appiah (2019) relates this approach with an explanation about voting:

Because citizenship is a kind of identity, its pull, like that of all identities, varies with the context and the issue. During mayoral elections, it matters most that I’m a New Yorker;

in senatorial elections, the city, the state, and the country all matter to me. In presidential elections, I also find myself thinking as both a citizen of the United States and a citizen of the world. So many of the gravest problems that face us – from climate change to pandemics – simply don't respect political borders (p. 21).

With this understanding of cosmopolitanism, globalization can be seen in a broader, more inclusive context. Additionally, Choo (2017) discusses the need to move beyond capitalist and utilitarian views of education to a more cosmopolitan view in which the competencies and skills mentioned in existing frameworks are used to make more informed, humane decisions, rather than merely a way to contribute to the economy through being prepared to enter the workforce. Cosmopolitanism, if practiced as stated above, can help schools and citizens move toward education that builds citizenship in multiple dimensions.

Challenges of Global Citizenship Education

Throughout the literature, there are many proponents of global education and just as many critics. Without a clear understanding of both, further developments in the area of global education is increasingly difficult. The following section discusses the challenges many authors are finding with the current global education practices. In a survey on principals' perceptions of global competency offerings in their schools, Reimers (2009) found three prominent "constraints to developing global competency in the respondents' schools: a lack of agreement on the definition of global competency among teachers, global competency not being a priority for teachers, and insufficient opportunities for students to develop global competency" (The Reality In School section). These constraints are echoed, along with others, throughout the literature. The challenges discussed in the following paragraphs include the vague definitions throughout global citizenship education which allows it to be used in many differing ways, a lack of specific

educational standards, global education as privileged education, and a lack of teacher preparation and knowledge.

Varied Definitions

The first challenge facing global citizenship education is in the name itself. There is a lack of concrete understanding of the terms associated and various ways global education theory is practiced. Though there is seemingly great agreement on the need to change education to address increased globalization and interdependence as well as incorporate more global aspects of curriculum, there is little consensus on the definitions of the terms used, much less the specific curriculum and pedagogy involved. Throughout the research, many terms are often used interchangeably to denote the inclusion of a global component in curriculum. Some of these terms include global connections, global citizenship, global education, internationalization, cosmopolitanism, international studies, multicultural education, and global studies. This lack of clarity and definition leads to schools teaching and using global citizenship education in many different, often contradictory, ways (Goren & Yemini, 2017; Oxley & Morris, 2013).

Global Educational Standards in the United States

Curriculum standards in the United States guide schools and teachers in development and assessment of teaching and learning. These standards, while not compulsory, often serve to shape the content of courses throughout K-12 education. These standards are followed with the goal of adequately preparing students to pass the achievement tests necessary to continue through the grade levels in public schools. In reviewing state graduation requirements, Vermont appears to be one of the only states mentioning global citizenship proficiency in the state graduation requirements (Vermont State Board of Education, 2016). According to Vermont's *Educational Quality Standards* (2016), high school graduates should be able to demonstrate "global

citizenship (including the concepts of civics, economics, geography, world language, cultural studies and history)” (p. 5). Following this trend, in the United States, global education most often falls into the Social Studies curriculum and standards (National Council for the Social Studies, 2011; Ohio Department of Education, 2010). Social Studies, as defined by the National Council for the Social Studies (2011) is:

The integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. Within the school program, social studies provide coordinated, systematic study drawing upon such disciplines as anthropology, archaeology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology, as well as appropriate content from the humanities, mathematics, and natural sciences. The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world (p. 9).

The themes for social studies include strands to study “global connections” as well as “civic ideals and practices”, specifically addressing the need to broaden education to prepare students to engage globally (NCSS, 2010, p. 10). Other strands included in national, as well as state, social studies standards are also applicable to global citizenship education. However, as research suggests, this requires a certain expertise and awareness from the teacher in order to include global aspects into these traditional areas of social studies (Andreotti, 2010; Dill, 2012; Goren & Yemini, 2017; Merryfield, 2000; Rapoport, 2010; Yemini et al., 2019; Wang & Hoffman, 2016).

Though global topics are mentioned in educational standards throughout the United States, there is still a lack of direction when it comes to specific content as well as pedagogy. One example of this lack of direction or specific global content is found in a study comparing

textbooks for World History courses in the United States. Bolgatz and Marino (2021) found that textbooks available for World History courses are still widely “European in focus” and the most popular high school level textbooks continue to “follow a historical chronology that replicates the orientation of ‘Western Civ’” giving “primacy to events from European history” (Conclusions section). In contrast, the Advanced Placement World History texts “reflect a more global orientation toward world history” by using themes to organize content rather than the Western Civilization chronology (Bolgatz & Marino, 2021, Conclusions section). However, comparatively, very few students complete these Advanced Placement (AP) courses, therefore not receiving the content in those texts. If not teaching an AP World History course, it is up to individual teachers to find and include additional texts to broaden student understanding of World history. Similarly, many of the standards require much interpretation and prioritization by individual teachers or schools. In addition, teachers often feel as though there are too many standards to cover in any given year and due to high stakes achievement testing in the United States, curriculum content that is tested is prioritized over untested content in many situations. As some researchers assert, merely having global standards, or even global content, without critical analysis and approach by the teacher will not lead to the transformative global citizenship, but instead serve to continue the marginalization of others worldwide (Andreotti, 2010; Dill, 2012; Fernekes, 2016; Gaudelli & Fernekes, 2004; Mannion et al., 2011; Mikander, 2016; Hatley, 2019; Spring, 2022, Wang & Hoffman, 2016). As Ferenkes (2016) suggests, social studies curriculum needs to move away from curriculum that promotes “naked nationalism” toward curriculum which promotes “nuanced nationalism” (p.50). This includes “a love of one’s own country and people, but [also] demands a critically reflective analysis of the nation’s history and contemporary values, as well as an understanding of how the nation is nested in a wider

system of global responsibilities” (as cited in Fernekes, 2016, p. 50). Saito (2020) also points to the need for educators to resist the standardization of curriculum in order to meet state standards, instead developing curriculum with a focus on cultural relevance and competence. Thus arguing that standardization of curriculum is in opposition to cultural relevance and embracing the diversity within the classroom.

World Language Instruction

In reviewing the existing global education frameworks in addition to state standards and graduation requirements, the Global Education Benchmarking Group (GEBG), which works primarily with independent schools, is the only organization to include world language learning in their standards or expectations for student learning (Detloff, Nordquist & Sisisky, 2020). As of 2019, only twelve states require world language instruction for high school graduates, with Tennessee and West Virginia noting the requirement applies only to college-bound, or professional pathways, students (Macdonald, Zinth, & Pompelia). However, in the first assessment of global competence, OECD countries more than 90% of students reported that they learn at least one world language at school (Schleicher, 2020). This lack of focus, or requirement, on world language learning possibly contributes to the lack of direction for global education. As world language instruction is believed to aid in the development of intercultural awareness and communication (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL], 2015), competencies listed in all of the frameworks noted, the lack of explicit inclusion in the existing frameworks is notable.

Conflicting Approaches to Global Citizenship Education

In reading the available research, several authors have attempted to place global citizenship education approaches into certain categories (Andreotti, 2006; Dill, 2012; Oxley &

Morris, 2013; Spring, 2022; Xanthopoulos, 2005). Overall, scholars have noted a few main differences in the global education focus such as economic versus social, individualist versus collectivist, and human capital and consumerism versus human rights and happiness.

Similar to DiCicco Cozzolino (2016) previously noted, Dill (2012) puts global citizenship education into two categories which lead to certain assumptions and practices on the part of educators; global competencies, which is aimed at preparing students to compete in a global economy, and global consciousness which aims to increase students' cultural sensitivity and global perspective. Additionally, Andreotti (2006) distinguishes between "soft global citizenship" and "critical global citizenship". In this analysis, Andreotti illustrates the difference between these two approaches to global citizenship, arguing that critical global citizenship is necessary in order to combat many of the other challenges noted regarding global citizenship education. Critical global citizenship education

provides the space for them [students] to reflect on their context and their own and others' epistemological and ontological assumptions: how we came to think/be/feel/act the way we do and the implications of our systems of belief in local/global terms in relation to power, social relationships and the distribution of labour and resources (p. 27).

After this analysis, many additional studies have shown the need for a critical approach to global citizenship education in order to ensure that students achieve the goals set out by those framing global citizenship education theory and standards (Andreotti, 2012; Blackmore, 2011; Dill, 2012; Leduc, 2013; Mannion et al., 2011; Mikander, 2016; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016; Wang & Hoffman, 2016).

Oxley and Morris (2013) also looked at the different forms of global citizenship education practiced and created a "typology for its multiple conceptions" (p. 301). Oxley and

Morris identified “eight principal conceptions of global citizenship and these were grouped into two broad forms/types: the ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘advocacy’ based set of models” (p. 305).

According to Oxley and Morris, the cosmopolitan models are broken down into political, moral, economic, and cultural global citizenship which represent “an essentially mainstream set of models” while the advocacy models are broken down into social, critical, environmental and spiritual concepts that “involve a strong degree of advocacy from a particular perspective” (p.305). Using this typology, Goren and Yemini (2017) found that the United States curriculum most commonly uses the political and economic approaches to global citizenship education, citing world political changes as the need for this curriculum. Through this same research, Goren and Yemini also found that those regions that did include more multidimensional models of global citizenship education often had higher rates of immigration and used global citizenship education as a peace building tool to create a common identity. This echoes the previous work of Xanthopoulos (2005) who generalized three ways in which global education is framed in the United States:

1. **Win the superpower contest** in which students in the United States learn primarily of national history, especially democracy, in contrast to totalitarian and theocratic governments.
2. **Win the global economic contest** in which education prepares students to compete and succeed in the global economy thus emphasizing courses and skills such as geography, international studies, and foreign languages.
3. **Persons, peoples, and planet** in which education “seeks to help children worldwide to understand the increasingly interdependent nature of the human world and understand the consequences of their choices” (p. 638).

The United States and China, “countries that are considered central forces in the globalized world focus more on serving national interests through GCE” while “human rights often receive more attention in lower-income countries” (Goren & Yemini, 2017, p. 176). These findings are echoed throughout the research as most critiques focus on an overuse of the cosmopolitan models without a critical or social aspect present to provide multiple perspectives or challenge existing systems.

While schooling for economic growth and human capital has led to many improvements in the field of education, the main argument against focusing on human capital and economic growth alone posits that this continues colonization and “provides little understanding of other nations or cultures or of the deeper life processes of the planet” (Xanthopoulos, 2005, p. 636). This practice, often referred to as “neo-colonialism”, is argued by several authors to continue marginalization and oppression of countries seen as developing or not capitalistic, rather than teaching students to see the strengths among the differences (Andreotti, 2006; Pais & Costa, 2016; Wang & Hoffman, 2016; Xanthopoulos, 2005). Scholars also assert that global education needs to move away from the superpower and economic contests to include realistic curriculum that looks critically at the practices of globalization rather than follow the “neo-colonial” trend in which “education systems in developing countries are overly dependent on the ideas, curricula and expertise of wealthy countries” (Wagner, 2018, p.21).

Critics of the global consciousness models echo critics of cosmopolitanism. These critics claim that justifying global curriculum and programs as a moral imperative by recognizing that all humans have certain rights simply because they are human has the possibility to erase different cultures in order to create a “global culture.” However, others point to the need for

cosmopolitan views in order to bring balance to the programs focusing too heavily on competencies and skills for career success (Appiah, 2019; Bayram, 2019).

In addition to the critique of neoliberal approaches, others believe that many of these approaches fail to recognize the ability to affect change in the global society (Mannion et al., 2011; Pais & Costa, 2016; Spring, 2022; Xanthopoulos, 2005). Similar to the three themes noted by Xanthopoulos (2005), Mannion and colleagues (2011) discussed “two dominant themes [in global citizenship programs] which are solely about making an *economic* and *cultural* response to a fixed context” noting that in these approaches “the world is not just ‘becoming global’ but *already is so*” (p. 450). As Mikander (2016) points out, there is a “tendency to portray globalization [and its challenges] as a ‘natural force’ rather than something politically constituted” (p. 76) therefore leading to curriculum that emphasizes individual action over political and structural reform (Balarin, 2011; Dill, 2012; Mikander, 2016; Wang & Hoffman, 2016; Andreotti, 2006). Additionally, Pais and Costa (2016) argue that the differences in approach to global education, regardless of name, serve to reinforce the current state of education in the United States, allowing neoliberalism to continue to grow. Thus, arguing that if education reform is approached as a fixed response rather than seen as an ongoing process of change and restructuring, the approach as well as the outcomes of that education will be different from what is actually needed.

Privileged and Privileging Education

One of the biggest critiques of global citizenship education practice thus far is that it often “rests on a view of onward economic development of Western countries” rather than increasing equality and participation worldwide, continuing the privilege of some students and privileging the education of those students with higher socio-economic status (Mannion et al.,

2011, p. 450; Wang & Hoffman, 2016). As Andreotti (2006) points out, without certain education and critical reflection, global citizenship has the possibility to “promote a new ‘civilising mission’ rather than addressing the economic and cultural roots of the inequalities in power and wealth/labor distribution” across the globe (p. 22). Spring (2022) points to the “global curricula” that already exists wherein schools worldwide focus on the same subjects and are organized in the same way- with age-graded classrooms focusing mainly on reading, writing and arithmetic. Additionally, Wang and Hoffman (2016) continue to argue that globalization has led to a global curriculum that has become “more synchronous around a narrower set of priorities, skills, subjects, and goals” rather than reflecting the increasing immigration and diversity in the classroom (p.10). Thus, they echo the claim that Western countries and cosmopolitanism are forcing countries to let go of local customs and ways of education in order to receive what has been decided is a good education (Spring, 2022; Wang & Hoffman, 2016). Without critical reflection and more focus on the social sciences, “the global curriculum is designed to build national identity through teaching a common language and local citizenship, and to prepare citizens for participation in the global economy” (Spring, 2022, p. 77).

Several researchers have found that global citizenship education, when moving past theory and ideology, actually reinforces privilege, marginalization, and colonization (Andreotti, 2006; Balarin, 2011; Dill 2012; Longview Foundation, 2008; Mannion et al., 2011; Mikander, 2016; Wang & Hoffman, 2016). Through a study of two U.S. high schools and materials available on websites, Wang and Hoffman (2016) found global citizenship appears to be “dominated by an underlying focus on the self-development and self-orientations of the global citizen” that “reflect the structure of the U.S. classed culture” (p. 13). Wang and Hoffman also noted the lack of focus on what different topics might mean to other people around the world,

with these programs instead focusing solely on its students' "own individual views and opinions" (p. 9). The authors argue that this individual focus is not only incomplete, but also "potentially destructive" when educating for global citizenship and, in fact, is "antithetical to a genuinely global citizenship" (Wang & Hoffman, 2016, p. 14). Similarly, Dill (2012) found that the 'global citizen' often "takes a highly particularized form that reflects a Western, liberal, rational, secular, and consumerist account," making little room for those not fitting that description (p. 545). In a study of marginalized students in Lima-Peru, Malarin (2011) found that despite opportunities discussed in global curriculum generally being unavailable to them, students' "imagination is almost completely depoliticized" (p. 364). She further asserts that here, global citizenship education seems "to generate a kind of positive feedback into a neo-liberal/global political system that favours precisely these kinds of individualistic and socially fragmented attitudes" thus continuing the marginalization of the world's poorest citizens (p. 364). Another example of this Western influence is the common acceptance and practice of the English language as the "lingua franca" or dominant language (Paasi, 2015). This practice, while making some global knowledge and communication easier, also could serve to further marginalize authors knowledge from non-Anglophone citizens (Paasi, 2015).

In their call for increasing global education in teacher preparation curriculum, the Longview Foundation (2008) asserted that "students in the United States, especially those in low-income and minority communities, leave high school without the knowledge and skills to engage in the world effectively and responsibly" (p. 4). Similarly, Goren and Yemini (2017) found that global citizenship education content was often tied to teacher perception of student socioeconomic status (SES). Through their analysis, Goren and Yemini found students who were perceived as belonging to the low and middle SES were not perceived by teachers as having

“futures in global terms,” and, as a result, the main aspects of global citizenship education that were focused on were more humanistic and cultural (p.14). In contrast, those perceived as having a high SES were perceived as “more appropriate candidates for global citizenship education” and there was a “strong focus on the development of concrete skills necessary for their students’ futures” (p.7). As asserted in this study, “if this gap is perpetuated, students of high SES will be given the tools to become members of a mobile, global elite class, able to fully participate in a global society and economy, while students of low SES will remain static, uncritical citizens of the nation (and the nation alone)” (Goren & Yemini, 2018, p. 19). This coincides with Malarin’s (2011) assertion that “the marginal is the (maybe not so) hidden other of global citizenship” (p.361).

Study Abroad and International Experiences

Study abroad, or global experiences, are other widely used practices to increase global education. Historically, “study abroad” encompassed much of what educators felt was needed for global competence; however, there is now recognition that merely studying abroad is not enough, leading to the call for overall educational change (Long, n.d; Donnelly-Smith, 2009). Study abroad and international travel experiences still play a large part in global education; however, as research is showing, this practice also needs to include changing the practice of academic tourism, which often leads to outcomes of continuing colonization and inequity (Breen, 2012). Academic tourism, as defined by Breen (2012), is “travel that occasions connections with academic programmes whose intended outcomes are the reproduction of existing perspectives” (p. 84). Rather than building inter-cultural competence and true global citizenship, traditional study abroad programs and academic tourism often simply recreated United States’ programs or created a “third culture that represents those characteristics from the target culture that students

adopt without jeopardizing the safety net of their home culture” in other places around the world (Creeden, Kelly-Aguirre & Visser, 2016, p. 18).

In addition to the above challenges, only certain students with the ability to pay for these experiences, or attend a private school that would assist, are typically able to participate in travel, thus increasing the privileging of this practice and marginalization of certain populations (Sweeney, 2013). To achieve the goals set out by global citizenship frameworks to create a more equitable global society, these experiences need to be available to as many students as possible, creating the need to think critically about the practices and policies around study abroad and international experiences (Hudzik & Stohl, 2017; Durbin, 2006).

The global Covid-19 pandemic is another challenge to travel at this time. Though improvements in vaccination rates and treatment have increased, the current health protocols and personal health risks have limited travel, at times resembling a “post-mobility world” (White & Lee, 2020). As White and Lee (2020) assert, “the post-mobility world is less space bound, allowing for international partnerships to change from exporting education to collaborative models that use multinational expertise and situate education locally, while still building meaningful connections across borders and cultures” (p. 2). In addition, White and Lee (2020) point out the possibility that,

anti-immigrant proposals and policies, such as travel bans, limiting international collaboration in allegedly sensitive areas, restrictions on work visas and limits on international engagement are some of the perceived threats to mobility. Post-mobility models of internationalisation, in contrast, can transcend such political barriers” (p. 2).

However, as Tamrat and Teferra (2020) point out, there are many students worldwide, at all levels, that are simply unable to access the internet to take part in ‘post-mobility’ options for

education. In addition, they assert, “not much is known about what alternatives exist for students without internet access, but alternative solutions that do not necessarily demand an internet connection should be sought, including the use of media such as radio, TV and other forms of offline delivery” (Tamrat & Teferra, 2020. p. 2). Until these alternative solutions are explored, in addition to improving the technology infrastructure and affordability in developing areas of the world, the promise and increase in equity outlined by White and Lee (2020) will not be possible.

Teacher Perception and Preparation

One of the largest critiques of the implementation, or lack thereof, of global citizenship education is lack of teacher education in global curriculum as well as critical, culturally competent pedagogy (Ainscow, 2016; Andreotti, 2010; Borrero et al., 2018; Goren & Yemini, 2017; Longview Foundation, 2007; Merryfield, 2000; Rapoport, 2010; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016; Wynter-Hoyte et al., 2019; Yemini et al., 2019). Goren and Yemini (2017) note that,

In most studies, teachers and educators recognize the importance of GCE; however they often feel trapped between curricular goals encouraging its incorporation in the classroom and cultural norms of nationalism or lack of practical resources that hinder their ability to actually teach it (p.179).

Tichnor-Wagner and colleagues (2016) assert, “in order for educators to foster a unique set of global competency dispositions, knowledge, and skills in students [...] educators are required to develop those same competencies in themselves” (p. 5). However, many leadership and teacher preparation programs continue to train for traditional educational environments in a traditional, historically oppressive, manner (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Borrero et al., 2018; Brown, 2006; Kim & Slapac, 2015; Longview Foundation, 2008; Nagda et al., 2003). Andreotti (2010) also notes, there “is a mismatch between ‘20th century’ teaching and the needs of ‘21st century’

learners” (p.7) and calls for “comfortable notions of knowledges and identities [to be] disrupted and transformed, so that educators learn to live with difference, ambiguity and complexity in their contexts and within themselves” (p.20). With “course requirements and student teaching taking up significant space in most pre-service teachers’ schedules, there is little room for study abroad, world language study, or internationally oriented electives” leading to “most teachers beginning their careers with little more than superficial knowledge of the world” (Longview Foundation, 2008, p. 6). Thus, as a subject in an interview by Rapoport (2010) states, “you can’t really teach what you don’t know” (p. 184).

Pedagogy for Global Citizenship

In addition to critically examining and changing curriculum content for global citizenship, there are also studies pointing to the need to improve teacher pedagogy (Borrero et al., 2018; Leduc, 2013; Merryfield, 2000; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016; Wynter-Hoyte et al., 2019; Yemini et al., 2019). As Goren and Yemini (2017) state, “policy alone may not be sufficient in minimizing the global citizenship education gap. Teacher agency plays a major role in the enactment of policy in the classroom; therefore, teacher education must undergo reform to include GCE-related contents” (p. 20).

Despite the critiques, research in this area also points to emerging best practices for leadership and pedagogy including culturally sustaining pedagogy, integration of global education into all aspects of curriculum, authentic and sustained engagement, and sharing of global experiences (Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016; Tichnor-Wagner & Manise, 2018; Wynter-Hoyt et al., 2019; Santamaria, 2014). Through interviews of ten teachers, Tichnor-Wagner and colleagues (2016) found three signature pedagogies; “1) intentional integration of global topics and multiple perspectives into and across the standard curriculum; 2) ongoing authentic

engagement with global issues; and 3) connecting teachers' global experiences, students' global experiences, and the curriculum" (p. 12). Santamaria (2014) also discussed the importance of combining multiple aspects of different models of leadership and theory (Critical Race Theory, Multiculturalism, Transformative and democratic leadership, and Culturally Responsive Teaching) for a new leadership theory and practice called "Applied Critical Leadership" (p. 356).

Critical pedagogy attempts to change the traditional approach to education by "interrogating differences in terms of how they are socially constructed based on power dynamics" (as cited in Kim & Slapac, 2015, p.22). Many schools mention critical thinking as a necessary component of all education, however, as Blackmore (2016) points out, there are two forms of critical thinking; "technical and political" (p. 41). Technical practices focus on "the application of logic and conceptual analysis [...] and strives for impartiality" (as cited in Blackmore, p.7). In contrast, the political "rejects impartiality" and includes personal reflection and thinking critically about current societal practices or outcomes (p.7). This additional aspect of thinking critically about all information given and how it relates to the current power systems and society is a noted gap in knowledge for teachers and the biggest opportunity for social change.

Culturally relevant and sustaining teaching is another aspect important in a global education program in order to achieve true respect for, and collaboration with, other cultures. Similar to critical pedagogy, culturally relevant pedagogy "acknowledges how deficit beliefs of culturally diverse students are very much a part of schooling structures" (as cited in Wynter-Hoyte et al., 2017). In order for an educator to practice true culturally relevant teaching, one has to first know one's own "positionality", recognizing that "if we want students to undertake journeys of self-discovery and reflection, we must understand our own unique characteristics and

undergo a similar journey ourselves" (Borrero et al., 2018, p.32). This pedagogy also recognizes that students enter the classroom with existing knowledge and expertise and encourages teachers to acknowledge and use that expertise moving beyond the deficit thinking often found in education (Borrero et. al., 2018; Wynter-Hoyt et. al., 2019). Culturally relevant and sustaining teaching uses students' home cultures as resources and allows students to draw on them as such in the educational setting. Findings in the research by Borrero, Ziauddin and Ahn (2018) also showed that culturally relevant teaching needs to "recognize the fluid, active nature of culture so [teachers] can reach students who inhabit a multitude of identities, rather than essentializing students and their cultures" (p.28). In addition, culturally relevant pedagogy works to counter dominant narratives and move past the idea that marginalized populations need to assimilate (Borrero et. al., 2018).

Transformative pedagogy refers to any pedagogy, including critical and culturally relevant pedagogy, which expects and creates personal transformation as well as transformation in actions outside of the classroom (Farren, 2016; Kim & Slapac, 2015). As Brown (2006) states, transformative learning "changes the way people see themselves and their world" (p. 708). Farren (2016) used six key theoretical dimensions of transformative pedagogy: identity, beliefs and attitudes, moral-ethical values, socio-affective factors, social interaction/collaboration, target language use, metacognition, and school and wider society; pointing out that transformative education must include personal experience and reflection as well as explicit teaching of information. The multiliteracies pedagogy, a type of transformative pedagogy, uses the above theories in combination in order to create a "repertoire" that teachers may choose from in order to increase student engagement and achievement that is multiliterate as well as multimodal (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). Throughout the curriculum, teachers should be able provide education

using the four quadrants of “experiencing the new, conceptualizing with theory, analyzing critically, and applying creatively” to ensure that students are engaged and learning new ways of thinking and transforming their world (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). As Brown (2006) concluded, "if they [learners] have engaged in experiential learning, critical reflection and rational discourse regarding their underlying assumptions about practice, the next logical step is to integrate these assumptions into an informed theory of practice" (p.733). In other words, when all four of the above dimensions are included in education, it transforms student practice and application in society.

Conclusion

Primary and secondary schools around the world are recognizing the continued effects of globalization and have shown the desire to address these effects through increasing curriculum with a global lens. A survey of the literature indicates a foundation of philosophies and frameworks on which to build programs of global citizenship education. However, clarity in purpose, teacher preparation and effective curricular design also play a large role in program efficacy. More research on the implementation of the existing programming, international travel, and teacher preparation for global content and pedagogy is needed in order to give a clear direction to global citizenship education in K-12 schools. With the approaches noted above, in addition to competencies and skills laid out in the multiple frameworks researched, there exists a possibility for global citizenship education to live up to the highest potential: that of preparing our students to change the world.

Throughout the research, there is critique of focusing solely on one or two aspects of globalization or global citizenship education. In order to achieve the ideological goals of the existing frameworks, there is a need to see global education as complex and multi-layered as a

global society itself. Reimers (2020) notes that many of the existing frameworks and tools are “almost exclusively about practice, with limited theoretical and conceptual grounding,” calling for a “theoretical multidimensional model of global education” (p. 2). Rather than choosing one approach over another, it seems research is pointing to a need to meaningfully integrate approaches to provide skills for success as well as critical understanding of what “success” means in the current and future global society. In their research, Eidoo and colleagues (2011) discuss a kaleidoscope approach, explaining, “the view of global citizenship education is changed and refracted by the interconnection and overlap among diverse perspectives and identities” (p.61). If global citizenship is to meet the ideological goals set out in standards as well as the existing frameworks, this kaleidoscope approach is one worth contemplating. Without competencies and skills, students will not be able to successfully navigate the world in which they are entering *and* without the critical analysis of the structures that exist, realistic views of human rights and differing cultures, students will not be able to solve the global problems that are before us. More research on current practices is necessary to find if the kaleidoscope approach is possible in K-12 programs and to believe, as cosmopolitans do, that we are all part of one human society. Making room for students to see themselves as a part of the global community *and* critically examine the political and economic practices of that community in order to allow everyone to thrive.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As discussed in previous chapters, there is a gap in research on global citizenship education in K-12 schools. To address this gap and provide more detailed information for those interested in global education for primary and secondary students, the following research questions were posed:

1. How is the global studies program at this school organized?
2. What curriculum and experiences are necessary for this global studies program?
3. How is this program implemented and assessed?

After reviewing the literature and finding the lack of standards and requirements for public schools in contrast to the presence of global curriculum and programming in many independent schools, a case study design was developed to gain understanding of the research questions in a fully developed and resourced environment of an independent school.

In this chapter, further explanation of the case study design and qualitative methods, as well as researcher positionality, are explained. Additionally, I will describe the research participants, setting, and data collection methods. Finally, there is an acknowledgement of the limitations of this research.

Qualitative Case Study

As Mirriam and Tisdell (2016) define, a qualitative case study “is an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (p. 37). This design was necessary to discover how one independent school system has formed and maintained a global studies program. This bounded program had defined faculty members, a separate diploma board, independent graduation requirements for students choosing to specialize in global education, and curriculum throughout

the grades. The research design also incorporated Creswell's description of a qualitative case study in that it involved "multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audio-visual material, and documents and reports) (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 188). Due to the lack of definition around global education in the United States, it was important to research and describe this case in such a way that the reader comes away with a better understanding of what the program involves as well as what it is like to experience the program at that institution (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p.28).

Researcher Positionality

Because qualitative research requires the researcher as an instrument as well as interpreter, acknowledgement of the researcher's role and positionality in the study is imperative (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Without this acknowledgement and explanation, the researcher as well as the reader may not be aware of how personal biases or social identities may have influenced the research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). By including the self-reflection below, and reflecting on these identities throughout the research process, the reader is better able to understand and rely on the researcher's data and interpretation.

As the researcher for this study, I am a white, cisgender, straight woman. I grew up in a "colorblind" house that denounced the overt racism that I still witnessed regularly, but did not recognize any institutional oppression. As an adult, I attended a SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) facilitator training that changed my life and opened my eyes to the reality of systemic oppression and the role that education plays in the continuation or changing of this system.

In college, I was able to study in Hull, England for a semester and travel throughout Europe during that time. As many people who have studied abroad recognize, this was a life-

changing experience for me in that it built my confidence and exposed me to many different cultures, learning through immersion how to communicate, respect, and navigate difference.

In addition to the life experiences above, I also have been employed at an independent, all-girl school for the past thirteen years. In my time at this school I have served both as a school counselor for Pre-K through fifth grade as well as the Director of Diversity and Inclusion. My extensive experience with the independent school environment and its operation in the Midwestern region of the United States informed my research and possible participants. This positionality could have also created some biases or assumptions about the school I was studying due to its resemblance to my own place of employment.

These experiences have shaped my belief in what a global citizenship program needs and the critical ways in which education needs to look at curriculum. I believe that global citizenship curriculum needs to do more than just teach about different people and places around the world. It needs to be recognized that we are all citizens of an increasingly global community and need to treat each other as such. My assumption about much of the existing curriculum in schools is that it still does not take a fully critical, social justice, approach to education.

During my interviews with participants at a peer school, my social identity could have affected interactions, most specifically with interview participants. Realistically, I fit into many of the dominant social identity categories, which could have helped or hurt my initial relationship building depending on the social identity of the person I was interviewing. I also recognize my privilege in being able to conduct this research and the privilege of the institution in which the research was conducted. Independent schools are historically accessible to higher socioeconomic status families and, while the diversity is growing, mostly white families. This

will continue to be important to recognize and keep in mind when discussing the applicability in other schools.

Participants

This study sought to describe, in detail, the components and curriculum of a long-established global education program in an independent, or private, K-12 school. Therefore, purposeful, respondent-driven sampling was utilized to identify participants who could describe the phenomenon of their lived experience in an independent school setting with an established global studies program. Using a list of ambassadors identified by the National Association of Independent Schools, the researcher contacted four different schools via email to recruit one school in which to perform a case study. One East Coast independent school was selected as the research setting. The school was selected based on longevity of the global studies program, website review and an initial conversation with the director of the global studies program.

Participants interviewed included the school's Director of Global Studies, the Assistant Head of School for Academic Affairs and person who helped to create the Upper School diploma program, Lower School Curriculum Director, Middle and Upper School Science teacher and Global Studies diploma board member, Assistant Head of School and Head of Middle School, kindergarten teacher and Lower School Global Education Coordinator, and the Middle and Upper School Spanish teacher and International Exchange Coordinator. Each participant was employed at the school and a part of the global studies program for a minimum of five years.

School Profile

The school chosen for this study was discovered through the National Association for Independent Schools (NAIS) global studies ambassadors' roster. Based on data from this list of

individuals, the researcher chose the study school for its long-standing global education programming in a K-12 setting.

The school is an independent school located on the northeast coast of the United States. Founded in the late 1800s, this all-gender day school serves students from preschool through high school. As part of its mission, the school seeks to develop lifelong learners who are informed, engaged, and ethical citizens and leaders in our diverse world. The school also has the Core Values of respect, responsibility, kindness, honesty, and equity.

Set on a small campus in a residential area, classrooms and divisions based on grade level are divided among academic buildings as well as houses that have been converted to classrooms. The Lower School, or pre-K through grade five, is divided between two houses situated across the street from the Middle and Upper (high) School. In a separate building next to the main academic building is a gymnasium. Also located near the Lower School classrooms is a playground for the early grades and a large sports field for physical education and some sports practices. Other facilities on campus include a STEAM Lab, Makerspace, Innovation Space, Digital Media Center, and French Library.

Small by design, the school enrolled 417 students at the time of the study with an average class size of 12. Demographics of the school show that 7% of the student body are international students, 38% of the students identify as students of color, and 27% of the student body receives financial aid.

After receiving a letter of consent to perform research at the school, snowball sampling was utilized by working with the faculty leaders from the school to identify additional faculty at the institution who were engaged in the global studies program. These participants not only included the director of the program, but other administrators in the kindergarten through eighth

grade levels, current or former membership on the institution's global studies diploma board, and current or former involvement in teaching global studies courses. Seven faculty and/or staff members were invited by e-mail to participate in this study, and each of the seven agreed to participate. All the participants were current members of the institution's global studies program.

Data Collection

Participant Interviews

After consenting to participate in the study, each participant completed an initial, in-depth, semi-structured interview lasting approximately 60 minutes. The interviews took place over Zoom video conferencing due to distance and health and safety protocols of the time. Participants were each assigned a pseudonym to protect their identity and were asked to agree to have their interviews audio recorded and transcribed. To ensure continuity and decrease variation, all questions were prepared in advance, and during each interview, the questions were asked in a relatively uniform order and manner (Appendix A). However, the interview protocols were designed as a starting point to the conversation and in many cases, additional follow-up questions were asked to further facilitate data collection. The same, principal researcher conducted each interview.

Protection of Human Subjects

Although this particular research project was determined to have little to no risk to participants, the following measures ensured confidentiality and anonymity. Participants were identified only through pseudonyms and identification of sensitive demographic and personal information in the interviews, such as a person's name or title, location, school, or district name, were removed. To minimize security risks associated with teleconference tools, all interviews were conducted in private meetings, utilizing a Personal Meeting ID. In addition, participants

were required to use a password to prevent unauthorized access to the videoconferencing platform. Prior to interviewing, participants all signed a consent form, then verbally consented to the interviews while being recorded (see Appendix B). Upon completion of the project, the recordings were deleted. See Appendix C for Institutional Review Board approval.

Document Review

In addition to qualitative interviewing, there was a thorough review of documents from the school. Public information from the school website, including the curriculum guide for each division were analyzed. Additionally, published information about the global studies program, including blogs from the travel program, were analyzed. As available, participants also provided more documentation such as specific curriculum resources, lesson plans and google slides, syllabi and other communication documents related to the global studies program. Requirements for receiving a global studies diploma as well as global components to a standard diploma were also reviewed. All documents were analyzed using the same coding themes as the interviews.

Analysis

Following the interviews, transcriptions were downloaded from the Zoom platform and processed for clarity. Filler words, incorrect punctuation and erroneous terms were edited and corrected by listening to the interview again while reading the transcription.

As suggested by Creswell and Creswell (2018) the qualitative data in this study was analyzed in three broad stages. First, the data were prepared and organized into transcripts for analysis. Next, codes were assigned to the data upon thorough reading and organized into themes. Finally, the data were interpreted as represented in Chapter 5. Based on the literature reviewed, the researcher examined beginning themes such as frameworks and learning objectives, curriculum requirements, international travel, professional development, and

assessment throughout the coding in addition to any other themes that emerged throughout the coding and interview process.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are important in research as it ensures that the research was conducted in such a way that the results are trustworthy, reliable and ethical (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Reliability and validity ensure a study in which the results are accurate and credible. In addition to identifying my positionality, I offer multiple strategies for promoting validity within the study: triangulation, member checks, an audit trail, and rich, thick description.

Triangulation is a strategy to build a coherent justification for themes using multiple sources of data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). As themes recur in the different sources, a case is built that data is authentic and valid. In this study, teacher and administrator interviews were used as the primary data source, supported by the addition of school website information, evaluation reports, and curriculum documents as secondary sources. The data mined from these additional sources support the primary data analysis and findings. In addition to triangulation, as themes and findings were emerging throughout the research, I performed “member checks” or “respondent validation” where I solicited feedback from participants to “rule out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what the participants said or did” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 246). Finally, “peer debriefing” assisted in ensuring that the research was valid and “resonated with people other than the researcher” (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 201).

Reliability in qualitative research allows readers to be sure that the researcher’s approach and interpretation is consistent across data sources (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 199). The use of a semi-structured interview guide as well as consistent application of the codes that were

created, and in those that emerged, assists in showing reliability. In addition, the researcher positionality mentioned previously was a constant point of reference in the researcher memo.

Limitations

To ensure that future studies may replicate or continue similar research, limitations to this study must also be acknowledged (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Through the case study design, saturation of participants in the global studies program was largely possible, but other limitations were present. These limitations were in large part due to the global pandemic and lack of ability to observe the physical environment of the school being studied.

The global COVID-19 pandemic affected this study in multiple ways. The pandemic required the completion of interviews from remote locations rather than in person. Additionally, due to health and safety restrictions due to the pandemic, on-site observation of the research site was not permitted until late in the study. Due to the inability to visit the school site earlier, many interactions with the school personnel took longer than expected due to lag time in email response. Had a site visit been possible at the beginning of the study, many of the interviews and recruiting could have been done in person, shortening some of the research timeline.

Finally, the interview process itself may have created a biased response as participants may have tailored answers to what they thought the interviewer wanted to hear (Boyce & Neil, 2006). After explaining my research, participants may have unintentionally altered their responses during the interviews, potentially telling me what they thought I wanted to hear, or what would make their program sound better. While actively trying to reflect and mitigate bias it is also possible that I, as the researcher, might have unconsciously led the interview towards a biased result through my questioning (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

Introduction

Global education is expanding in both public and private K-12 settings. In order to discover best practices that are sustainable in multiple settings, this research sought to discover the aspects of a global education program in a fully developed and resourced environment via a case study. Discussion of results will be framed in terms of answering the research questions:

1. How is the global studies program at this school organized?
2. What curriculum and experiences are necessary for this global studies program?
3. How is this program implemented and assessed?

Interview data, combined with document review data, will be discussed in relation to each of the research questions in order to maintain the confidentiality of each participant.

Organization of the Global Citizenship Education Program

Interviews and documentation of the study school revealed programs and curriculum organized with intentional global focus. Beginning with the school's stated mission and strategic goals, the school implements a program of studies and experiences with intentional global focus. This focus is achieved through helping students progress through an integrated curriculum, culminating with the global studies diploma track and travel study experiences in Upper School. According to the school, this focus on global education "enables students to expand their understanding of what it means to be citizens not only of the school community but of an interdependent world." In addition to student travel, the school places great importance on the travel experiences of its faculty, reporting that many travel globally for professional development. Recent faculty trips have included: Beijing, Argentina, Morocco, Spain, India, China, Japan, and Finland.

While the school mission is known and referred to often in relation to global education, the school has not solidified one common definition of global education. However, as found during this research, there does seem to be agreement or common approaches in the school's global education. School personnel interviews as well as curricular documentation highlight the following as working definitions, skills, and requirements for global education:

- Prepares students to be informed, involved and ethical citizens in a global society.
- Learners experience perspectives of other people and learn how culture, new technologies, and standards of living impact viewpoints.
- Recognizes and respects diversity and the interconnected nature of society today. Learning about our place in the world as well as our responsibility and impact.
- Builds awareness of how history has shaped the present.
- Builds skills such as critical thinking, empathy, curiosity, communication, taking meaningful action to affect change, and collaboration.
- Being open to, and taking part in, experiences beyond the local or national through travel and world language instruction.

In addition to the above points, school documentation referenced the Asia Society (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2018) competency standards as well as standards and skills from World Savvy.com as resources.

Though the school does not claim to adhere to any specific framework or existing definition of global competence, there nevertheless appears to be a well-organized and defined program. Through many years and iterations, the school and its faculty seem to have found a way to organize the program in a way that works for them, as well as echoes the frameworks and standards set forth by the global organizations noted in earlier chapters.

Global Education Curriculum and Experiences

Global Studies Diploma Program

In addition to a whole school global focus, the Upper School also has a specific diploma program in global studies. After their freshman or sophomore year, students may choose to apply for the global studies diploma program. As one participant shared, this application “requires students to be reflective and thoughtful in addition to capturing where they are at the time.” It requires that students do some work to present themselves to the diploma board and show their sincere interest as well as ability to meet the requirements of the program through a plan of study. The global studies diploma board consists of the Director of Global Studies, the Assistant Head of School for Academic Affairs, and members or department chairs of the science, world languages, and humanities departments. Each year this board reviews applications and the status of current students. They also serve as advisors to global studies students, chaperone study trips and offer different global education programs throughout the year. Board functions are in addition to teaching and administrative roles.

The Global Studies Diploma Program typically has close to fifteen students participating. Once accepted into the program, students must choose a concentration for their studies. Concentrations include: the sciences, world languages, political science and culture, or economics. Within these concentrations, students then design their individual course of study based on their own interests and passions. The participants interviewed thought this flexibility for students is part of what makes the program successful. One participant noted, “every single student gets something different out of the program. They're able to tailor it to them, to their own passions.”

To earn the global studies diploma, students must maintain a grade of B or higher in each course and an overall GPA of 3 or higher. Each global studies diploma student must take the following courses:

- World History 1 & 2
- Geographic Information Science
- Global Social Justice OR Global Diplomacy
- Four years in one world language
- 2-3 credits in their concentration.

If a student has a concentration in world languages, they have a requirement of taking an additional three years of a world language. This often means they are taking two languages at a time.

In addition to the above courses, global studies diploma students are also required to complete 650 credit points for other activities outside of school. These credit points are broken up into 200 points in “global action” which consists of travel or service learning with a global focus, 200 points of “cultural engagement,” 200 points of student choice which consists of additional coursework or leading an assembly, and 50 points for the senior reflection paper and presentation. The points for each activity vary and are determined and approved by the Director and the global studies diploma board. In order to gain the credit for these experiences, students must submit an artifact as proof of participation and meet with the Director of Global Studies or their advisor to discuss and reflect on the experience. A Global Studies Diploma with Distinction is earned when a student earns 800 credit points, maintains a B+ or higher or has above a 4 in all AP coursework, has proof of consistent leadership in the program and is approved by the board.

Global Travel

The school has two exchange programs in the Upper School each year. First, as part of the STEAM and Global Studies diploma track there is a Global Entrepreneur program where students travel to China for ten days. Second, there is an exchange program with the Northlands International School in Argentina which takes place for three weeks over the summer. For the exchange in Argentina, students stay with a host family and the only cost associated is the travel cost to and from Argentina along with incidental costs while in country. Students must apply and be selected for both of these programs. The participant running the exchange in Argentina described it as “an opportunity for kids to get involved outside the classroom and really get all of their skills involved in a full immersion program exchange with a school outside the United States.”

The aspect of the global focus in the Upper School that is seen by many of the participants as the most successful piece of their global program is their bi-yearly travel program, with one participant noting “it has always been I think our shining star. It's just, like, such a cool thing that we have done for years”. Echoing what was found in the previous literature, the global travel program was the only aspect of global education at the school for several years. Additional curriculum and the diploma program were created to expand global citizenship years after the travel program was established. For the travel program, every other year, all students in the Upper School are required to travel; mostly internationally as well as a few domestic options. Each of these years, teachers and the Director of Global Studies propose ten to eleven trips and survey the students to gather interest. After interest is gathered, seven to eight trips are chosen to move forward and every student in the Upper School is assigned to a trip after giving their top three choices. The student assignments are given in late fall with the travel taking place the week

before spring break. These trips are an additional cost for the students' families, however those students already on scholarship to the school receive the same amount of scholarship for the trips. There are an average of fifteen to twenty students on each trip and there is at least one service trip per year. Most recently, themes of the trips fell into the following four categories: service learning, language immersion, cultural awareness, and curriculum connections. In each trip description for students to choose from there is an overview of the trip as well as how it connects to the curriculum and graduation requirements. For each trip, there is one teacher or head chaperone who proposes and plans the itinerary with the help of a travel company. Working with agencies that are flexible, some teachers will create their own trip based on curricular goals while others mostly follow an itinerary already created by the travel companies. Several participants noted their involvement in this travel program, having designed and led several trips of their own. As one participant noted, some leaders are more particular about their trips while others "work within a framework and then add in things we really want to see."

As suggested in current research on best practices for study abroad, the school works intentionally with students before, during and after these trips. After students are assigned, each group meets weekly during second semester to prepare for their travel. According to the participants, these meetings not only help students prepare for the practical aspects of the trips, but also learn more about where they are going and the culture they are entering into. The groups discuss their goals for the trip and get to know each other more during these meetings as well. After the trips are complete, the groups may come together once or twice, though several participants reported this has varied over the years. There generally is a writing assignment during or after the trip to help students process and reflect on their experiences.

As noted above, the travel program in Upper School is a hallmark of the school and widely regarded as one of the major strengths of the program. One participant pointed out their belief that this program, while not the only piece of global education at the school, gives “great practical experience for living in the world beyond just going down the street.” As another participant said, “while they are American travelers in another place, the place has an impact.”

K-12 Global Curriculum

In addition to the diploma track, there is evidence of global curriculum throughout the K-12 experience. Throughout the interviews with faculty at different grade levels as well as the document review, there were many examples of global components in the curriculum. These are summarized below.

Lower School

In the Lower School, which encompasses grades Pre-K through five, an interdisciplinary approach is emphasized in the curriculum and instruction. This approach, with a global focus, helps to “expand understanding of what it means to be a citizen not only of school and community, but also an interdependent world.” Each grade studies different parts of the world throughout the year. This focus is the foundation for most, if not all, of the classes the students participate in from the core content areas, to special classes such as art, music and physical education. The goal of this curriculum is to develop cultural awareness and understanding, present different perspectives and spark imagination, empathy and curiosity about the greater world they inhabit. An example of this integrated curriculum, as described by one participant is:

In the fourth grade classroom they study Asia from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. They start out talking about ancient China and the Silk Road and the relevance of the Silk Road; what it did and what it brought to other parts of the world outside of

China. Then, after winter break, they have a country focus looking at the countries of India and Japan. They end the year with Asian immigration to the United States. [During the country study] they are immersing themselves in those countries. They are learning about not only the history, the ancient civilizations of those countries, their traditions, their culture, the modern day life about what kids and families do but they are also learning about alternative energy sources in India and Japan because they're studying electricity in science. They may take something like the Taj Mahal and study some of the geometric patterns within that. They might look at some of the art forms that are there, like mosaic tile work and make their own mosaic tiles on a 3D printer. They may actually make a STEAM village so while they are studying electricity and learning about perimeter and area they actually make a village. We try to integrate that curriculum so that the students are really understanding what they are learning and they are getting hands on, authentic, experiences around what it means to be a student in India, or Japan. We have various members of our faculty and family population that are either Indian or Japanese so we invite them in to share their traditions and whatever they want to share with the students as well.

According to the Lower School Curriculum Guide, “understanding and appreciation of cultures and communities around the globe broadens and deepens with each unit of study”. Based on the curriculum guide and participant interviews, the following units of study take place each year:

- Kindergarten: The central question for kindergarten is, “what can I learn from the world around me how to live well with others?” Social Studies “launches students on a journey of becoming global citizens” through an exploration of maps, highlighting personal connections. Throughout the year, students study a different

continent each month, incorporating environmental issues and endangered animals. There is also an opportunity during these units to focus on student connections to different places with family visits and shares. These explorations allow students to “begin to develop their understanding of identity, diversity, community, social activism, early globalization and interdependence.”

- Grade 1: The central question that first grade focuses on throughout their Social Studies units is, “what is courage?” Through a study of North America, first grade takes an anti-bias, anti-racist approach to learn about courageous individuals who demonstrated perseverance and the pursuit of a just, equitable world.
- Grade 2: “How does the environment around us influence our perspective” is the central question shaping the study in second grade. After learning about their own state history, there is a focus on the study of Brazil and the Amazon with studies of the culture, peoples, history and geography of the country.
- Grade 3: Third grade focuses on the question, “how do geography, climate and natural resources affect the way people live and thrive?” through a study of African geography. Third grade spends the entire school year studying Africa in Social Studies with a focus on how geography and climate dictate how people and animals live. In addition to the study of Africa, third grade students also have an introduction to Art History which explores the role of the arts in community and society.
- Grade 4: Fourth grade studies Asia for the entire school year with central questions of, “What is identity? What is culture?” Through exploration of Ancient China and the Silk Road, students are able to learn Asian geography, the

environment and modern cultural practices and influences. Each student is also given an individual country study which they present to the rest of the class each year. In addition, there is a focus on Asian immigration to the United States, studying the cultural and social contributions of all immigrants to America with a special focus on the Asian-American experience.

- Grade 5: “What is strength of character?” This central question in fifth grade guides students as they study the influence of the Renaissance in Europe. Fifth grade also learns about Colonial America and the American Revolution. The goal is to help students understand the perspectives and experiences of the many people who composed and built early America and its impact on today’s world.
- Grades 4 and 5 Science: Over a two-year period, fourth and fifth grade students participate in an environmental ColLab during their science classes. In this inquiry-based class, students study the range of environmental concerns and problems that face the global community and work to find solutions. Solar energy, wind energy, climate change, gardening, composting, water usage, animal biomimicry, and water filtration are some of the topics covered in this two-year study. With each topic, students typically take part in a two-week, hands on experience that bring the current environmental concerns to life.

According to interviews, world language instruction supports global education.

Beginning in Pre-K, students at the school begin to learn to speak French. Each year students work on their oral language skills using music and the *Story in Action* program which starts in first grade. Starting in third grade, students learn to read in French through learning lines of the annual French Plays. In fourth grade, students take part in a mock citizenship exam in French.

In addition to integrated curriculum in each grade, the school appointed one of their kindergarten teachers as the new Lower School Global Education Coordinator. This person works to create additional global education in the kindergarten through fifth grades with the belief in “the importance of opening young children up to the greater world more than just their own at an early age. I mean, in my opinion, if we start all of this super young they're just going to live it. It's not going to need to be like retaught, as it is for many adults currently.” The Lower School utilized assembly time several times throughout the year, focusing on three different UN Sustainable Development Goals; Life on Land, Life Below Water and Climate Action. For each goal, the Lower School Global Education Coordinator created a presentation to be shared during the school assembly along with preparation lessons and follow up activities for each grade. Two books were also used as anchors for these conversations: *Old Enough to Save the Planet* (Kirby, 2021) and *How to Make a Better World* (Swift, 2020). Through these conversations, students explored what type of activist they are; animal rights activist, community activist, human rights activist, or environmental activist. Using this knowledge, students were able to choose activities and projects that related to the change they wanted to see related to each goal. In addition to the integrated topics of study and assembly presentations, the school partnered with several organizations to demonstrate ways that kids can help enact change. According to reports and school documentation, students participated in the following service learning connected to the global sustainable development goals:

- Activism for Nature- Students created a poster/art piece of a tree to show nature positivity which were uploaded and shared at the World Biodiversity Forum.
- Partner with Students Rebuild – Students helped raise money for causes related to their goals.

- Waste reduction day- Students worked to produce the least amount of trash by class.
- Earth Hour- All classes turned the lights and electronics off for an entire hour of the school day.
- Community Clean Up- Students walked and cleaned up areas of the community.

With assistance from the Curriculum Coordinator and the Global Education Coordinator, each grade also investigated ways each goal could be applied to their country or continent of study throughout the year.

Middle School

Middle school continues the globally conscious curriculum through literature and identity exploration in addition to specific units of study. According to the middle school faculty and administrator participants, middle school kids “leave middle school with an understanding of their own identity and place in the larger world with understanding and respect for others.” Specifically, students in sixth grade complete a world language rotation in which they try three languages: mandarin, French, and Spanish. After sixth grade, students select one language to continue with in later grades. Additionally, in grade six humanities, students study the ancient civilizations of China, Africa, Egypt, and Mesopotamia as well as the origins of the major world religions. As they study each civilization, parallel themes across the different civilizations are considered in addition to asking students to consider how they influenced modern society.

In seventh grade, while the humanities curriculum is largely focused on the United States, including United States Civics, government and constitution, there is a stated and intentional inclusion of curriculum to help students “consider multiple perspectives and voices left out of traditional narratives.” In reading additional texts such as *American Born Chinese* (Yang, 2006),

Brown Girl Dreaming (Woodson, 2014), and *Inside Out and Back Again* (Lai, 2011), students “seek to understand how the world they live in has been, and continues to be, shaped.” Seventh grade students also travel to Washington D.C each year.

In grade eight humanities, the focus centers around identity, othering, leadership, responsibility, and power dynamics. Students “look critically” at leadership styles in other countries while studying the Holocaust, Cultural Revolution, and India’s Freedom Movement. Through these studies, students examine how leaders obtained, abused and lost power in these locations. In eighth grade life skills there is also a focus on ethical decision making which ties into the study of leadership.

Throughout the school literature as well as interviews, many different aspects of global education appeared to be woven throughout the school’s curriculum. The curriculum guide referred to global topics throughout the courses offered at each level, even in classes one might not expect. Guides for science courses, economics, art and math courses all refer to helping students develop a deeper understanding of their global impact, how other countries or international events shaped our country, or studying cultural aspects from another location around the world. For example, one of the participants with experience in the science department shared, “the course is threaded through the underlying science first and then we move to the impact on the planet. Also woven in, we spend a lot of time looking at laws and treaties, asking ‘Do they work?’”.

Additional Student Experiences

Outside of the given curriculum, the school offered many other global experiences and programs for students. Middle School activity schedules included culture clubs, cultural events nights, and community service days throughout the school year. In the Upper School, affinity

groups are “meant to give participants the tools to be meaningful contributors to school and the larger world around them”. Additionally, the Upper School had a Model United Nations (UN) club and a partnership with Women Leaders of Tomorrow in which students virtually tutored girls from Afghanistan in English.

While challenges related to the pandemic are discussed in a later section, there were also some benefits discovered for students. Increased virtual programming was necessary over the last few years due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This allowed students to connect with additional global groups through partnerships with universities and online organizations. One such organization was the Shared Studios Portal which was on site for a pilot program at the school in January of 2020. Shared Studios is an organization whose mission is to “forge meaningful human connections between people separated by distance and difference” (Shared Studios, 2022). Though a longer program was not possible due to the Covid-19 shut down, the school is planning on bring back the Shared Studio in the near future. During this program a portable, inflatable cube with a full-body projection screen is set up allowing students to “engage with people from across the country or around the world on topics such as arts and culture, current events, language, science and technology, research topics, world history, and more.”

As research suggests, the school showed intentional and integrated global education throughout each grade level. Rather than waiting until the high school grades, the school starts its global focus with its youngest students through similar content and themes as suggested by UNESCO (2015), Oxfam (2015) and the Asia Society (2018). Additionally, the school places importance on world language learning, starting instruction in French in the elementary grades with the ability to expand, possibly learning more than one world language by graduation. As noted previously, world language learning is not mentioned specifically in the existing

frameworks, but is seen by many as a necessary component to building intercultural awareness and perspective taking. One thing to note is the inclusion of global content across the curriculum in Upper School, even for those not participating in the global studies diploma track. This practice is aimed at helping to ensure that all of the school's graduates have some global competence and sense of global citizenship.

Participant Approaches to Global Citizenship Education

As noted in the literature review, research on global citizenship education is often implemented differently based on teacher philosophy and preparation. Additionally, the location of the school and local views on global education could play a role in how the curriculum is shaped. Several participants noted that the school's location on the East Coast of the United States enabled the school, and global citizenship education, to be more "progressive" in their approach. In the interviews with the participants, there was evidence that the school takes a more critical, social-justice approach to global citizenship education. One participant spoke to this approach in giving an example about how the Lower School teachers approach the third grade study of Africa.

Third grade is spending a whole year studying Africa, and so they started to really look at how to teach Africa in a way that was globally minded without initiating or continuing stereotypes or biases that students may come in with about Africa. We talked a lot about the geography, about the animals, and about how the environment and geography and climate can dictate how people live. Going through it from that lens has helped the students really understand why people live all over the world, why houses are built a certain way, or why certain foods are eaten more predominantly in some areas than in other areas.

In the Middle and Upper Schools, participants spoke of the ways in which they try to show students multiple perspectives without influencing them with personal opinions. A teacher and global studies diploma board member explained,

It can be really easy to just throw stuff out there and say ‘this is what I think’ or, ‘you should think this way because this is crazy otherwise’. I’m really big on thinking routines; focusing on what kind of thinking a student uses to get to the solution of a problem and talking about that within the class. I try to present different perspectives and not really point students in a direction. I also really focus on the theoretical perspectives and I find different voices [for class readings and assignments]. Perspective really helps, it helps keep me from providing opinion, although they’re always after me for my opinion on things.

In middle school, another participant noted,

Especially when you look at the humanities in the literature that we're reading we're looking to have varied perspectives, we're looking to have all of our students reflected and literature. And we're looking to ensure that those perspectives aren't coming necessarily from a damaged centered narrative.

While career and college preparation are stated goals of the overall program, individual teacher approaches and pedagogies continue to impact the topics, perspectives and studies of the students. With this critical approach and belief in the overlap between global citizenship education and diversity, equity and justice work, the school appears to be attempting to combine what research has previously shown to be conflicting approaches.

Assessment of the Global Citizenship Education Program

It is noteworthy that the case study school lacked a solidified definition of global education. Assessment of program success therefore could also be a challenge. However, there were formative assessments intertwined in the K-12 program. Lower School assessments on units of study included projects, portfolios and exhibitions which, according to the school, “allow teachers to evaluate how students integrate the skills they’ve learned.” In the Upper School, global competence was evaluated mostly for students who had completed the global studies diploma program through interviews with the global studies director at the end of the program, the required reflection paper, and presentation to the entire Upper School student body. In addition to these assessments, the global studies diploma board also examined what students choose to do after graduation and in college to assess the success of the program in creating global citizens.

Challenges

Overall, participants and documents were very positive about the global education program, particularly in the Upper School. Specific to the global studies diploma track, mentioned by several participants, two challenges were cited. There was a slight competition with other diploma programs in the Upper School and some trouble recruiting students to join the program. Participants believed that this was exacerbated over the last few years due to the creation of a new STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Math) diploma program. In addition, the possibility was mentioned of students feeling like they do not have enough time for the diploma program given other school and extracurricular requirements.

The main challenge noted throughout the data was related to limited time to accomplish certain things. Several participants recognized a lack of time to provide meaningful and authentic

experiences for students within the given school schedule. Limited lunch times to meet with the global studies diploma program students was given as an example. As it currently stands, one of the only times that all the global studies program students met as a whole group was during their lunch period. This meeting schedule provided its own challenges as it is a short amount of time with students arriving at different times after getting their lunch. Another challenge related to time that several participants mentioned was limited time to meet and collaborate with other faculty members or organizations. Participant interviews highlighted limited time for work on outreach projects, research on new content and best practices, and collaboration across divisions.

Due to the context in which this research was taking place, perhaps the biggest challenge noted was the Covid-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic, a lot of the previous programming and opportunities given to students were eliminated or put on hold for several years. For example, the travel program in the Upper School was not implemented during the pandemic. In the year of the study, there were no off-campus field trips at any level and no speakers were allowed to enter the school. These limitations, while necessary to protect the health of the community, hindered some of the important experiences related to global education. In addition, the pandemic increased separation between divisions so that most participants noted a disconnect in knowledge and curricular consistency across divisions. While building a global mindset is a clear part of the school's mission, most participants were not aware of specific things the other divisions were doing to achieve this goal. Many participants noted the desire to meet and collaborate across all divisions to look at the global education scope and sequence to create more continuity between Lower, Middle and Upper School curriculum.

Specific to the Lower School, there is an additional challenge in finding global education content and experiences for the elementary level student. While there are several organizations

that assist with connecting students around the world, most of these are designed for older students. The Lower School Global Studies Coordinator was actively searching for ways to connect young students to other young students around the world. Finding an effective global curriculum that is appropriate for younger students was also a challenge.

Conclusion

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, this research sought to answer the following questions:

1. How is the global studies program at this school organized?
2. What curriculum and experiences are necessary for this global studies program?
3. How is this program implemented and assessed?

The East-Coast school that was the focus of this case study has an organized, long-standing global education program. Evidence of this program is found throughout the different grade levels in the school. The most specific program definition and curriculum were in the high school grade levels, culminating in a Global Studies Diploma for certain students. Requirements for students to earn the diploma were perhaps the most specified aspect of the global citizenship education program overall. However, less definition and evidence were available when it came to assessment, student outcomes, and consensus on overall efficacy of the program.

Discussion and recommendations for this research and future research will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the qualitative study of one global citizenship education program. Research explored qualitatively how program organization, necessary curriculum and experiences, implementation, success indicators. In addition to data presented in the previous chapter; this chapter will focus on overall conclusions. Discussion will emphasize implications for K-12 schools and the education profession at large. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

Review of Study

Global education, or internationalization of education, has been present in post-secondary education institutions for decades. However, its inclusion in primary and secondary institutions is still growing. While these institutions recognize the importance of global education, research is still needed to discover and share best-practices and curriculum for grades K-12. This research used a case study design to better understand how one K-12, independent, school designed, implemented and assessed a long-standing global studies program. Using the following research questions, qualitative interviews and document reviews were completed to build a rich case description:

1. How is the global studies program at this school organized?
2. What curriculum and experiences are necessary for this global studies program?
3. How is this program implemented and assessed?

Summary of Major Findings

Major findings of the case study discussed in the previous chapter included information organized around the research questions and emergent themes in the data. These findings, while

in depth for the high school age students, echo the need for more research, practice, and preparation for younger students. Evidence about curriculum design and experience was well developed in school documents, which corresponded well with themes in interviews of program participants. For example, it was clear from curriculum documents and teacher interviews that students begin second language instruction in primary grades and that a program of global language instruction continued through high school. Requirements for a global studies diploma program were also clear.

However, there were critical areas of program description that appeared lacking or unclear. The study school, for example, lacked a well-articulated definition of global studies/global education though teachers and staff understood program components well. Little evidence was found regarding specific teacher education and preparation for teaching and supporting the global education program. Finally, except for global studies diploma requirements, there were no stated student outcomes or summative assessments specified for program implementation at each grade level.

Implications for K-12 Education

Throughout the available research prior to this study, several themes emerged regarding global education. While many resources exist to assist with global studies endeavors in schools, states and individual schools are often left to define program expectations and navigate these resources independently. This leads to a wide variety of curriculum and experiences of students in programs intended to prepare them for citizenship in a global society.

Definition and clarity of program

As previously noted, a continued challenge of global education is the lack of common language and definition across educational settings. Even at the individual institution level this

challenge remained evident. In addition to not having a common language to guide work across grade levels, the lack of one definition at the school of study could be helping to contribute to the perceived lack of connection between divisions. While every participant mentioned global studies being a part of the school mission, each participant defined global education and their work toward that mission in a slightly unique way.

Reimers (2020) notes, “a systemic approach to global education has been lacking in much of what has been attempted to date” (p. 1). Recently, several organizations have attempted to assist in this area by providing additional recommendations and processes for K-12 schools hoping to implement a more comprehensive global citizenship education program. Many of these frameworks use existing definitions and standards from previously noted organizations such as UNESCO and Asia Society, with additional suggestions for school and program leaders. Two of the most comprehensive documents found to date are the following:

- *Globally Competent Educational Leadership: A Framework for Leading Schools in a Diverse, Interconnected World* by Tichnor-Wagner and Manise through ASCD and the Longview Foundation (2019).
- *Educating Students to Improve the World* by Reimers (2020).

These frameworks recognize that schools must “balance offering opportunity to students who are interested in global education with ensuring all students acquire a minimum baseline of knowledge” (Reimers, 2020, p. 81). According to these frameworks, there are several recommended steps that schools should take to set up and maintain a comprehensive global citizenship education program. Among these steps are the following:

- Establish a leadership team which will be responsible for setting the vision and mission, implementing and assessing the global citizenship education strategy.

- Develop a long-term, shared, vision and mission statement allowing all stakeholders to assist in defining and incorporating global education into their own practice and lives.
- Identify existing practices, curriculum, and policies that support global competence through a curriculum audit to determine where to focus capacity-building efforts.
- Design a framework that reflects the current and ideological vision of global education at the school, then work to align current standards, curriculum, and assessments with global competence outcomes.
- Communicate vision, framework, and action steps to the larger community.
- Support staff and students in developing and implementing curriculum and experiences which focus on global topics.
- Develop and use global competence assessments based on the framework and standards created by the leadership team.

One additional framework worth mentioning is *Big Picture Thinking* by Boix Mansilla and Schleicher (2022). This framework uses the results of the PISA Student Assessment of Global Competence to make suggestions to educators wishing to increase global competence in students. While the other frameworks noted here focus on whole-school design, Boix Mansilla and Schleicher (2022) focus on the learning sought and the ways in which to teach global citizenship at a more individual educator level. However, several of their recommendations echo those of the other frameworks mentioned above.

All of these frameworks highlight the importance of integrating global citizenship education throughout the school's curriculum, not just in the easy or low-hanging areas such as social studies or globally specific courses (i.e., international relations, world languages etc.). As Nikolitsa-Winter, Mauch, and Maalouf (2019) point out, "GCED [Global Citizenship Education]

does not necessarily constitute a separate subject or pedagogical method. Rather, GCED represents a framing paradigm that accommodates elements from a number of other fields” (p. 19). This allows students to better understand the authentic connection between their learning, their world, and their ability to act to improve it (Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022; Reimers, 2020; Tichnor-Wagner & Manise, 2019). Additionally, each of these frameworks highlights the importance of making learning and curriculum relevant to students. Boix Mansilla and Schleicher (2022) point to this relevance through creating deep learning and “zooming into an aspect of an issue” or finding “opportunities to connect elements of the curriculum to the world around them [teachers] and to emerging topics of interest to their students” regardless of content area (p. 58).

While there are still differences in how these publications define and work toward global citizenship, these documents do provide more definition and clarity when attempting to solidify a whole-school approach to global citizenship education. In relation to this research, the school studied appeared to have a solidified understanding of the importance of global citizenship education across grade levels. This emphasis was well communicated across stakeholder groups. However, despite being a long-standing program that reports much success, a more defined framework, standards, and assessment outcomes for global competence could assist the school in confirmation of success in global citizenship. Outcomes should also extend beyond the number of students graduating with a global studies diploma.

World Language Instruction

As noted in the literature review, world language instruction is not a graduation requirement in most states despite being a requirement for admission into most post-secondary institutions. Additionally, though not a state requirement, many individual schools in the United

States choose to make taking two courses in world language a high school graduation requirement. Further evidence of the importance of world language instruction is referenced in recent global competence frameworks and curriculum (ATFL, 2015; Longview Foundation, 2008; Reimers, 2016). In the study school, world language instruction begins in the elementary ages with the French language. Instruction then expands in middle and high school ages so that students may learn more than two world languages by graduation if desired. More definition around this content area would be beneficial both for the study school and schools nationwide.

International Experiences

Study abroad and international experiences still play a significant role in global education, especially at the post-secondary level. While global competence may be achieved without international travel, these experiences are thought to aid in building student global competence through intercultural learning, communication across difference and empathy building (Lee & Negrelli, 2018; Newstreet & Rackard, 2018). The belief in travel's ability to be life-changing has both encouraged secondary educational institutions to offer travel studies and has sparked a whole sector of travel companies serving secondary schools and colleges. K-12 schools continue to increase travel programming where possible.

The travel experiences at the case study school were frequently referenced as successful experiences in building global citizenship. An important aspect of the study school's travel program is the school's ability to offer scholarships to students already on financial aid. However, this ability for students to travel as part of their schooling at the high school level, as well as post-secondary, is often only available to students who can afford it. Therefore, the travel component of the study school's global education program will be increasingly difficult to replicate, specifically in many public schools in the United States. With the cost of travel

continuing to increase, student travel is not often possible without significant funding and willingness among all school stakeholders.

While travel was not possible during the Covid-19 pandemic, international experiences, and communication were still prioritized to build intercultural awareness and communication. The pandemic illustrated the ability for all ages to continue to connect worldwide using technology. The study school was able to take part in many of these opportunities through partnerships with local universities and online organizations. Using the study school as an example, it is promising for K-12 schools to seek out and foster global partnerships and global connections, even when not in person. Perhaps practices in connections through technology are one of the most replicable practices for other institutions, while keeping in mind the possible inequity surrounding access and affordability for these services worldwide.

Implications for the Education Profession

If global citizenship education programs are to thrive, these programs will need support of trained educators, effective pre-service training, clear expectations of outcomes, and research on effective pedagogical approaches.

Teacher preparation and disposition

Often, with lack of a stated definition and standards for the program, or framework to anchor to, the practice of global education is left up to interpretation by individual teachers. As discussed previously, this open interpretation often leads to vastly different practices and outcomes of global education (Goren & Yemini, 2017; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Pais & Costa, 2016; Pashby et al., 2020). Despite many calls for changes to teacher education programs, research still points to a lack of global citizenship education in teacher preparation programs

(Goodwin, 2019; Kopish, 2017; Longview Foundation, 2008; Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022; Myers & Rivero, 2020; Siczek & Engell, 2019).

As noted in the literature review, internationalization has been widespread in many institutes of higher education. However, “teacher training programs are often among the least internationalized programs on American college and university campuses” (as cited in Longview Foundation, 2008). This lack of internationalization may be due to restrictive course requirements which lack global perspectives, teacher educators who are not globally competent themselves, lack of opportunity to travel or gain intercultural experiences, and increasing standardization of teacher preparation curriculum (Goodwin, 2020; Kopish, 2017; Longview Foundation, 2008; Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022). With these limitations in mind, several authors have published research and recommendations for increasing internationalization and global citizenship education in teacher preparation programs. These approaches focus on specific experiences, pedagogies, and content to assist teacher candidates in building their own global competence, including practical tools, curriculum, and pedagogical approaches for teachers to use. These tools are needed for both current teachers who lacked global citizenship education in their training programs and for educators currently teaching in training programs. Among the most thorough of these publications is *Big Picture Thinking: How to Educate the Whole Person for an Interconnected World* (Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022) and *Empowering Global Citizens: A World Course* (Reimers et al., 2016). Boix Mansilla and Schleicher (2022) focus on principles and practices for educators drawn from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Project Zero. These “characteristics of learning” include: “learning that is *whole, relevant, deep, social, long-lasting, and ‘in the world’*” (as cited in Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022, p. 26).

Through case study examples and pedagogical recommendations, the authors give teachers practical suggestions for increasing global competence in students.

In another approach, Reimers (2016) published an entire curriculum with specific topics, lessons and resources for each grade level starting in kindergarten. This resource follows Reimer's (2016), and others, assertion that "global education [must] encompass both distinct curricula and distinctive pedagogies" (p.liii). Using the twenty-first century-skills framework, Reimers et al. (2016), created the World Course which builds "intercultural competency, ethical orientation, knowledge and skills, and work and mind habits" (p.lvii). This curriculum "focuses not only on knowledge and ideas but also on developing the skills needed to put that knowledge to use and the attitudes necessary to inspire meaningful action in the pursuit of global stability and peace" (Reimers et al., 2016, lxi).

According to the participants in the case study, most felt that they did not receive specific global education, but felt it was a mindset they already possessed or education they pursued on their own, later in their career. While several participants noted school provided professional development through WorldSaavy.com and the Global Education Benchmarking Group, it was unclear how widespread or frequent this professional development occurred. Of note, one participant noted continued professional development for many faculty members through Primary Source (www.primarysource.org), which "formed the basis for much of the curriculum developed in the past two decades". However, few other participants noted this professional development as part of their own global education or curriculum preparation. Though not specific to the school being studied, this ad-hoc approach to adult global citizenship education could also contribute to the disconnect and lack of collaboration across divisions felt among participants. Additionally, without consistent education and school-wide definitions, it is difficult

to ensure each teacher is including global education effectively and in alignment with the school mission.

Assessment of Global Competence

Another area of critique found in the literature prior to the current study was lack of clear assessment for global citizenship. This was another challenge that the current study echoed. As with much of the conversation around global citizenship education, this is a circular discussion related to the lack of definition, concrete standards, or rubrics and other assessment tools for global education. Without a clear definition and framework to work from, assessments of global competence and citizenship will remain subjective and anecdotal. While the Asia Society relies on the PISA Assessment of Global Competence, this is only available to Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) schools (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2018). As other publications suggest, assessment for global competence must look different, much as global citizenship education itself should be different from traditional models. Many suggest assessments that include demonstration of student learning through formative and summative assessments that make student learning visible. These kinds of assessments may include journal entries, product creation, portfolios, and capstone projects (Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022; Reimers, 2016). Global education groups also call for educators to be more “deliberate about the particular aspects of global competence they seek to nurture and assess” (Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022, p. 67)

While participants at the case study school did not feel there were many specific assessments of global competence, many of the above examples of assessment and proof of learning were evident. In visiting the school, global education was visible throughout the school buildings through displayed student work as well as school documentation. The kindergarten

classroom was full of books, imagery and student work related to their study of South America and the Amazon Rainforest. Lower School Changemakers posted their goals and plans to enact changes related to the UN Sustainable Development Goals in the Lower School hallways. Evidence of the global focus was also present in the dining hall, with QR codes attached to student work and creation of geometric patterns related to their study of Islamic world in ninth grade history. Students graduating from the global studies diploma track do participate in a summative assessment through a reflection paper and presentation. While all of these are examples of student learning and assessment of global competence, the study school and others hoping to implement global programming, might benefit from more deliberate and concrete alignment to standards, outcome statements, and assessment tools such as holistic rubrics.

Approaches to Global Education

As noted in the literature review, there continue to be many conflicting approaches to global citizenship education at the school and individual classroom level (Andreotti, 2006; DiCicco Cozzolino, 2016; Dill, 2012; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Pashby, Costa, Stein & Andreotti, 2020; Spring, 2022; Xanthopoulos, 2005). Research and programming for global citizenship still struggle with the tension between the traditional global competitiveness approach and a social justice approach that includes envisioning a better world. As programs emerge, many attempt to include elements of both. While these conflicting approaches persist, in part due to the challenges mentioned above, more organizations and research are evident to try and combat the understanding that these approaches are mutually exclusive. The frameworks noted in this chapter all appear to attempt to combine these approaches in order to educate students for the world they are currently in as well as encourage them to create the world they want to see (Tichnor-Wagner & Manise, 2019; Reimers, 2020; Boix Mansilla & Schleicher, 2022). An

additional approach that these publications, schools, and individuals should consider is that of transformationalism (Shultz, 2007). According to Shultz (2007), transformationalism is a type of critical global education which views globalization “as more than a new form of imperialism or just a path to a single global market economy” instead seeking “to include and engage others based on their shared common humanity” working *with* others rather than competing against them (Shultz, 2007, p. 255). This allows students to “completely reimagine patterns of inclusion and exclusion and calls for the creation of new forms of engagement” (Witt, 2022). Combining this approach with the calls of Pashby et al. (2020) to ensure that ontological questions and approaches are being considered provide a clearer path forward for those schools hoping to enact a global citizenship program that changes the current neoliberal practices of globalization.

Throughout the participant interviews as well as document review, an integrated approach was evident in the study school. The school included traditional courses such as economics, American and World History, U.S. Government, and social studies in earlier grades. However, these seemed to be balanced with more critical global content. Even in traditional courses, global perspectives and critical analysis was noted in curriculum documents, asking students to see themselves as changemakers starting in kindergarten. While more specific assessments looking at this aspect of the global studies program were not evident, it was a common belief expressed by participants that students must have a realistic, socially just, view of the world outside of their local community.

Limitations

This study was conducted in a small, well-resourced environment purposefully. Therefore, the program components and organization may be difficult to replicate or generalize to other schools, specifically public schools. Independent schools, in general, have more

flexibility with curriculum. Funding sources and student demographics are also vastly different in independent schools versus public K-12 education. When considering global citizenship education and the replication of this program, funding as well availability of faculty and curriculum content could continue to be barriers.

This study was also specific to a college preparatory institution though global citizenship education is widely believed as valuable for all students, even those who do not attend college. The Asia Society has a new Career and Technical Education Toolkit for secondary educators that could assist with this endeavor (Asia Society, 2023, <https://asiasociety.org/education/global-cte-toolkit>). More research is needed in environments where students are not explicitly college-bound.

Another limitation could be researcher bias. Though the researcher used interview guides and reflection regularly, it is possible that the researcher's experience in another independent school created a bias when observing the study school. Assumptions or omissions of critical questioning could have affected the interview process or the site visit. To decrease this limitation, triangulation of data, respondent validation, and researcher reflection were conducted.

Recommendations for future research

As Pais and Costa (2016) assert, “a programme of global citizenship education designed by researchers is not the same as the concrete practice of global citizenship education in educational institutions” (p. 10). Though it may lack definition, global education in K-12 settings has widespread support among educational institutions. Educators may access many resources, from frameworks and rubrics to organizations offering global connections. Many well-respected organizations offer guidance for specific curriculum content. However, little research is available for sharing the effectiveness and reliability of available resources and content across different

school systems. Thus, more research is needed in the existing concrete practice of primary and secondary global citizenship education programs.

Most pressing is the need for additional research in the area of teacher preparation and pedagogy that supports global education across all educational settings. Given the vast differences in educational funding and resources at primary and secondary school levels, efforts to prepare teachers may offer the most widespread promise for increasing global citizenship education in K-12 schools. While organizations such as Harvard's Project Zero and the Longview Foundation are continuing to conduct research in this area, little has been published to date.

Conclusion

Global education, by this or other names, has been a topic of discussion and research for decades due to increasing globalization and internationalization. Starting with post-secondary education, internationalization of curriculum and experiences followed economic and neoliberal trends. Non-governmental organizations started creating suggested frameworks and content to work toward global competence, skills, and values to help students succeed in this increasingly interconnected world, and in some cases, change it (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; OECD, 2018; Oxfam, 2015; Reimers, 2016; UNESCO, 2015). However, as global education increased, researchers recognized that this education was practiced differently among schools and teachers, leading to many different outcomes- many reinforcing the neoliberal, competition-based, preparation for the work force. While this may be economically beneficial for some, many researchers noted the need for more critical and social-justice oriented approaches (Andreotti, 2012; Blackmore, 2011; Dill, 2012; Leduc, 2013; Mannion et al., 2011; Mikander, 2016; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2016; Wang & Hoffman, 2016). Adding to the above challenges,

educators and researchers alike began to call for global education starting at earlier ages, thus expanding and creating global education programs in the K-12 setting. While this has also been a conversation for decades, there remains little research sharing the effectiveness and reliability of the available resources and content across different school systems.

This study attempted to add to the existing research in global education in K-12 settings by performing a case study at one independent school on the East Coast of the United States. In finding a long-standing, well-resourced, global education program, this research attempted to solidify suggestions for best-practices and content for the K-12 students. While some of the program studied would be difficult to reproduce elsewhere, such as the travel program for all high school aged students, other program components are easily reproduced and assist in showing the importance of global content even at early ages. Through intentional, integrated curriculum starting in kindergarten, global education is a constant part of the school's curriculum. Beginning even in primary grades, students must think about how their actions affect their local community as well as their global community and vice versa. Through the study of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals in Lower School, major world religions and multiple perspectives even in American History in middle school, and the global studies diploma track in Upper School, the study school attempts to live its mission to develop learners who are informed, ethical, engaged, and ethical citizens and leaders in our diverse world.

This study found there could be some increased definition, standards, and assessments with which to anchor global citizenship education. Many of the aspects evident at the study school echo those called for in existing curriculum frameworks and educational research. Most notably, global content is woven throughout all the curriculum as a framing paradigm rather than a curricular addition. Throughout the data reviewed, the study school continued to bring a critical

global lens to most subject areas with a focus on student capability to enact change. Despite not having a concrete global studies vision and mission, all the participants agreed that global citizenship education is a main value of the entire school and important for student success. An increase in communication and collaboration across divisions and faculty would not only help to solidify global citizenship content and competencies, but also increase the school's ability to assess students' global competence, skills, and values. As other research shows, explicit direction and frameworks help give the school faculty and students a clearer picture of what is expected and what is accomplished, hopefully leading more consistent practice among teachers.

As educators and leaders alike continue to call for increased global competence and understanding, the demand for global citizenship education in K-12 settings will only increase. It is important for these leaders in education and beyond to incorporate many things into this global education. As suggested throughout this research and other literature, global education cannot be an "add-on" or stand-alone program, but a framing paradigm in which teachers situate their entire curriculum. This paradigm is one that must incorporate global perspectives into traditional content as well as create added content to fill gaps. Global citizenship education must not only prepare students to enter the workforce and global economy, but also challenge them to change or recreate systems that are unjust and oppressive. Global education needs to realistically educate students on the challenges the global society face together such as climate change, increased migration, and the health and wellbeing of its citizens while instilling in them a belief in their ability to act and collaborate to solve these challenges. Through this study, and hopefully others to come, best practices and suggested content have begun to emerge. With increased research and practice, it is this researcher's hope that global citizenship education will accomplish all these things and more.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M. (2016). Diversity and equity: A global education challenge. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 51, 143-155. DOI 10.1007/s40841-016-0056-x.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2015). *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*. Retrieved from: <https://www.actfl.org/resources/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages>.
- Asia Society/OECD (2018). *Teaching for Global Competence in a Rapidly Changing World*, OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264289024-en>
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3, 40-51.
- Andreotti, V. (2010). Global education in the ‘21st Century’: Two different perspectives on the ‘post’ of postmodernism. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 2(2), 5-22.
- Appiah, K. A. (2019). The importance of elsewhere: In defense of cosmopolitanism. *Foreign Affairs*, 98(2), 20-26.
- Balarin, M. (2011). Global citizenship and marginalization: Contributions towards a political economy of global citizenship. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 355-366.
- Bayram, A. B. (2019). Nationalist cosmopolitanism: The psychology of cosmopolitanism, national identity, and going to war for the country. *Nations and Nationalism*, 25(3), 757-781. DOI: 10.1111/nana.12476
- Blackmore, C. (2016). Towards a pedagogical framework for global citizenship education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 8(1), 39-56.

- Borrero, N., Ziauddin, A., & Ahn, A. (2018). Teaching for change: New teachers' experiences with and visions for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Critical Questions in Education*, 9(1), 22-39.
- Breen, M. (2012). Privileged migration: American undergraduates, study abroad, academic tourism. *Critical Arts* 26(1), 82-102.
- Brown, K. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 42(5), 700-745.
- Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4, 164-195.
- Centner, C. M. (2014). Cosmopolitanism & humanism. *The Humanist*, 31-33.
- Choo, S. S. (2018). Approaching twenty-first century education from a cosmopolitan perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 50(2), 162-181.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2017.1313316>
- Committee for Economic Development (2006). *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security*.
- Creeden, J., Kelly-Aguirre, K., & Visser, A. (2016). Increasing understanding of cultural differences. *Independent School* (Winter), 18-19.
- Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Fifth ed). SAGE Publications.
- Cumming-Potvin, W. (2009). Social justice, pedagogy and multiliteracies: Developing communities of practice for teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 82-99.

- Detloff, Nordquist & Sisisky (2020). *An Annotated Guide to Global Education: Standards and Practices from the GEBG Community*. Global Education Benchmark Group.
- DiCicco Cozzolino, M. (2016). Global citizenship education within a context of accountability and 21st century skills: The case of Olympus High School. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(57). <https://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2364>
- Dill, J. S. (2012). The moral education of global citizens. *Global Society*, 49, 541-546. DOI: 10.1007/s12115-012-9599-8.
- Donnelly-Smith, L. (2009). Global learning through short-term study abroad. *Peer Review*, 11(4), 12-15.
- Eidoo, S., Ingram, L., MacDonald, A., Nabavi, M., Pashby K., & Stille S. (2011). "Through the kaleidoscope": Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34(4), 59-85. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/canajeducrevucan.34.4.59>.
- Farren, P. (2016). "Transformative Pedagogy" in the context of language teaching: being and becoming. *World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues*, 8(3), 190-204.
- Fernekes, W. (2016). Global citizenship education and human rights education: Are they compatible with U.S. civic education? *Journal of International Social Studies*, 6(2), 34-57.
- Gaudelli, W. & Fernekes, W.R. (2004). Teaching about global human rights for global citizenship: Action research in the social studies curriculum. *The Social Studies*, 16-26.
- Gollnick, D. M. & Chinn, P. C. (2009). *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society* (eighth ed). Pearson Education, Inc.

- Goren, H. & Yemini, M. (2017). The global citizenship education gap: Teacher perceptions of the relationship between global citizenship education and students' socio-economic status. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 9-22.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.009>.
- Goren, H. & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined – A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 170-183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.02.004>
- Global citizenship education*. (2015). UNESCO.
- Hatley, J. (2019). Universal values as a barrier to the effectiveness of global citizenship education: A multimodal critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 11(1), 87-102.
<https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.11.1.06>.
- Hamelink, C. J. (1999). The elusive concept of globalization. *Global Dialogue*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Hudzik, J. K. & Stohl, M. (2012). Comprehensive and strategic internationalization of U.S. higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl & T. Adams (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp. 61-80). SAGE Publications.
- International Telecommunication Union (2017). *Measuring the Information Society Report*. ITU Publications.
- International Telecommunication Union (2019). *Measuring Digital Development: ICT Price Trends*. ITU Publications.
- Kerkhoff, S. N. & Cloud, M. E. (2020). Equipping teachers with globally competent practices: A mixed methods study on integrating global competence and teacher education.

International Journal of Educational Research, 103.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101629>.

Kim, S., & Slapac, A. (2015). Culturally responsive, transformative pedagogy in the transnational era: *Critical perspectives. Educational Studies*, 51(1), 17-27.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2014.983639>

Knight, J. (2006). Crossborder education: An analytical framework for program and provider mobility. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 21, 345-395.

Leduc, R. (2013). Global citizenship instruction through active participation: What is being learned about global citizenship? *The Educational Forum*, 77(4), 394-406.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2013.822038>.

Long, T. E. (n.d.). From study abroad to global studies: Reconstructing international education for a globalized world. *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 12, 25-36.

Longview Foundation for Education in World Affairs and International Understanding, Inc. (2008). *Teacher Preparation for the Global Age: The Imperative for Change*. Retrieved from www.longviewfdn.org.

Macdonald H., Zinth, J. D. & Pompelia, S. (2019). *50 State Comparison: High School Graduation Requirements*. Retrieved from: <https://reports.ecs.org/comparisons/high-school-graduation-requirements-01>.

Boix Mansilla V. B. & Jackson, A. (2011). *Educating for Global Competence: Preparing Our Youth to Engage the World*. The Asia Society.

Boix Mansilla V. B. & Schleicher, A. (2022). *Big Picture Thinking: How to Educate the Whole Person for an Interconnected World*. OECD.

- Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Merryfield, M.M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 429-443.
- Mikander, P. (2016). Globalization as continuing colonialism: Critical global citizenship education in an unequal world. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 15(2), 70-79.
10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v15-12-1475
- Myers, J. P. (2016). Charting a democratic course for global citizenship education: Research directions and current challenges. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(55).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2174>.
- Myers, J. P. & Rivero, K. (2020). Challenging preservice teachers' understandings of globalization: Critical knowledge for global citizenship. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 44, 383-396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2020.05.004>
- Nagda, B.A., Gurin, P., & Lopez, G. (2003). Transformative pedagogy for democracy and social justice. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 6(2), 165-191.
- National Association of Independent Schools (2020). *NAIS Research: 2019 NAIS Global Education Survey*.
- National Association of Independent Schools (2017). *Principles of good practice: Educating for Global Citizenship and International Mindedness*. <https://www.nais.org/learn/principles-of-good-practice/educating-for-global-citizenship/>.

- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved October 30, 2021, from <http://www.corestandards.org/>.
- NCSS (National Council for the Social Studies), (2010). Retrieved September 16, 2018, from <https://www.socialstudies.org/standards/strands>
- Newstreet, C., & Rackard, J. (2018). High school study abroad: What do world history students really learn? *Journal of International Social Studies*, 8(2), 55-77.
- Nikolitsa-Winter, C., Mauch, W. & Maalouf, P. (2019). *Addressing Global Citizenship Education in Adult Learning and Education: Summary Report*. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. ISBN: 978-92-820-1234-5
- OECD, (2018). *Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World: The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework*. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/Handbook-PISA-2018-Global-Competence.pdf>
- Ohio Department of Education (2018). Ohio's learning standards: Social studies standards. Retrieved from: <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/Social-Studies/Ohio-s-Learning-Standards-for-Social-Studies/SSFfinalStandards01019.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>.
- Oxfam (2015). Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools. <https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/resources/education-for-global-citizenship-a-guide-for-schools>
- Oxfam (2015). Global citizenship in the classroom: A guide for teachers. <https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/resources/global-citizenship-in-the-classroom-a-guide-for-teachers>

- Oxley, L. & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Education Studies*, 61(3), 301-325.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393>.
- Paasi, A. (2015). Academic capitalism and the geopolitics of knowledge. In J. Agnew, V. Mamadouh, A. Secor & J. Sharp (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography* (1st ed., pp. 509-523). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Pais, A. & Costa, M. (2016). An ideology critique of global citizenship education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 61(1), 1-16. DOI: [10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772](https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772).
- Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S. & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 56(2), 144-164.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352>.
- Piacentini, M., Barrett, M., Boix Mansilla, V., Deardorff, D., & Lee, H-W (2018). *Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World: The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/Handbook-PISA-2018-Global-Competence.pdf>
- Rapoport, A. (2010). We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 5(3), 179-190. DOI: 10.1177/1746197910382256.
- Reimers, F. (2009). Leading for global competency. *Teaching for the 21st Century*, 67(1).
<https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/leading-for-global-competency>.
- Reimers, F. M., Chopra, V., Chung, C. K., Higdon, J., O'Donnell, E. B. (2016). *Empowering Global Citizens: A World Course*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

- Saito, J. (2020). Maintaining national standards while engaging culturally relevant education: A comparative analysis of citizenship education in the United States and Japan. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook*, 14, 39-51.
- Schleicher, A. (2020, October 22). Are students ready to thrive in an interconnected world? The first PISA assessment of global competence provides some answers. *OECD Today*.
<https://oecdeditoday.com/students-ready-thrive-interconnected-world-first-pisa-assessment-global-competence/>.
- Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 53(3), 248-258.
- Shulsky, D. D., Baker, S. F., Chvala, T., & Willis, J. M. (2017). Cultivating layered literacies: Developing the global child to become tomorrow's global citizen. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 9, 49-63.
<https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.9.1.05>
- Spring, J. (2007). *A New Paradigm for Global School Systems: Education for a Long and Happy Life*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Spring, J. (2022). *American Education*. Routledge.
- Srinivasan, R. (2017). *Whose global village?: Rethinking how technology shapes our world*. New York University Press.
- Stuteville, R. & Johnson, H. I. (2016). Citizenship education in the United States: Perspective reflected in state education standards. *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research*, 6(1), 99-117. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5929/2016.6.1.7>.

- Tamrat, W. & Teferra, D. (2020). The shift to online learning calls for global cooperation. *University World News: Africa Edition*. Retrieved from <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200413115722610>
- Tavangar, H. S. & Mladic-Moales, B. (2014). *The Global Education Toolkit for Elementary Learners*. Corwin, A SAGE company.
- Tichnor-Wagner, A., Parkhouse, H., Glazier, J. & Cain, J.M. (2016). Expanding approaches to teaching for diversity and justice in K-12 education: Fostering global citizenship across the content areas. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(59). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2138>.
- Tichnor-Wagner, A. & Manise, J. (2019). *Globally Competent Educational Leadership: A Framework for Leading Schools in a Diverse, Interconnected World*. ASCD & The Longview Foundation.
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. <https://sdgs.un.org/publications/transforming-our-world-2030-agenda-sustainable-development-17981>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2015). *Global citizenship education*. UNESCO.
- U.S. Government Strategy on International Basic Education: Fiscal Years 2019-2023. Retrieved from <https://www.usaid.gov/education/usg-strategy>.
- Vanden Berg, T. & Schwander, L. (2019). The long-term impact of short-term study abroad program: Perspectives on global citizenship. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(4), p. 18-31.

- Vermont State Board of Education (2016). *Series 2000: Educational Quality Standards*. Retrieved from: <https://education.vermont.gov/sites/aoe/files/documents/edu-state-board-rules-series-2000.pdf>.
- Wagner, D. A. (2018). *Learning as development: Rethinking international education in a changing world*. Routledge, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wang, C. & Hoffman, D. M. (2016). Are WE the world? A critical reflection on selfhood in U.S. global citizenship education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(56). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2152>.
- White, B. & Lee, J. (2020). The future of international HE in a post-mobility world. *University World News*. Retrieved from <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200417105255362>
- Witt, A. (2022). Postpandemic futures of Global Citizenship Education for preservice teachers: Challenges and possibilities. *Prospects*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-022-09599-5>.
- Wynter-Hoyte, K., Braden, E. G., Rodriguez, S., & Thornton, N. (2017). Disrupting the status quo: Exploring culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogies for young diverse learners. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 22(3), 428-447.
- Xanthopoulos, J. A. (2005). *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas* (2). Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Yemini, M., Tibbitts, F. & Goren, H. (2019). Trends and caveats: Review of literature on global citizenship education in teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.09.014>.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Program Director

1. How do you define global education?
2. What is your program's mission and learning objectives?
 - a. How does this tie in with your school mission?
3. How do you achieve your learning objectives?
 - a. Is this program integrated into existing curriculum or independent?
 - b. Is there a core set of courses that all students get?
 - c. If it's separate, how do you relate "global" back to United States?
4. How long has your program been in place?
5. How does your program view international travel? Local travel?
 - a. What does this look like? What is the objective? Who pays?
6. How did you/your school create this program? Were any existing programs used to assist (UNESCO, Asia Society etc.)?
 - a. What roadblocks did you have?
 - b. How many iterations has it been through?
7. How do you assess the success of your program?
8. Who oversees the program?
9. Are there certain designated teachers for this program?
 - a. What training or professional development did these teachers receive?
10. What standards documents (if any) do you align with?

Global Studies Interview Guide

Faculty

1. How are you involved in your school's global education program?
2. How do you define global education?
 - a. How did you develop this definition?
3. What courses do you teach?
4. How did you create this course?
5. What is missing from the global education program?
6. What are the biggest challenges you face in the global education program?
7. What do you think is the most successful aspect of your program? Why?
8. What kind of education and/or professional development helped you prepare for your involvement in the global education program?

APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Global Studies Programming in K-12 Settings

You are being asked to participate in a voluntary research study. The purpose of this study is to determine the ways in which global studies programs are formed and practiced in K-12 schools. Participating in this study will involve a brief interview with the researcher. Minimal risks related to this research include a slight demand on participants' time; benefits related to this research include increasing the knowledge and literature in the field of global studies.

Principal Investigator Name and Title: Betsy Esser, Doctoral Student
Department and Institution: Global Studies in Education, Educational Policy, Organization and Leadership, University of Illinois
Contact Information: eesser2@illinois.edu
Sponsor: Dr. Allison Witt, University of Illinois

Why am I being asked?

You are being asked to be a participant in a research study about Global Studies Programming in K-12 Settings. The purpose of this study is to determine the ways in which global studies programs are formed and practiced in K-12 schools. You have been asked to participate in this research because of your knowledge and expertise in global studies education. Approximately 10 participants will be involved in this research at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future dealings with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.

What procedures are involved?

The study procedures are interviews via phone or in person.

This research will be performed at the Columbus School for Girls. If you agree, you will participate in a personal interview, phone call or internet meeting 1-2 times over the next 6 months. Each of those conversations will last approximately one hour.

What are the potential risks and discomforts?

There are no risks to individuals participating in this survey beyond those that exist in daily life.

Are there benefits to participating in the research?

Benefits to the research include increasing knowledge and practice of global studies programming.

What other options are there?

You have the option to not participate in this study.

Will my study-related information be kept confidential?

Faculty, staff, students, and others with permission or authority to see your study information will maintain its confidentiality to the extent permitted and required by laws and university policies. The names or personal identifiers of participants will not be published or presented.

Will I be reimbursed for any expenses or paid for my participation in this research?

You will not be offered payment for being in this study.

Can I withdraw or be removed from the study?

If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time. The researchers also have the right to stop your participation in this study without your consent if they believe it is in your best interests or you were to object to any future changes that may be made in the study plan.

Will data collected from me be used for any other research?

Your de-identified information could be used for future research without additional informed consent.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

Contact the researchers Betsy Esser at 937-935-7251 or eesser2@illinois.edu if you have any questions about this study or your part in it, or if you have concerns or complaints about the research.

What are my rights as a research subject?

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 217-333-2670 or irb@illinois.edu.

I have read the above information. I have been given an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research. I will be given a copy of this signed and dated form.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent
subject's)

Date (must be same as

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Consent

APPENDIX C: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER



OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH

Office for the Protection of Research Subjects
805 W. Pennsylvania Ave., MC-095
Urbana, IL 61801-4822

Notice of Exempt Determination

September 10, 2019

Principal Investigator	Mary Allison Witt
CC	Elizabeth Esser
Protocol Title	<i>Global Citizenship Programming in K-12 Schools</i>
Protocol Number	20162
Funding Source	Unfunded
Review Category	Exempt 2 (ii)
Determination Date	September 10, 2019
Closure Date	September 9, 2024

This letter authorizes the use of human subjects in the above protocol. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) has reviewed your application and determined the criteria for exemption have been met.

The Principal Investigator of this study is responsible for:

- Conducting research in a manner consistent with the requirements of the University and federal regulations found at 45 CFR 46.
- Requesting approval from the IRB prior to implementing major modifications.
- Notifying OPRS of any problems involving human subjects, including unanticipated events, participant complaints, or protocol deviations.
- Notifying OPRS of the completion of the study.

Changes to an **exempt** protocol are only required if substantive modifications are requested and/or the changes requested may affect the exempt status.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

IORG0000014 • FWA #00008584
217.333.2670 • irb@illinois.edu • oprs.research.illinois.edu