

Development of Global Identity in the Social Studies Classroom

Anatoli Rapoport¹

Abstract

Global citizenship is a citizenship model that draws growing attention of practitioners and education theorists. Global identity is an important prerequisite for the development of global citizenship. This empirical study conducted in three social studies classrooms investigated whether social studies classroom discourse contributes to the emergence and development of students' global identities and what linguistic elements of discourse impact the development of students' global identities. Using the framework suggested by Bucholtz and Hall (2010), which analyzes identity as constituted in linguistic interaction, the study demonstrated how teacher mediated discourses are pertinent to the construction and development of global identity among students. By applying the indexicality principle, it was determined which linguistic symbols students identified as indexes of global identity. The study concluded that the use of words and phrases that relate indexically to global identity in the teacher's narrative or a textbook affects the development of students' global identities.

Key words: *Global citizenship, global identity, classroom discourse, indexicality*

Introduction

Citizenship education – the preparation of young people to make informed and reasoned decisions, and the education of citizens of a “culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (NCSS, 2001) – has been the primary purpose of social studies education. For the past several decades, however, the attention to citizenship education has been mostly the result of the belated attempts to coordinate curricular development with the rationalization of numerous emerging models of citizenship. The rising wave of globalization has profoundly influenced the very notion of citizenship and citizenship education rationales by infusing a global perspective and by challenging the core principles of citizenship as a nation-state related concept.

Identity

In a time when both group and individual students' characteristics have become a focus of research in education, identity, at the core of human perceptions, motivations, and actions (Karlberg, 2008),

¹ Assoc. Prof. Purdue University, rapoport@purdue.edu

becomes the centerpiece for understanding the many processes that impact various patterns of behavior. Identity, a role-specific understanding, expectation, and projection of self (Bowell & Stokoe, 2006; Wendt, 1992), is particularly significant in citizenship education research because of the multiple features common to both concepts. Erikson (1964) described identity as a dynamic process between the self and community. Identity is constructed and performed rather than essential and possessed, resulting in “each of us performing a repertoire of identities that are constantly shifting, and that we negotiate and re-negotiate according to the circumstances” (Joseph, 2010, p. 14). The construction of identity begins when an individual identifies with significant others such as parents or siblings, and develops as a selection of norms or ideals with which the individual identifies (Mansoor, 2012).

For educators, the most important features of identity are the relative flexibility and constructivist nature. Identities are not once-and-for-all given characteristics; they appear at some point in a person’s life and are gradually developed and constructed over time. Among various identities, such as gender, racial, ethnic, national, or social identities, one’s global identity occupies a special place. As a collection of various imaginary norms, behaviors, or ideals that one believes she or he voluntarily shares with other people, identity is an exclusionary concept that individuals use to separate themselves from those who do not seem to support those norms, behaviors, or ideals. Unlike exclusionary identities, however, global identity is inclusive because there is no known community that stands in opposition to global community. The universally inclusive global identity allows people to live without compromising their other multiple collective identities (Abizadeh, 2005; Karlberg, 2008; Mansoor, 2012). Although the existence of norms, behaviors, and ideals shared by humanity remains questionable to some, the very admission of the lack or nonexistence of shared norms allow us to talk about individuals with weak or strong, developed or undeveloped, global identities. Therefore, as in any developmental process, an individual global identity is a continuum on which the “zero” starting point is a complete unawareness of one’s global identity. Erikson (1964) specifically highlighted the importance of future replacement of any imaginary distinctions that divide people with a universal identity. He believed that a “species-wide... more inclusive human identity” (p. 242) will result in the emergence of truly global ethics.

The recognition that one shares imaginary norms and ideals with individuals who live beyond national borders is expedited by the progression of globalization, characterized by the rise of

supraterritoriality and cosmopolitanism, in which social relations become increasingly less tied to territories and locations (Appiah, 2008; Scholte, 1997). Our world is becoming “far more equal, far more active and energetic” (Zakaria, 2005, p. 92). Global processes in economy, science, and technology have given a tremendous impulse to changes in values, customs, and social mores. Regardless of how positively or negatively it is perceived by various groups, globalization has already irreversibly changed the world. Arnett (2002) argued that globalization has its primary psychological influence on issues of identity, particularly among adolescents. Unlike children, adolescents are more mature and autonomous in pursuing information and new experiences, but unlike adults, they have not yet committed to certain habits, beliefs, or behaviors. Arnett (2002) concluded that “as a consequence of globalization... identity becomes based less on prescribed social roles and more on individual choices. Globalization [will result] in increasingly complex bicultural, multicultural, and hybrid identities” (pp. 781-782) that give young people an awareness of practices and information that are part of a global culture as well as a sense of belonging to the worldwide culture.

Global identity and global citizenship

What are the relationships between global identity and global citizenship? To what extent are these constructs similar or different? Is there an intrinsic connection between them, or are they tied only by the global nature of both? These questions are particularly important because, despite a growing number of empirical studies (see: Davies, Harber, & Yamashita, 2005; Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2015; Merryfield, 2008; Rapoport, 2013, 2015; Sant, Davies, Pashby, & Schultz, 2018) educators and education theorists are still at the initial stage of developing a methodological basis for teaching global citizenship. Indeed, there is controversy regarding these concepts and skepticism among some educators and theorists about the legitimacy of the status of global identity and global citizenship – in other words, whether or not they exist (Koyama, 2015).

Identifying relationships between global citizenship and global identity is critical for global citizenship education (GCE). Despite ongoing debates and skepticism regarding global citizenship (Armstrong, 2006; Cory, 2006; Koyama, 2015; Standish, 2012; Wood, 2008), global citizenship education has gained a significant momentum in the last decade (Harshman, 2015; Maguth & Hilburn, 2015). The increase in the use of global citizenship and critical cosmopolitanism (Byker & Marquardt, 2016) frameworks in the classroom resulted in the steady growth of empirical

analytical studies directed at codifying specific methodologies and teaching devices to improve global citizenship education. Research on a methodological approach to GCE demonstrates the importance of mediation and teacher agency. To develop global awareness and engagement in students, teachers use (a) reflection on their own cultural assumptions and the frameworks that help other people make sense of the world; (b) learning from scholarship in other countries; and (c) techniques that help engage students as citizens of the world (Merryfield, 2008). Despite many teachers' reluctance to teach controversial topics or de-politicize views of citizenship, most teachers and students agree that appropriate teaching of global citizenship includes (a) debates and discussions (sometimes generated from role playing or simulations); (b) experiential learning; (c) visits or visitors; and (d) research and information (Davies, Harber, & Yamashita, 2005).

Discourse as origin of identity

Identities, like citizenship, are social constructs. Despite being dynamic and evolving in nature, identities, "once established, exist as mental representations [that] makes them every bit as real as if they were grounded in anything natural" (Bourdieu in Joseph, 2010, p. 12). As social constructs, identities appear and develop as the result of discourses (Bowell & Stokoe, 2006; Cuberto & Ignacio, 2011; Joseph, 2010; Karlberg, 2008). Identities, particularly social and collective, are demonstrated through enactment and performance rather than connections to people's internal ideas or thoughts, which Gee (2001) called "internal states" (p. 99). Both discourse theory and identity theory postulate that individuals develop projections of themselves in the course of interactions. People who are engaged in interaction establish their identities through verbally performing social acts and verbally displaying certain attitudes (Ochs, 1993). We explain much meaning to ourselves with the help of inner speech and by defining things or phenomena through language. Language and linguistic devices become the essential tools that help us define and project ourselves. On the other hand, identities are also constructed by other people who engage an individual in interaction, and by non-verbal elements of environment. In other words, identity is a response to the activities of others (Bowell & Stokoe, 2006). Thus is discourse the primary locus where identity is constructed.

Theoretical framework

This study is informed by two theoretical frameworks: epistemological constructivist theory (Dewey, 1925/2003; Garrison, 1997; von Glasersfeld, 1989) and the framework suggested by Bucholtz and Hall (2010), which analyzes identity as constituted in linguistic interaction. While the theory of social constructivism (Berger & Luckman, 1966) examines the construction and institutionalization of social reality and concepts, such as identity or citizenship, the epistemological constructivist theory explains how knowledge and understanding of these concepts are constructed through negotiation of meanings. Discourse analysis will be used to explore linguistic, extra-linguistic, visual, or other devices that are used to create global discourse in the social studies classroom. Discourse theory is concerned with human expressions, often in the form of language, and highlights how such expressions are linked to human knowledge. Discourse analysis considers how language (spoken or written) and extra-linguistic devices enact social and cultural perspectives and identities (Gee, 2014a). Meanings are created and negotiated through language, so language (oral, written, symbolic) and speech play a critical part in discourse analysis. In social studies classrooms, as in all other classrooms, teachers use language to construct their students' identities and shape their own by creating discourses and inviting students to participate in them.

The second framework that informed this study was suggested by Bucholtz and Hall (2010). It analyzes identity as a product of linguistic interaction. Broadly defined as “social positioning of self and other” (p. 18), identity is approached as a dynamic relational and socio-cultural phenomenon that emerges and is negotiated in local intersubjective dialogical discourse contexts, rather than being individually produced or a priori assigned. The classroom involves an example of such a local dialogical intersubjective context that provides mediated linguistic interaction.

The identity analysis framework is based on five principles:

- The emergence principle maintains that identity, as a social and cultural phenomenon, is an emergent product rather than the source of linguistic and other meaning-creating practices. Thus, identity is not a psychological mechanism of self-classification but a reflection of the self-established through social action and language. According to this principle, global identity is not something that already preexists in a student, but emerges as the result of intersubjective dialogical local discourse in the classroom and elsewhere.

- The positionality principle reflects the dynamic state of identities that, besides macro level demographic categories, also incorporate local cultural and social positions as well as temporary interactionally determined participant roles. Because identities are determined through enactment, students' roles and positions in an intersubjective classroom discourse are demonstrative of their identities, including global identity, that otherwise may be less identifiable.
- The indexicality principle. The concepts of indexical order (Silverstein, 2003) and indexicality (Johnstone, 2010; Ochs, 1993) are fundamental to understanding how linguistic forms are used to construct identity positions. Index is any linguistic form that depends on the interactional intersubjective context for its meaning. Indexicality, created through linguistic reflexivity and metapragmatics (Johnstone, 2010), demonstrates the establishment of semiotic links between linguistic forms such as words or phrases and meanings. Indexical ties are inherently ideological and created either in bottom-up or top-down fashion, prompting ideological expectations among discourse participants (Bucholtz & Hall, 2010). In the latter case, they are imposed by media or authorities, including textbooks and instructors. Among the most important concepts within indexicality are labeling and categorization, in which speakers use or react to very specific words or phrases that in their views constitute identity categories and labels. The indexicality principle maintains that identity and identity relations emerge through overt mention of identity labels and categories. Therefore, as Bucholtz and Hall (2010) pointed out, the circulation and frequency of such categories and labels within active discourse, and their explicit or implicit juxtaposition with other categories, provide important information about identity construction. In other words, we can assume that a student's global identity is being constructed when the language devices that the student labels and categorizes as related to "global" are being used in classroom discourse.
- The relationality principle emphasizes identity as a relational phenomenon. Identities are never independent, for they acquire meanings in relation to other identity positions.
- The partialness principle is based on the notion that "identities are constituted by context and are themselves asserted as partial accounts" (Visweswaran in Bucholtz & Hall, 2010, p. 25), which means that any identity construction may be in part intentional and in part habitual and not fully conscious. It can be affected by both small group interaction and

much larger ideological or cultural processes. Therefore, not only is identity unstable and dynamic, it also shifts as interaction unfolds.

The basic premises or general philosophical assumptions that underpin the analysis of classroom discourse as a tool in constructivist research (Jongensen & Phillips, 2002) state that:

- Our knowledge of the world is accessible to us through categories; therefore, knowledge of the world is not a reflection of reality but is instead the product of discourse.
- We are fundamentally historical and cultural beings; therefore, the ways in which we know, understand, and interpret the world are historically and culturally specific.
- Knowledge is created through social interaction by constructing common truths and meanings.

Because identity is constructed in a discourse, the analysis of a classroom discourse, particularly the construction of meanings and interpretations, is critical for understanding the mechanism of identity construction and development. If education is an epistemological process that consists of the development of mental contexts, shared terms of reference, and intersubjective dialogical conversations (Cuberto & Ignacio, 2011), then verbal and non-verbal elements of the discourse will serve as pieces of mosaic that will eventually help us see a bigger picture of identity. Language, on the one hand, helps construct and shape identities and, on the other hand, helps to observe, track, and analyze the identity construction process. Verbal communication and language, whether oral or written, are indicators of what we say, what we do, and what we are (Gee, 2014a). As individuals, we listen, speak, write, or read differently and this difference is reflected through language and through meanings that we assign to elements of language. We are how and what we say, and the words we use and how we use them are what we are (Gee, 2014a; 2014b).

The following research questions guided this study:

- Does social studies classroom discourse contribute to the emergence and development of students' global identities?
- What linguistic elements of discourse in the social studies classroom impact the development of students' global identities?

Methods and Modes of Inquiry

Data were collected through observations, tape-recording of classroom discourses, and participants' responses to identify words and phrases that relate indexically to global identity.

Participants in this study included three teachers and 55 students from three high school social studies classes: AP World History, Sociology, and History of World Armed Conflicts. The researcher and teachers collaboratively identified three lessons in each class (nine lessons total) in which teachers and students engaged in discourses pertinent to the development of global identity and global citizenship. All lessons were observed by the researcher, recorded, and transcribed. Lesson transcripts were then given to students to identify (by highlighting) linguistic elements that they believed impacted the development of their global identities. All participants were instructed on the meaning of global identity through short presentations in each class. Students' choices were then grouped into categories. The same transcripts were analyzed by teachers, who were asked to read the transcripts of their lessons and identify the elements of the discourse that they believed were essential to the development of students' global identities. To determine the effect of classroom discourse on the construction of students' global identities, the results of the linguistic discourse analysis were triangulated with the analysis of observations (field journals).

The results of data analysis and original transcripts were used to determine what elements of classroom discourse and linguistic devices potentially impact the development of students' global identities, how identity emerged from linguistic interaction (emergence principle), to what extent students' and teachers' temporary roles and orientations influenced global identity construction in classroom discourse (positionality principle), what categories and indices students and teachers selected as constructing elements of global identity (indexicality principle), and to what degree teachers' choices were similar to or different from students' choices.

Findings and Discussion

Fifty-five students (sophomores and juniors) in three social studies classes were invited to participate in the study. After student participants had been asked to review lesson transcripts and highlight words or phrases that they believed impacted the development of their global identities, 48 transcripts (87%) with at least one highlighted word were returned: from AP World History, 12

out of 14; from History of World Armed Conflicts, 17 out of 20; and from Sociology, 19 out of 21. The following categories emerged after the analysis of the highlighted words and phrases:

- **Geographic names**

Examples - *England, Europe, Anglo-Saxon, Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, Mexico, Iraq, Austria-Hungary, Rwanda, Dominican Republic*

- **Phrases with at least one ethnic, non-US related qualifier/adjective**

Examples - *Irish heritage, Mexican restaurant, Indian food, Asian grocery store, Mexican insurgent leader, Rwanda genocide*

- **Proper names of historical or political actors**

Examples - *Saddam, Pancho Villa, Hitler, Mussolini, Roger Waters, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, Gavrilo Princip*

- **Foreign words and phrases**

Examples - *Danke schön, Manheim, chimichanga*

- **Words and phrases that determine relations between nations, cultures, or ethnic groups**

Examples - *war, conflict, skirmish, Big Stick Diplomacy, upheaval, assimilation, dominant culture, cultural differences, migration, unique identity, identifiable culture, authentic, ethnicity, genocide, assert dominance*

- **Historical dates and international organizations**

Examples - *UN, 1914-1918, 1991*

- **Racial identifiers, personal pronouns, and phrases with possessive pronouns**

Examples - *white people, these people, we, their country, them*

Teachers' choices were limited to only five categories: a) geographic names, b) phrases with ethnic qualifiers, c) proper names, d) foreign words, and e) international organizations and dates (only one teacher selected a single date).

People use language in order to be recognized as who they believe they are, to demonstrate their identities or roles. Discourse helps people present and enact their identities. At the same time, discourse helps people develop, shape, negotiate, reevaluate, reflect upon, and renegotiate their identities. Because people possess multiple identities, all of them can be identified to various degrees in a discourse (Gee, 2014b). My task as researcher was to determine whether and to what

degree classroom discourse allows students to present and consequently develop and negotiate their global identities, and what language devices among “identity building tools” (Gee, 2014b, p. 116) helped them to do so.

It is not possible to objectively categorically confirm whether or to what degree the given part of a discourse lead to the development of any social identity, including global identity. I operated on the assumption that words and phrases that students identified as possible global identity indexes (labels or categories) marked those parts of classroom discourses that could potentially and to a degree greater than other parts be pertinent to the development of students’ global identity. To select excerpts from classroom discourses that demonstrate to various degrees the emergence, development, or negotiation of students’ global identities, I used indexes (labels and categories) of global identity selected by students. Several intersubjective dialogical conversations in which those indexes were used by students or teachers are presented as examples.

Excerpt 1 (In AP World History, the teacher and students are discussing an artifact, a traditional Chinese female garment, brought to class by a female student.)

Teacher: *Who else has an East Asia* briefing for us today? You ready? [students mumbling] Who’s ready? Do you want to give your briefing now? [chatter] Okay. What’s your topic? [students mumbling] Okay, go ahead.*

[student produces an artifact]

Teacher: *Oh look at you! Wonderful. Oh my gosh.*

Female student 1: *Pass it around, be careful. This one would be the most traditional because it’s in red. Also I would like to bring your attention to the phoenix* on the front of this one. Phoenixes usually represent the Empress, and most people, when you get married or at least if you have a traditional Chinese wedding*, they’re considered the Phoenix Empress*, so... And this one also has a phoenix on it. It’s called Chi Pow*, I believe.*

Female student 2: *Yes, remember? When we did Puyi* and he was the last emperor of China*, so after the Qing* fell. He was the last emperor of China*, and he was also the emperor of Macedonia* after the Japanese* took over, and he was basically just a puppet emperor in...?*

Teacher: *Are you sure it’s Macedonia*?*

Male student: Manchuria*.

Female student 2: They have two different names, wait.

Teacher: It's Manchuria*, how did you get Macedonia*?

Female student 2: I have no idea.

Male student: Maybe because when you type...

Teacher: Maybe it was spell-check, okay.

Female student 1: Right now, actually, I looked it up. Manchuria* actually is now part- I didn't realize before that it had been a separate state*, but this section right here of China* is what people might say is the head of the dragon, I suppose you could say, if you look at it.

Teacher: Hey yeah, folks, the Qing* were a foreign invader*. They were Manchus*. They were a different ethnic group*. They didn't speak Chin- they didn't speak Mandarin*, they spoke Manchu*. I mean, they probably spoke- We're kind of oversimplifying. Notice Puyi*, the last emperor, he's in the lower right-hand corner there, he looks like he could be maybe Russian*, you know, Caucasian, so they were a lighter skinned, not so East-Asian-looking people. 1644*, Manchurians*- By the way, Manchuria, it's northeast China, I guess you could say. So this fellow was the last emperor of China. So China was ruled by a foreign force until you have all these other events of Westernization come in in the first part of the 20th century. Ladies, go ahead, sorry.

Based on the principle of indexicality (Bucholtz & Hall, 2010; Ochs, 1993), a number of words and phrases that students later distinguished as global identity indexes demonstrate that this part of the lesson was pertinent to the development of global identity. The indexes marked in Excerpt 1 with asterisks (*) belong to several categories:

Geographic names – East Asia, China, Macedonia, Manchuria

Phrases with ethnic qualifiers – Chinese wedding, Mandarin [language], Russian, East-Asian-looking people

Names of political or historical actors – Puyi, the Qing [dynasty]

Foreign words or phrases – Chi Pow (a transliterated name for a traditional Chinese female garment)

Words and phrases that determine relations between nations, cultures, or ethnic groups –
foreign invader, different ethnic group

Historical dates – 1644

This excerpt also demonstrates the ontological status of global identity. Based on the emergence principle (Bucholtz & Hall, 2010), it is fair to assume that Female Student 1's global identity emerged and developed when she tried to resolve the problem caused by her confusion of Manchuria with Macedonia. She had prepared her material using the incorrect geographic term Macedonia, but she discovered her mistake only by using the term and the related story in the discourse. Without the use of the indexed term Macedonia in the discourse, she would not have learned the difference between Macedonia and Manchuria, or the fact that Manchuria had been a separate state and had the shape of a dragon's head. Her discovery was so important to her that she asked her peers to support and legitimize her new knowledge by looking at Manchuria on the map. The positionality principle, another principle that determines the ontological status of identity, is demonstrated in this excerpt when Female Student 1 displayed the traditional Chinese wedding garment. When she explained the meaning of the color and phoenix on the dress, she assumed the role of a museum guide or teacher lecturing about elements of foreign culture unknown to her fellow students. The same role was assumed by Female Student 2 when she asked her classmates if they remembered talking previously about Puyi. Bucholtz and Hall (2010) noted that the temporary roles and orientations that discourse participants assume at the most basic level contribute to the formation of subjectivity and intersubjectivity in discourses.

James Paul Gee (2014a) asserted that people use language and discourse not only to build identities for themselves in different contexts but also help build identities for other people that they invite them to take up. This identity-building "technique" can be well illustrated by the following excerpt from one of the classroom discourses. The excerpt contains a number of elements that students later identified as indexes of global identity.

Excerpt 2 (In Sociology, the teacher discusses how the Holocaust was ignored.)

Teacher: So Adolf Hitler* comes along, and when he invades Poland, he gives direct orders, "Kill them all," and literally says, "as nobody has cared or noticed about others, that's what people will think about the Poles. Nobody will care." We'll argue later about whether or not it even

happened. I mean, hell, are we still arguing about the Holocaust? There are people, there are Holocaust deniers, right? They're like, "It never happened!"*

Student 1: *I don't understand how you can deny that. Send them on a trip [makes plane noise] to concentration camps in Germany.*

Teacher: *[laughs] I'm laughing about it because it seems insane, but most famously, the president of Iran*, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad* – he's no longer the president, he was the once-president – he was a Holocaust* denier and he would host Holocaust* denier conferences, and is this still relevant today? A little bit. I don't know if you guys follow what's going on in Iran* today, and... Yeah?*

Student 2: *When my dad came to the US, and my mom- I don't know how they got into a conversation about the Holocaust, but he was like, "What? That happened?" And he was like, "That can't be true. They never taught us that in school, so that's a lie." And he was, like, going off about how it's not true and it's a lie, and my mom's like, "No, I'm serious. This actually happened. They went and tried to kill all these Jews." And he didn't believe it at all. To this day, he's just like, "No, I don't think it happened."*

Teacher: *Yeah, just an example of how people, once it happens, people just want to look the other way and go, "Huh? Sure, it just happened a long time ago and won't happen again." So yeah. Have we done this in the United States? Obviously, what we did to the Native Americans seems kind of harsh.*

The reactions of the two students provide examples of how the teacher's story about the Holocaust triggered students' personalization of global tragedies and prompted different emotional reactions. By relating the Holocaust story to his family's history, Student 2 legitimized and authenticated the teacher's account of Holocaust deniers. At the same time, he globalized his initially small and unmemorable family conversation by connecting his family identity to his developing global identity.

Student 1, who sincerely could not understand how such a tragedy can be denied, demonstrated the development of his global identity through artificial deligitimation of the teacher's information. This delegitimation is not genuine, as Student 1 does not question the authenticity of the teacher's account; his delegitimation is emotional rather than rational. By the expression of his disbelief in

the denial of the Holocaust, he authenticated and legitimized the horrible nature of the event. The complementary relations, such as genuineness/artifice and authority/delegitimacy are features of the relationality principle (Bucholtz & Hall, 2010) of a developing identity.

The following excerpt demonstrates how global identity is affected by students' immediate ideological and cultural environment, and how the teacher tries to reconstruct elements of student's global identity by redefining the meaning of an indexical label:

Excerpt 3 (Sociology)

Teacher: *Look, if somebody were to open a Mexican restaurant when I was in school and refused to speak English when they served people, and served identifiable Mexican food, I'm not so sure that place wouldn't have been burned down in a week. I'm really not. We accepted Mexican food, it was ChiChi's, a whole bunch of high school honkies walking around in sombreros singing "Happy Birthday" doesn't seem very Mexican to me, but that was acceptable. You would order a chimichanga and you would feel like, "I just accomplished something there. I just used the word chimichanga in a sentence." And that was cultural pluralism... There's a restaurant here in this town that's in an Asian grocery store, anybody hear about this place? I don't know where it's at.*

Student 1: *I've been there.*

Student 2: *Is it that place by B-Dub's?*

Student 1: *Yeah, over on 11th [Street].*

Teacher: *I just know that it is, like, really authentic.*

Student 1: *There's some weird crap.*

Teacher: *Hey, hey...*

Student 1: *I mean, I've seen the restaurant because I've been lost up in the store, but I haven't eaten there because it'd probably be gross. From what I think.*

Teacher: *Yeah, but nobody's burned the place down, nobody's protesting, nobody cares. In fact, increasingly, you're getting a lot of honkies going to places like- What's that bakery on [name of the street]? And you're, like, really actually getting perhaps some authentic flavors that you certainly wouldn't have gotten 20, 30 years ago.*

Student 2: The Acropolis.

Before this conversation, Student 1's global identity was affected by someone's negative opinion about an Asian restaurant at which he had never eaten. By shifting the focus of the conversation from negative opinions about ethnic food to the positive changes that have occurred in the last several decades, the teacher renegotiated Student 1's imaginary experience without noting that the student had never had that bad experience. Bucholtz and Hall (2010) called this the partialness principle of identity, stating: "Because identity is inherently relational, it will always be partial, produced through contextually situated and ideologically informed configurations of self and other" (p. 25). This dialogue is also an example of the positionality principle described earlier. Through the choice of words and grammatical structure, the student positions himself as a white "macho."

Conclusion

In 1992, the National Council for the Social Studies determined that the primary purpose of social studies is to help young people make decisions as citizens. Although this purpose has not changed much since then, the notion and concept of citizenship has indeed changed. It has become more dynamic, contextualized, and discourse-dependent. One of the elements of the citizenship paradigm is a global model of citizenship that is slowly but steadily entering scholarly and classroom discourses; however, research shows that teachers and teacher educators do not pay much attention to teaching or discussing global citizenship in the classroom (Myers, 2006; Rapoport, 2010; Schweisfurth, 2006). The analysis of reasons why social studies curricula, or any other curricula, lack GCE instruction demonstrates that teachers do not know much about global citizenship and are unaware of methodological tools of GCE.

I approached this research with an assumption that global identity and global citizenship, although ontologically different, are still interconnected constructs, and thus the development of global identity in the social studies classroom is imperative for the education of global citizens. I saw my task in the study as twofold: a) to investigate whether a discourse in the social studies classroom contributed to the development of students' global identities, and b) to discover what elements of discourse were particularly effective for the development of students' global identities.

By applying the indexicality principle, it was determined which linguistic symbols students identified as indexes of global identity. Therefore, if those indexical symbols were used in classroom discourses, it was logical to assume that the discourses were pertinent to the development of global identity. Further evidence of emerging or developing students' global identities was the example of five principles that Bucholtz and Hall (2010) considered fundamental to the study of identity. Besides the indexicality principle, which helped recognize indexical symbols of emerging or developing global identity, the observed classroom discourses illustrated the emergence principle, the positionality principle, the relationality principle, and the partialness principle.

Based on the observed classes, the following recommendations can be made:

- Any discourse in the social studies classroom is conducive to the development of students' identities.
- Frequent use of words and phrases that relate indexically to global identity in the teacher's narrative or a textbook positively affect the development of students' global identities. In other words, the more teachers talk and teach about the world, the stronger the students identify themselves with the world and global activities.
- Connecting world historical or contemporary events with students' social, gender, ethnic, or cultural selves and encouraging students to talk about and judge international events from the positions of their multiple identities positively impact the development of students' global identities.
- Discussions of the discursive nature of identities are visibly missing from social studies education curricula. Educators should emphasize the importance of discourse in the development of student identities.

As it follows from the data presented, there is evidence that students' global identities were being constructed during classroom discourse in the observed classrooms. Because any social identity is constructed in discourse and determined through discourse or enactment, it was difficult to conclude whether students' global identities were constructed or emerged during classroom discourse or were solely a result of out-of-classroom environments or activities. This challenge, however, presents an opportunity for further research: What is the role of a global discourse in students' identities construction outside the classroom? How do teachers

of other subjects use classroom discourse to develop students' global identity? What is the impact of literacy and social studies integration in elementary school on the development of students' global identity? Answers to these and other questions will help educate citizens who are ready to develop new allegiances in a globalized democratic world.

References

- Abizadeh, A. (2005). Does collective identity presuppose an Other? On the alleged incoherence of global solidarity. *American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 45-60.
- Abowitz, K. K. & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research* 76(4), 653-690.
- Appiah, K. A. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in the world of strangers*. N.Y.: Norton.
- Armstrong, C. (2006). Global civil society and the question of global citizenship. *Voluntas*, 17(4), 349-357.
- Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist*, 57(10), 774-783.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckman, Th. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Bowell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2010). Locating identity in language. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Language and Identities* (pp. 18-28). Edinburgh University Press.
- Byker, E. J., & Marquardt, S. K. (2016). Using critical cosmopolitanism to globally situate multicultural education in teacher preparation courses. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 7(2), 30-50.
- Corry, O. (2006). Global civil society and its discontents. *Voluntas*, 17(4), 303-324.
- Cuberto, R. & Ignacio, M. (2011). Accounts in the classroom: Discourse and the construction of meaning. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 23(4), 234-267.

- Davies, L., Harber, C., & Yamashita, H. (2005). *Global citizenship education: The needs of teachers and learners*. Birmingham, UK: Center for International Education and Research (CIER), University of Birmingham.
- Dewey, J. (1925/2003). *Experience and nature*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing.
- Erikson, E. H. (1964). *Insight and responsibility*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Garrison, J. (1997). An alternative to von Glasersfeld's subjectivism in science education: Deweyan social constructivism. *Science & Education*, 6, 301-312.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.
- Gee, J. P. (2014a). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. N.Y.: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014b). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. N.Y.: Routledge.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1989). Cognition, construction of knowledge, and teaching. *Synthese*, 80(1), 121–140.
- Johnstone, B. (2010). Locating language in identity. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Language and Identities* (pp. 29-36). Edinburgh University Press.
- Jongensen, M. & Philipps, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Joseph, J. (2010). Identity. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Language and Identities* (pp. 9-17). Edinburgh University Press.
- Harshman, J. (2015). Introduction to research in global citizenship education. In J. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. Merryfield (Eds.), *Research in global citizenship education* (pp. 1-8). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Karlberg, M. (2008). Discourse, identity, and global citizenship. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 20(3), 310-320.
- Koyama, J. (2015). *The elusive and exclusive global citizen*. New Delhi: Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development/UNESCO.

- Lilley, K., Barker, M. & Harris, N. (2015). Exploring the process of global citizen learning and the student mind-set. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19(3), 225-245.
- Maguth, B. & Hilburn, J. (2015). Introduction: The state of global education: Learning with the world and its people. In B. Maguth & J. Hilburn (Eds.), *The state of global education: Learning with the world and its people* (pp. 1-10). N.Y.: Routledge.
- Mansoor, Sh. (2012). Exploring global identity in emerging adults. Available at: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2-549930/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Merryfield, M. M. (2008). Scaffolding social studies for global awareness. *Social Education*, 72(7), 363–366.
- Myers, J. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370-394.
- NCSS (2001). *Preparing citizens for a global community*. A Position Statement of the National Council for the Social Studies. Retrieved February 22, 2015 from <http://development.ncss.org/positions/global>
- Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 287-306.
- 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), 1-11.
- Rapoport, A. (2013). Global citizenship themes in the social studies classroom: Teaching devices and teachers' attitudes. *The Educational Forum*, 77(4), 407-420.
- Rapoport, A. (2015). Global citizenship education: Classroom teachers' perspectives and approaches. In M. Merryfield, T. Augustine, & J. Harshman (Eds.), *Research in global citizenship education* (pp. 119-136). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., & Schultz, L. (2018). *Global citizenship education: A critical introduction to key concepts and debates*. London: Bloomsbury
- Scholte, J. (1997). Global capitalism and the state. *International Affairs*, 73(3), 427-452.

- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication*, 23, (193-229).
- Standish, A. (2012). *The false promise of global learning: Why education needs boundaries*. New York: Continuum.
- Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Education for global citizenship: Teacher agency and curricular structure in Ontario schools. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 41-50.
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391-426.
- Wood, P. (2008). The impossibility of global citizenship. *Brock Education*, 17, 22-37.
- Zakaria, F. (2005). Education for global citizenship. *Independent School*, 64(3), 86-92.