

Florida State University Libraries

Faculty Publications

School of Teacher Education

2009

Negotiating the Global and National: Immigrant and Dominant Culture Adolescents' Vocabularies of Citizenship in a Transnational World

John Myers and Husam Zaman



Negotiating the Global and National: Immigrant and Dominant Culture Adolescents' Vocabularies of Citizenship in a Transnational World

The current national debate over the purposes of civic education is largely tied to outdated notions of citizenship that overlook its changing nature under globalization. In fact, civic education in the U.S. is based on a predominantly legalistic understanding of citizenship that emphasizes patriotism and the structures and functions of local, state and federal governments (Avery & Simmons, 2000-2001; Boyte, 2003; Hahn, 1999). Accordingly, much of the debate is over the meaning of patriotism, as calling for national loyalty and love of country (e.g., Ravitch, 2002) or a kinder, more inclusive form of patriotism (e.g., Nash, 2005; Westheimer, 2007). When a global dimension to civic education is mentioned, it typically equates the global with a broad cosmopolitan vision and humanitarian concern (e.g., Nussbaum, 2002). Yet, these positions oversimplify the complex, and evolving, relationship between national and global dimensions of citizenship. As Mitchell and Parker (in press) have demonstrated, fixed categories of citizenship are false because these allegiances are socially constructed and therefore contingent (see also Szelényi & Rhoades, 2007). We argue that this relationship—of a nation state increasingly integrated in and influenced by a globalizing world—should be central to citizenship education.

The discourse on citizenship education is important because the ways that citizenship is represented shape who will be included or excluded as good citizens, thereby legitimizing some groups while marginalizing others in the political arena. This situation is particularly relevant for immigrants because although immigration is one of

the primary factors reshaping the national-universal dynamic in citizenship (Sassen, 2004), they have experienced structural barriers to gaining full citizenship rights and to participating in politics (Jones-Correa, 1998; Junn, 2004). In fact, one of the longstanding roles of U.S. civic education has been to assimilate immigrants by pushing them to shed their ethnic identities in favor of broad civic ideals (Mirel, 2002).

Globalization is significant for citizenship because it is altering the historical responsibility of the nation state to develop informed, loyal citizens through public schooling (Ichilov, 1998; Law, 2004; Torres, 2002). While citizenship as a formal institution remains fundamentally attached to the nation state, it has become increasingly linked although in different ways with human rights and the global economy. These changes have created openings for the development of cosmopolitan democracy and global citizenship, areas traditionally bound to the nation state and national politics. Sassen (2003a, p. 16) described the implications for an emerging, more complex notion of citizenship:

Globalization makes legible the extent to which citizenship, which we experience as some sort of unitary condition, is actually made up of a bundle of conditions. Some of them are far less connected to the national state than the formal bundle of rights at the heart of the institution of citizenship. There are citizenship practices, citizenship identities, and locations for citizenship that are not as inevitably articulated with the national state as is the formal bundle of rights.

Sassen points out that citizenship is not simply detaching from its nation state moorings, but is instead reconnecting with it in the context of new forms of governance, politics, and political actors. Immigrants are key among these new actors (Sassen, 2004).

However, there is little research that explores the impact of the rich and dynamic “bundle of conditions” that signify the contemporary practices and identities of citizenship, nor has much attention been paid to the ways that diverse groups of youth

interpret and understand these emerging forms of citizenship. While educational researchers have begun to examine a global dimension to citizenship education (e.g., Banks, 2004; Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005) they typically have not included an explicit conceptualization of global citizenship, its purposes, and its applicability to the school curriculum. As well, there are few model programs that educators can look to with a specific focus on global citizenship and its relationship to the nation.

The purpose of this study¹ is to examine a case of diverse adolescents' "vocabularies of citizenship" (Carens, 2000), a concept that captures their beliefs and the tensions in making meaning out of the complexities of citizenship. Underlying this conception is an understanding of learning as socially constructed, in terms of the ways that adolescents' life experiences shape how they receive ideas and facts and are actively involved in constructing meanings (Adams & Carfagna, 2006; Cornbleth, 2002; Oldfather et al., 1999). We explored the students' vocabularies about two issues central to the evolving relationship of nations with their citizens: universal human rights and global citizenship. This was done in step with their participation in an international studies program, the *Pennsylvania Governor's School for International Studies*² (PGSIS). This state-funded, 5-week summer program teaches secondary students current scholarship and skills in political science, cultural studies, foreign language, and international affairs.

We contend that adolescents' beliefs about citizenship are "negotiated" within, across, and around levels of citizenship. Guided by Anderson-Levitt's (2004) assertion that global dimensions of education inhabit the national, and vice-versa, we focused on the ways that national citizenship, as an "incomplete" institution "embedded" in its social and political contexts (Sassen, 2003a, p. 14), is being redefined in dynamic relationship

to the emerging viability of global citizenship, rather than replaced. Because immigrants are at the center of this change process, we focused our investigation on the differences between students' from immigrant backgrounds (IM) with those from dominant culture (DC) families in order to understand the role of their perspectives for understanding citizenship. Guided by the extensive scholarly literature on immigrants and transnational citizenship, we hypothesized that IM students would understand the national-global dynamic of citizenship differently due to their transnational experiences than would DC students.

We agree with Reimers (2006) that in a global era, the responsibility of public schooling for developing democratic citizenship needs to address changing world conditions. This research is designed to contribute to these efforts by exploring the ways that a model global civics program facilitates adolescents' learning.

Citizenship in a Global Age

In this section, we develop our theoretical framework and review the relevant literature on citizenship under globalization and on immigrant youth. First we elaborate on the impact of globalization on citizenship. Then we outline a definition of global citizenship that we employ in this study, including a discussion of some of the tensions associated with them. Next we review the literature specific to transnationalism and transnational citizenship, considering its implications for immigrant students. Lastly, we use insights from our review of the literature to formulate our research questions.

The Transformation of Citizenship

The concepts of global and transnational citizenship framed and informed our inquiry. We use these terms to capture the changing meanings and practices of citizenship in light of globalization and its evolving relationship with the nation state. From this perspective, we understand citizenship beliefs as fundamentally complex, flexible, and multiple (Mitchell & Parker, in press; Ong, 1999; Sassen, 2003a). In other words, citizenship is not only a fixed legal status that nation states confer but also includes multiple beliefs, allegiances and identities about an individual's role in society (Howard & Gill, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

Globalization has raised challenges to the traditional understanding of citizenship as bounded to, and limited by, the nation state. A supranational form of citizenship is emerging based on shifting affiliations and solidarities within and outside of the nation state (Held, 2002). Two processes of globalization— global markets and the discourse of universal human rights— are transforming the nation state's control over citizenship, although from very different perspectives (Torres, 2002). Global markets play a key role because they require nation states to act more to promote their economies to a global audience and multinational corporations have become the key participants in the global economy (Carnoy, 2001). Universal human rights also weaken nation states because they presume a higher legal and moral authority independent of politics (Doyle & Gardner, 2003).

Some scholars argue that nation states are undergoing a process of “denationalization” in which certain national capabilities are being reconfigured at a global scale³ (e.g., Sassen, 2006). Denationalization³ points to the role of both an international elite, made up business officials and staffers of international organizations

and the flow of poor immigrants in re-shaping the practice of individual rights that were previously the exclusive domain of the nation state. These elites challenge the notion of allegiance to a single nation state through their exercise of dual citizenship. From a very different socio-economic position, both legal (but not yet naturalized) and undocumented immigrants make a similar challenge by claiming rights that were formerly restricted to legal citizens, such as the protection of human rights, the right to education for their children, and the claim to legalization for long-term illegal residents (Sassen, 2006). The immigrants make their claims based on international law and appeals to human rights, rather than national laws, which together suggest a *de facto*, informal citizenship.

While citizenship remains bound to the nation state most strongly in terms of the provision of formal rights, the process of denationalization has led to the emergence of new political spaces and subjects less articulated with the nation state, such as global activists (Sassen, 2003b). The emergence of global civil society has provided an institutional setting in which people can act as global citizens (della Porta & Tarrow, 2004; Tarrow, 2005). Global civil society is comprised of actors and associations that work to democratize the authority of transnational corporations and global institutions, such as the World Bank and World Trade Organization. These actors include non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and international bodies working for peace and security, such as the United Nations. These processes suggest a break down in the barriers between terms of civic affiliation such as nationalism and cosmopolitanism, which were previously considered contradictory (Urry, 2000).

Global civil society has grown as a reaction to the negative consequences of globalization. One of these consequences is the displacement of people due to uneven

international patterns of economic growth and trade, transnational community bonds, political and ethnic conflicts, and international immigration law, which separates them from national citizenship and the rights that it guarantees (Brysk & Shafir, 2004; Castles & Davidson, 2000). Globalization has made less developed nations more exposed to the changes of the global market, which leads to them becoming sending zones of new migrants. This situation has led to a citizenship gap: the exclusion of groups from citizenship, primarily refugees, migrants, and undocumented residents, as well as the formation of second-class citizens, which include women, children, laborers, and ethnic minorities, who have lesser membership rights (Brysk, 2002).

Defining Global Citizenship

For this study, we defined global citizenship as an ethical construct that is premised on the normative value of contributing to the creation of a better world, especially the responsibility to solve world problems. Furthermore, we conceive of global citizenship as having three fundamental characteristics, corresponding to moral, institutional, and political dimensions (see Dower & Williams, 2002). These dimensions are:

- 1) Membership in a world community with shared identity and ethical responsibilities (*moral aspect*)
- 2) Belief in human rights as a legal framework and in global institutions (*institutional aspect*)
- 3) Commitment with other global citizens to solve world problems (*political aspect*)

While the concept global citizenship is often used in a positive light to denote the spread of democracy and solidarity across cultural differences, it also contains several inherent

tensions or problems. Thus, we also outline the tensions corresponding to the three dimensions of our definition.

Membership in a world community does not presuppose a single ethic but, paralleling national citizenship, is based on a shared sense of responsibility to act on the betterment of the world among people with different and sometimes contradictory values (Dower, 2002). What they hold in common is a desire to cooperate and seek consensus with diverse people over their shared global problems, which suggests some form of shared commitment and identity.

One critique argues that membership in a world community is too vague and rootless, in the sense of lacking a true moral community (McConnell, 2002). This argument is based on whether one understands global citizenship as contradicting with national loyalties or as compatible with them. The former suggests that citizenship is fundamentally a legal conception and therefore requires a government for its expression (see Dower, 2002). If one believes that citizenship means blind allegiance to one's government and that civil disobedience has no place in politics, then global citizenship presents a major problem. The latter is based on the belief that people have a range of allegiances and that absolute loyalty to a nation is unrealistic, nor is it a requirement for national citizenship. If global citizenship does not require an individual to give up other commitments, then it cannot be considered rootless.

Belief in human rights provides the moral foundation for global citizenship and the legal framework for the protection of individual and groups rights in light of national and international violations (Brysk & Shafir, 2004). It works for global citizenship in a similar manner to the way that US citizenship is built on rights guaranteed in the

Constitution. This is possible because the concept of human rights does not rely on the authority of a limited political community but instead on the universal principle that all people share a set of intrinsic rights. Human rights are also understood as a moral alternative to the spread of a global market ethos (Spring, 2004; Torres, 2002).

The tension is whether human rights are truly universal or culturally-relevant values. The cultural relativist position maintains that because there are not moral absolutes shared by all, cultures should be judged according to their own values. As Held (1995) remarked, “Human rights discourse may indicate aspirations for the entrenchment of liberties and entitlements across the global but it by no means reflects common agreement about rights questions” (p. 115). Others have asserted that human rights are based on Western beliefs masquerading as universal values, a form of “human rights imperialism” (Huntington, 1996). Global citizenship, however, is not a fixed idea but, like national citizenship, has some broad shared beliefs while also allowing for diverse values. Appiah (1993), for example, suggests that global citizens’ cosmopolitan beliefs do not lead them to consensus but to engage with the experiences and ideas of others.

The role of *global institutions* is more problematic because they can be perceived as a means for powerful states to dominate weaker ones. However, there are several possible configurations for global governance, ranging from a formal world state to strengthening the world community. Archibugi and Held (1995, p. 13) described their vision of a more democratic world community as

A model of political organization in which citizens, wherever they are located in the world, have a voice, input and political representation in international affairs, in parallel with and independently of their own governments.

In fact, many scholars of global citizenship view the idea of a world state as hegemonic, preferring a broad cosmopolitanism that focuses on solidarity and understanding across differences (e.g., McDonough & Feinberg, 2003). Others assert that global democracy can exist without domination and cultural homogenization (Young, 2004).

Commitment with other global citizens to solve world problems is realized primarily through participation in global civil society, sometimes referred to as “globalization from below,” which is the institutional setting in which people can act as global citizens (della Porta et al., 2006; Muetzelfeldt & Smith, 2002). For global citizens, participation in global civil society includes working within your state to pressure government to take on responsibilities for global problems. For example, a global citizen might sign a petition pressuring their state politicians to support legislation canceling the debts of poor nations, or boycott companies that are damaging the rain forest.

One argument, however, is that it is idealistic to think that most people can participate in global civil society to solve world problems. This concern is especially relevant for less developed nations, where individuals are less likely to have the resources for global mobility. Clearly, only a small number have such resources, such as activists in global movements, business elites, and officials of international organizations (e.g. the World Bank) who are under a special set of rights and entitlements (Sassen, 2003a). Global action, however, can be understood as occurring in relation to local action, ranging from direct participation in global social movements to acting locally to influence national governments to behaving more responsibly in local communities. Dower (2002) described this relationship as “intend globally act locally,” noting that the significance lies in an individual’s moral concerns (p. 33).

Transnational Citizenship and Immigrant Youth

Transnational citizenship describes the ways that individuals, especially immigrants, exercise citizenship in some form across nation state boundaries and is part of the broader discourse on global citizenship⁴ (Fox, 2005; Johnston, 2003; Stokes, 2004). Citizenship status, in this sense, is not only legitimized by the state, as one scholarly tradition maintains (e.g., Tilly, 1998), but arises from the shared identity created and maintained in civic and political communities, such as ethnic migrant communities (Fox, 2005). In this regard, transnational citizenship “pertains to the aspects of belonging and recognition. Its main purpose is to acknowledge the symbolic ties reaching back to the countries of origin” rather than citizenship as a solely formal and legal status (Faist, 2000).

Much of the work on transnational and global citizenship has been concerned with the cross-border political status of immigrants, who maintain stronger citizenship loyalties and political connections to their countries of origin than in the past (Castles, 2000; Massey, 1995; Yuval-Davis, 1999). This situation has been described as “long-distance nationalism” (Anderson, 1992). Immigrants, particularly those who are members of transnational households, do not hold exclusive national identities and are beginning to think of themselves as global citizens (e.g., Beal & Sos, 2001). For example, in the most comprehensive study on immigrant assimilation in the U.S., a longitudinal study of 5,000 children of immigrants, after four years of high school adolescents were more likely to identify with the nationality of their home country than with being a U.S. citizen (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). For undocumented immigrants, global citizenship takes on another meaning as the basis of efforts to gain legal rights in their host nations.

Immigrants and their children often develop stronger national and ethnic identities when they are away from their national homelands (Asanova, 2005; Smith, 2003). The links that immigrants hold to their countries of origin through ethnic and social networks accentuate their difficulties to integrate culturally and politically in their new nation, suggesting that immigrant youth hold complex and fragmented notions of national identity and citizenship (Eisikovits, 2005; Hoeder, Hébert, & Schmitt, 2005; Suárez-Orozco, 2004b). Youth of immigrant origin, whether born in or outside of the U.S., have repeatedly been found to have greater difficulties in school than students with dominant culture backgrounds (e.g., Fry, 2003) and this effect increases with time spent in the U.S. (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). As well, their diverse political perspectives have led many immigrant youth to develop critical views of national government policies in their adopted nations and multiple national identities (Ichilov, 2005; Lister et al., 2003; Mitchell, 2001; Osler & Starkey, 2003; Ramos-Zayas, 1998).

Research Questions

In this section, we outline our research questions for this study and link them to our review of the relevant literatures. The following research questions guided our study:

- 1) In the context of globalization, in what ways do adolescents in the PGSIS make sense of the emerging complexities of citizenship, particularly the tensions between national and global attachments and beliefs?
- 2) How do adolescents from immigrant backgrounds understand these complexities, and do their understandings differ from non-immigrant adolescents' understandings?

One of the main themes that we identified in our review of the literature was the need for a conceptualization of citizenship that takes into the consideration the ways that globalization is changing the nation state's relationship to, and provision of, citizenship.

The implications are for an understanding of citizenship that embraces a wider range of beliefs and allegiances.

A second theme was the emergence of supranational forms of citizenship. We identified a need to address the civic education of adolescents with immigrant backgrounds due to the barriers they face to becoming full citizens. Despite their shared learning experiences in the PGSIS, we expected that that the IM students' transnational backgrounds would shape their interpretations of what they learned. Furthermore, from a transnational perspective, it is reasonable to expect that the immigrant students would be more aware of, and less resistant to, the global dimension of citizenship. Dominant culture youth might also be connected to global issues and citizenship, but would likely have different perspectives.

Case Study:

The Pennsylvania Governor's School for International Studies

The PGSIS is a five-week, summer program for approximately one hundred high school students from across the state. The program was initiated in 1984 by the State Department of Education, which provides the majority of its financial funding. Students are selected by geographic region, each of which provides a number of students proportional to their applicant population in order to ensure representation of all intermediate units within the state. The PGSIS aims to have an ethnically and racially diverse student body although there are not specific regulations for this type of diversity in the selection process.

The core curriculum is comprised of the following courses: Global Issues, Intercultural Communication, International Political Economy, Negotiation and

Negotiating the Global and National

Diplomacy, Global Citizenship, and Language and Culture (Brazilian Portuguese or Japanese). Each core course is given two times per week for a total of two hours. Each student also selects a concentration area, in which they are provided additional coursework in one of the following areas: a) cultural geography, b) global economic perspectives, c) the global bouquet: societies and cultures, or d) U.S. foreign policy, politics and law.

The PGSIS program contributed to a complex understanding of global citizenship through its teaching methods and curriculum. The courses and experiences encouraged the students to develop their own beliefs and interpretations of citizenship and human rights through class discussions. The Global Citizenship course was particularly relevant to this research. The instructor attempted to create an open classroom environment that supported discussion of these controversial and complex issues, an approach that is considered key to the development of civic knowledge (Hahn, 1998; Torney-Purta et al., 2001). The curriculum emphasized three topics:

- 1) Citizenship as a moral, in addition to legal, concept
- 2) The perspectives of diverse actors
- 3) Civic engagement as a bridge between the local and global

Citizenship was portrayed as a complex topic that was not strictly tied to legal status afforded by the nation state. The notion that cultural and ethnic groups understand citizenship differently, and thus that democratic citizenship contains diverse creeds, was also included. As well, the implications of immigration for citizenship were discussed and debated during one class. Lastly, the course and the program activities encouraged a notion of active citizenship in which civic engagement links the local and the global. The course included classes on service learning and a community service day.

Methodology

Participants

Of the 100 students enrolled in the PGSIS during the summer of 2005, 79 agreed to participate in this research study (see Table 1). Two of these students originally agreed to participate but did not complete the PGSIS program and therefore we excluded them from the data analysis. This left us with 77 students in the questionnaire sample. All of these students took the entry and exiting questionnaires. 50 of the students were female (65%) and 27 were male (35%). There were 19 ethnic minority students (25%), including African-American, Latino, Asian, and mixed-race students.

Insert Table 1 about here

19 of the students in the sample were of immigrant origin (25%), of which 13 were female and 6 were male. These students had immigrant backgrounds from Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, and Europe. In the case of six students of immigrant origin, Spanish was spoken at home. The home languages of the other thirteen students were Chinese, Italian, Sri Lankan, Turkish, Russian, Polish, Korean, Arabic, Malayalam, Yoruba, Hindi, Gujarati, or Ukrainian.

20 students were selected for interviews according to four categories: male dominant culture (DC) students, female DC students, male immigrant (IM) students, and female IM students. In the male immigrant category there were two Asian students, one African student, and two Latino students. In the female immigrant category there were two Middle Eastern students and three Latino students.

One challenge we faced in capturing a transnational perspective in the total sample was to operationalize the IM category and to identify criteria for their selection. For example, would a foreign-born student who grew up in the U.S. have the same transnational perspective as a student who was born in the U.S. but whose parents immigrated and maintained a home environment rich in their native culture and language? What about a student who was born in the U.S. to American parents but lived for several years in another country?

We operationalized the IM category by limiting the sample to students from families that maintained cultural and linguistic ties to their country of origin. We settled on the following selection criteria for this category: a) born in another country, or b) parents immigrated to the U.S., or c) lived in home with a non-U.S. cultural and linguistic environment. Data on their place of birth and home language(s) was collected by the PGSIS staff. We gathered further details of their home environment and background in the interviews. We also developed exclusion criteria for the cases in which a student matched one of the above criteria but still lacked deep cultural knowledge. Thus, we excluded students who grew up in a DC family but who had lived for a period in another country because they would not likely develop a transnational perspective or lead to significant interaction with local populations.

We defined the category of dominant culture students (DC) as those adolescents who did not speak a language beside English at home, were not born outside of the U.S., and who did not mention having an immigrant background during the interview. Our goal was to capture the individuals, regardless of their ethnicity, race or religion, who did not have international home cultures connected to lives in other nations.

Data Collection and Analysis

We used a mixed-method, case study approach to collect detailed and rich data on the students' beliefs about citizenship (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1984). A case study approach is ideally suited to understanding the subtlety and complexity of adolescents' beliefs about citizenship in a global age (Bassey, 1999). We also recognize the limits to generalizability for this case study because, as Lincoln and Guba (2000) suggest, there are "always factors that are unique to the locale" (p. 39). Quantitative analysis of the questionnaires was combined with qualitative analysis of the interviews, observations, and documents because we believed that multiple data sources and analyses would provide the best approach to exploring this topic (Bernard, 2000; Shulha, Wilson, & Anderson, 1999).

We collected data from interviews with 20 students, pre- and post-questionnaires with 79 students that were administered by an external evaluator, informal observations of the Global Citizenship class, and curriculum documents. The questionnaire data provides a picture of the total sample, while the interviews, observations and curriculum documents were more appropriate for exploring the complexities of the students' understandings and knowledge.

Our main sources of data was in depth, semi-structured interviews (Seidman, 2006). The interviews dealt with the topics of global citizenship and universal human rights. We coded the interviews using the constant comparative technique (Strauss, 1987). First, we read through the transcripts, noting when students' made statements or took positions on the topics of global citizenship and human rights, which formed the basic codes. The students' different positions on these topics formed the subcodes. We

then compared these subcodes with the scholarly literature on the coded topic. During this process, we periodically checked the data with the research questions.

The questionnaires were designed to gauge the impact of the program on the students' knowledge and attitudes. The questionnaires asked students to assess their knowledge of and attitudes towards global issues on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1=not very competent, and 4=extremely competent. We analyzed this data for the two groups of students by calculating the means, significance, differences between the groups, and the significance of these differences for each item. In addition, we calculated the eta squared (η^2) as a measure of association between immigrant origin and students' evaluation of their global knowledge and attitudes. Eta-squared is appropriate for addressing the practical (vs. statistical) significance observed among students in different groups attributable to differences in group means (Huck, 2004).

Results

Assessing Global Knowledge

Their students' responses to the questionnaires are summarized in Table 2.⁵ Their learning, represented by the gains in their scores on the questionnaires, was most prominent for three items on global issues: "Ideas about how the world could be organized in the future," "Understand how the process of globalization (global interdependence) affects the national interests of the United States and those of other countries," and "Understand how policy decisions on international issues are made." These items indicate that global governance, globalization, and global issues were key areas of learning for all students and that, according to their low entry scores on these

topics, they did not bring substantial knowledge of these topics with them into the program.

Insert Table 2 about here

The IM students rated their knowledge higher than the DC students on nine of the ten measures although the statistical measure of association (eta squared) between these differences and the categories of DC and IM students were small. The IM students also had higher overall gains in their scores than the DC students for six of the ten items. The three items on which the immigrant students had the comparative largest gains were on “Knowledgeable about how history has shaped the global problems and issues of today” (+0.32 vs. -0.02 for the DC students), “Understand how economic, political, cultural, technological and environmental forces impact current global issues and problems” (+0.47 vs. +0.28), and “Knowledgeable about other languages and cultures” (+0.47 vs. +0.28). The DC students’ highest comparative gains were on “understand the complexities of intercultural relationships and communication” (+0.33 vs. +0.10 for the immigrant students) and on “Understand how the process of globalization (global interdependence) affects the national interests of the United States and those of other countries” (+0.66 vs. 0.22). The IM students’ gains were concentrated in knowledge of global issues and cultures, particularly in terms of what has been described as perspective consciousness (Merryfield, 1998), while the DC students’ gained in cross-cultural understanding and U.S. national interests.

These data supports our expectation that the two groups came to the PGSIS with different knowledge and beliefs about the world and that they would receive the curriculum differently according to their experiences and backgrounds. However, they

were less helpful for showing what their beliefs were and the ways they understood the tensions and contradictions in citizenship. In the following sections we turn to the interview data to explore these tensions in depth.

Locating Citizenship between the National and Global

The interviews showed that the students held different beliefs about the feasibility of global citizenship and its relationship with the nation state. Their responses to these questions corresponded to three positions:

1) *Post-national Citizenship* (6 IM and 3 DC students): Our primary responsibility is to the human race and to our shared problems on this planet (see Archibugi, Held, & Köhler, 1998). Some form of global governance is needed to accomplish these goals.

2) *Cosmopolitan Patriotism* (3 IM and 6 DC students): We are “rooted cosmopolitans”—concerned with the human race while taking pride in, and actively supporting, our own cultural and political communities. Patriotism is not all-encompassing but neither is it irrelevant (see Appiah, 1998).

3) *Liberal Nationalism* (1 IM and 1 DC students): Global citizenship is a nice idea but largely impossible and undesirable so we need to focus on what is near to us. Nations states remain our best hope for resolving world problems and for helping all citizens of the world (see Tamir, 1993).

Six of the ten IM students fit the Post-National Citizenship category while only three favored Cosmopolitan Patriotism. In contrast, the DC students had a stronger preference for the Cosmopolitan Patriotism category, in which six of the ten DC students fit. Only three DC students fit under Post-National Citizenship. There was one DC and one IM student in the Liberal Nationalism category.

The nine students in the *Post-National Citizenship* category believed that citizenship is fundamentally a global responsibility and saw a diminished role for the nation state. This did not preclude them from recognizing the importance of being a good

citizen in the community and nation but asserted that we must first look to our responsibilities to the human race and the planet in order to improve society. Samir, a male IM student of Indian background, expressed this belief: “Everyone is born a citizen of the world and everyone is a global citizen. Global citizenship is something you do, like having awareness about issues and then acting on them.” This statement emphasizes the universal character of global citizenship, which is based on the idea that the concept of the “human race” is central to relationships between people rather than national identities and that we must work together independent of nationality to solve major global problems. Steven, a male DC student, explained this role:

I think it [global citizenship] needs to remedy tensions between nations, streamline communication. It would get around cultural barriers a lot. It would stop people from seeing people as “them over there.” I don’t know necessarily how it would work or when it would happen... I define it more as there are issues that need to be dealt with. Water for example is something global citizenship will have to deal with. It will have something to do with oil distribution and global warming.

Steven saw global citizenship as the link to make diverse nations work together to resolve tensions and major global issues. He believed that the lack of understanding between cultures as one of the major barrier to greater cooperation.

All of the students in the *Post-national Citizenship* category described global citizenship as an inherent condition that extends to all people regardless of where they live or their socio-economic condition. Nesrin, a female IM student of Turkish background, typified this perspective:

I believe everyone is a global citizen. Some [students in class] thought that people who were secluded from the world, like in the Amazon Rain Forest, couldn’t be global citizens because they don’t have resources like newspapers... So directly or indirectly everyone is a global citizen.

Negotiating the Global and National

Nesrin understood global citizenship as an inclusive status for all people, who are otherwise divided by levels of wealth, language, and culture. Her thinking points to an understanding of citizenship as a moral construction rather than as a legal status bestowed by governments.

The students in the *Cosmopolitan Patriotism* category balanced a concern for the world with a strong allegiance to their nation. While they supported the concept of global citizenship, they were wary of the implications of its universal underpinnings for national sovereignty, preferring to align their citizenship with the nation state. Robert, a male DC student, exemplified the way that these students understood the global-national relationship:

A lot of people were kind of afraid of the term “global citizenship” and thinking about how that is going to affect my national citizenship. Like the support I have from my own country, would that somehow be diminished? I think that was one of my major concerns. I guess the idea of being globally minded is good, but I am not sure I would be willing to sacrifice my national support for it.

These students expressed concern that global and national citizenship are at odds and that the adoption of one meant the “sacrifice” of the other. The majority of the *Cosmopolitan Patriotism* students (six of nine), including Robert, specifically mentioned the term “globally-minded” to describe their relationship with the world as a conceptual mechanism to avoid a conflict that with their national citizenship.

Several of the nine students in this category were also prompted by a fear that the universal nature of global citizenship requires conformity to a totalizing set of values and beliefs. For example, Susan, a female DC student, commented when asked about her view of global citizenship:

I think global citizenship is trying to get everyone to bend and live under one set of rules... It was hard for me to understand how people from all across the world could come together and live together under one set of morals and values.

Here Susan hit on one of the major differences between the Post-national Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Patriotism groups. She extended the “rules” of citizenship, which she uses in reference to formal laws, to an imposed package of “morals and values” as citizenship. In contrast, the Post-national Citizenship group, and in particular the IM students who made up the majority of the category, believed that democratic citizenship allows for a broad range of morals and values despite the requirements of citizenship status for some shared values, such as commitment to democratic principles.

The third category, *Liberal Nationalism*, only included two students, Thomas, a male DC student, and Simon, a male IM student of Chinese background. They believed that global citizenship is an important ideal but that it is impossible and unnecessary in the world today. Both pointed to imbalances of power and to the system of nation states as barriers to global citizenship, arguing that we should focus on what is at hand rather than reach for an abstract ideal. Thomas summed up this viewpoint:

My feeling was that you really can't have global citizenship. The only way to have global citizenship would be if some catastrophic event happened to the world and everyone was brought together... I feel like we could make the world a better place but I just don't think that we could have global citizenship.

Thomas and Simon believed that the concept of citizenship is fundamentally tied to the nation state because only it can provide rights and responsibilities. Simon explained:

There is nothing to compare it [global citizenship] to, you can't compare yourself to someone in Switzerland and say that I have these rights and this is what I owe to the world and I owe my nation this... A citizen is supposed to defend their country, it's written in almost every constitution. You have to defend your country if you are called upon, and how are you going to defend the world and against what?

For Simon, citizenship is primarily a formal legal status that a national government provides. His thinking is based on the nation state system in which citizenship is defined as loyalty to one nation and also in opposition to other nations, which is expressed in his questioning of “against what” world citizenship would operate. He had difficulty in imagining global citizenship or a world government because he understood their function as providing an exclusive status.

Imagining Global Governance

In the students’ discussions of global citizenship, there was a recurring tension in their beliefs about global governance. Most of them had difficulty in imagining what a global government would look like and how it would function. They tended to understand global governance in terms of a formal government rather than in the sense of a stronger world community.

Citizenship, a majority of students in the Cosmopolitan Patriot and Liberal National categories reasoned, is only valid in relationship to a government and therefore a global government is required for global citizenship to exist. For example, Roberta, a female IM student of Peruvian background, commented:

When I came here, I believed everyone was a global citizen. You are born in the world therefore you are a citizen of it. But now, I think someone brought up the issue, that in order to be a citizen you have to have a government and participate in it. And that struck a chord with me and made sense. I guess I don’t believe in global citizenship by definition, I believe in global awareness.

Roberta’s understanding of global citizenship changed from citizenship largely as identity with and membership in the human race to a focus on legal status and political institutions.

Negotiating the Global and National

Most of the students struggled to reconcile the coexistence of national and global governments. For example, Susan, a female DC student, remarked:

Clearly we can't solve problems on our own. But I feel that if we get a stronger one [global government], the U.S. [government] will just get even more mad. I just don't know. It's so hard to think about the idea. I like the idea and it makes sense that it would solve the problems.

Susan had a difficult time imagining how nation states would function with a stronger form of global government. Steven, a male DC student, believed strongly in the need for a world government but also commented on the way it would clash with national sovereignty:

Some people aren't even willing to give up state sovereignty for national sovereignty let alone national sovereignty to an international governing body. I think that it seems like organizations like the WTO [World Trade Organization] have a lot more enforcement power and control than organizations like the UN [United Nations]. If you give all these enforcement powers to the WTO, why can't the UN work like that?

Steven differentiates between two types of global governance that already exist in the world, economic and political. He suggested that the world community has given greater attention to the regulation of the global economy through empowering governing bodies than to political and social global problems that the UN is charged to resolve.

Other students concluded that some form of stronger global community is needed but that it should not take the form of a governing body. Rita, a female DC student, also argued for a shared ethos to produce greater cooperation between nations without a world government. She suggested:

While this far-reaching idea of international interaction is not even remotely a form of world government, perhaps it could work toward a consensus of ideas or at least an understanding of disparate ideas that will allow all countries to coexist. A world government would not be able to reconcile the many different cultures, societies, and norms that exist.

Rita referred to a shared ethos for holding countries in the world together built on “consensus” and “understanding” of cultural differences.

A minority of the students held the position that there is a strong need for a world government. While recognizing the difficulties of global governance, they asserted that the benefits outweighed the negatives of such an institution. Stuart, a male DC student, typified this position:

Personally, I think that a world government will be very needed in the future. I'm not sure how near in the near future, but it will be both desirable and needed... As everything in the world is now becoming more connected, such as new markets opening between China and Canada, we need some governing body with a... wide perspective on issues and affairs.

These students set aside the practical and political difficulties of global governance and focused on the increasing interdependency between nations as a rationale for a global governing body. While most of these students who preferred global governance did so for its contribution to political stability and peace, Stuart also supported global governance in part because it could facilitate global markets and international trade.

Locating Human Rights between Cultural Relevancy and Universal Status

The second topic we examined was universal human rights. The doctrine of universal human rights presupposes that all individuals are entitled to a legal status based on the protection of their dignity. This status is independent of the authority of national governments and supersedes national laws. As such, human rights at times come into conflict with national legal systems and their understandings of rights (Spring, 2004). The students' beliefs about human rights in relation to the nation took three main positions:

1) *Universal Rights* (7 IM and 3 DC students): There are inherent, natural rights that apply equally for everyone. These rights should be adopted by all nations (see Donnelly, 2003).

2) *Culturally-relevant Rights* (1 IM and 6 DC students): Universal rights are problematic because they threaten cultural diversity. If they are even possible, human rights need to respond to the unique cultural values of each society (see Cowan, Dembour, & Wilson, 2001).

3) *Nationally-sovereign Rights* (2 IM and 1 DC students): Human rights and international law are needed but they should defer to national laws. National sovereignty must be preserved even at the expense of the universality of human rights (see Bennoune, 2002; see Ignatieff, 2005).

Similar to their thinking on global citizenship, the IM youth more often supported the universal dimension. Ten of the twenty students fit into the *Universal Rights* category, including seven of the ten IM students and only three DC students. The *Culturally-relevant Rights* category accounted for seven of the twenty students, with six of the ten DC students and only one IM student. There were three students in the category of *Nationally-sovereign Rights*, one DC student and two IM students. While these categories represent the students' dominant perspectives, some of the students held views that had elements from two or more of these categories.

The twelve students in the *Universal Rights* category believed in universal human rights that should be enacted and enforced across the world. For example, Luis, a male IM student, commented: "Well, human rights, yes, that's really something that you have to grant to everybody no matter what religion and what culture. Like, it's just something that I think is a right for everybody." Luis understood rights as superseding religious and cultural differences based on their common humanity. Steven, a male DC student, also held a strong conviction about the need for universal human rights despite cultural differences. He commented:

This is where I become the cultural imperialist. Yes, I do think there can be [universal human rights]... Sure they're Western, you know, it's really like I'm pushing values on people but I feel that way. I think those human rights have

already been created and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is what they should be. And it is only elements within other cultures that are against it. I don't think that every Islamic person kills their wife. I don't think that they all practice honor killings.

While recognizing cultural differences, Steven avoided stereotypical portrayals of other cultures that have surfaced in the U.S. media and textbooks (Cruz, 1994). He did not see a contradiction with his belief in a shared set of rights and the flourishing of cultural differences, despite acknowledging criticisms of their "Western" foundations.

However, the strong conviction about the universality of human rights held by Luis and Steven was atypical. Most of the students in the Universal Rights category struggled to define rights precisely and were uncertain about their feasibility for adoption worldwide. Rita, a DC female student, expressed this sentiment:

On some level there is respect for human life, maybe not women's lives or children's lives, but the fact that everyone is struggling to stay alive no matter what their condition is, no matter who they love and who they hate.

Rita was unsure of exactly which rights all people shared universally, settling on the shared desire for "staying alive" for the basis of the universality of rights.

The seven students in the *Culturally-relevant Rights* category questioned the universal basis of human rights by arguing that rights are incompatible with cultural diversity. Thomas, a male DC student, reasoned: "You can't have a universal declaration of human rights because people of different cultures and different religions believe different things and they all conflict." Like the other students in this category, Thomas understood the concept of universality in absolute terms that would not allow for differences. These students doubted that one set of rights for all people could encompass the range of values that exist in the world.

Negotiating the Global and National

Students in this category took a relativist view of cultures that assumed we cannot judge the values and traditions of other cultures. For example, Angela, a female DC student, asserted that the universality of human rights is a threat to cultural differences:

I think that it [human rights] is kind of like globalization. People are trying to homogenize human rights for the entire world. I think there has to be secular decisions made based not even on countries but on culture and what they define human rights as. My suitemate is from Egypt and she believes in polygamy. I mean, I was not raised to believe in anything remotely like that... So I think it's impossible to have one unified set of human rights.

Angela noted the trend to global uniformity although without distinguishing between the different aims and effects fostered by globalization, which she used in reference to the global economy, and by human rights. Regardless, she raises a significant criticism of universal human rights, namely that it is a homogenizing force that undermines cultural diversity (see Spring, 2004, pp. 71-76).

However, not all of the students in this category viewed other cultures as above criticism. George, a male DC student, used examples of cultural differences to argue for culturally-relevant rights. For example, George stated:

I feel very firmly that they [universal human rights] aren't [possible] because there are so many different cultures. And yes, there is globalization but that doesn't stop there from being cultures that think it is acceptable to sacrifice a human being. We can't tell them, no it's not, because that's what they believe is right.

George's comment casting other cultures as "primitive" or "non-modern" recalls the division of the world that Wilinsky (2000) documented as a result of colonial representations of the non-Western "other" in school curricula. It also points out how the cultural relativist position can reinforce stereotypes that suggest a lack of experience with and understanding of non-Western cultures.

Stuart, Franklin, and Samir, the three students who made up the *Nationally-sovereign Rights* category, took the position that nations should have the final authority to determine human rights. They emphasized the sanctity of national laws and were suspicious of effort to make rights the same across the world. Comments made by Samir, a male IM student, typified this view:

I think national rights will always overpower any law unifying the entire world. I really do think national sovereignty and rights will overpower them. I look at things realistically, the way the world works and I go with that.

Samir pointed to the fragility of recent efforts to enforce human rights and international law to make his case. Franklin, a male IM student of West African background, struggled more than Samir over the question of sovereignty. He stated:

I don't know which one would take precedence because they're equal in that sense. I guess it depends on interpretation at that time. In America, the Constitution may hold greater value over the declaration of human rights. But in other countries, human rights may be more important to that country than their laws. So, I have no answer to that question.

Franklin saw national authority as the authority over human rights. From his perspective, a nation could choose to adopt human rights but there is not higher authority or moral imperative that would compel a nation to adopt human rights.

The Spread of Human Rights

A key tension in the students' statements about human rights was the question of how they would spread to the developing world. Twelve of the twenty students raised this issue, of which seven were DC students and five were IM students. They came from all three of the human rights categories (Universal Rights: 6 of 10 students; Culturally-relevant: 5 of 7; and Nationally-sovereign: 1 of 3). The DC students struggled with their concern for global problems while recognizing the position of the U.S. in the world and

trying not to reinforce U.S. cultural hegemony. The IM students also struggled with this issue, in some cases focusing on the tension between identification with a developing nation and with their status in the U.S. Furthermore, in contrast to the DC students' focus on culture, several IM students raised the issue of national development, especially economic inequalities, as a major influence on the practice of human rights.

These students feared that rights were a vehicle for the spread of Western values onto other cultures. As Cristina, a female IM student, asked, "Would it be an American bill of universal human rights?" Other students were also critical of the role of the U.S. government in imposing human rights on other countries. Angela, a DC female student, expressed this position:

I mean I'm so biased because I'm an American. I have really liberal beliefs of what human rights should be and I think it would be unfair of me as a Westerner to decide on what human rights should be for other countries.

For Angela, imperialism was an extension of the culturally-relevant rights argument against universal human rights. Roberta, a female IM student, also was critical of U.S. cultural attitudes toward human rights:

Obviously everyone is going to be for human rights— that we shouldn't kill civilians in war and we shouldn't torture anyone in war, that's just wrong. But at the same time, I am contradicting myself because it just seems like the environment I was brought up in [the U.S.] has a certain political ideology and it just doesn't put human rights first.

She drew on her transnational perspective to distinguish between U.S. cultural views on rights and the situation in other nations, criticizing the values held in her "new" culture. Roberta referred to international criticism of the U.S. as both a defender and violator of human rights in the international arena. Roberta further explained her beliefs:

I am from Peru and I visited last year and I saw deprivation and such a difference in the standards... I said, "Oh, you know look at these people. I am from them

and I could be them.” And yet I wanted to take care of myself and not worry about what happens to them. I could have been one of them. So that’s the reason why I question it.

Roberta did not let go of her connection to her country of birth, which kept her aware of the different meanings and implementation of human rights between wealthy and developing nations.

Nesrin, Roberta, and Samir, all IM students, framed the issue of the imposition of human rights in the context of economic inequalities between developed and developing nations. They argued that human rights are more difficult to practice in developing nations because economic pressures take precedence. For example, Nesrin drew on her upbringing in Turkey to make this point:

Because America has so much wealth, it’s easy for us to say, “human rights—kids can’t work” because obviously they’re surviving and their families are going to have food to eat. But in Turkey it’s like if these kids don’t work, their families are dying for it... I remember being in Turkey and I never really thought of it like that. I just saw the kids selling water bottles and I saw it as a way of life. They are not being forced, they just know they are poor and they have to do it. I don’t think we can tell poor families, “No, your kids can’t work and you can’t eat for the next week because human rights have to be universal.”

Nesrin pointed out that even if the moral values of human rights are equal in all nations, their implementation and practice will remain imbalanced as long as economic and social development remains uneven between nations. Her experiences in Turkey provided grounded examples of the different contexts for human rights between developed and developing nations. These three students were the only ones to point out economic and political development as a major issue in the adoption of universal human rights.

Discussion: Mapping Adolescents’ Vocabularies of Citizenship

The qualitative differences in the students' knowledge suggest that the two groups held distinct—yet at times overlapping—orientations to citizenship. The students' vocabularies articulated in different ways with the nation state, for which immigrant status was a key factor. The IM students favored universal positions on citizenship and human rights that emphasized common humanity, making up a majority of the Post-national Citizenship and Universal Human Rights categories. A majority of the DC students supported positions balancing the national with the global that gave a more central role to national sovereignty and a culturally relevant belief about human rights.

While both IM and DC students were represented in each of the three categories of vocabularies for global citizenship and human rights, the IM students' transnational experiences gave them different perspectives. Transnational perspectives were evident in the ways that the immigrant students switched between views based on the national interests of the U.S. to outsider perspectives that drew on their immigrant cultural backgrounds. Indeed, all of the IM students made references to the countries from which they or their families emigrated in order to explain and rationalize their beliefs yet this did not always lead to greater clarification of the issues. It seems that having a transnational perspective made these students more universally-oriented because they could better understand the experiences of a wider range of others.

One area where transnational and globally-aware perspectives were apparent was in knowledge of the context of economic inequalities between developed and developing nations. Only IM students called attention to economic inequalities as a major barrier to the adoption of human rights in developing nations. In each case, their views were grounded in their personal knowledge of economic life in a developing nation and

accentuated by their learning about the global economy in the PGSIS. Their transnational experiences made them question skeptically the function of human rights in a world divided by economic inequalities.

The DC student' beliefs, while interested in and in most cases supportive of some form of global citizenship and of universal human rights, were filtered by their identification as national citizens. Most of these students, however, would not describe themselves as highly patriotic; instead, their beliefs showed that they struggle to reconcile world changes with their faith in their nation. For example, in terms of human rights, the culturally-relevant emphasis of students in the culturally relevant rights category was likely influenced by the prevalent discourse in the U.S. of multiculturalism. This does not mean that they were not globally aware or supportive of rights but that their views were likely shaped by a national understanding of cultural diversity that emphasizes values of difference. The PGSIS curriculum was also a factor as it stressed the perspectives of diverse groups on citizenship and cross-cultural understanding.

Insert Table 3 about here

Yet background doesn't entirely explain the adolescents' vocabularies; it helps to explain some of the dynamics within and across the categories but not, for example, why Robert, Irene, Simon, and Roberta switched from a universal position on human rights to a more nationally-oriented position on citizenship (see Table 3). Thus, the differences between IM and DC students were only part of the picture. We emphasize that our analysis does not suggest a simplistic scenario in which the IM students held universal beliefs and the DC students were oriented toward national beliefs. As Table 3 shows, just over half (11 of 20) of the students took different positions on the national-global

relationship. Six of the DC students held different views along the global-national continuum for global citizenship and human rights while five of the IM students held different views.

For us, these switches between universal and national positions on citizenship and human rights represent a strong indication of the tensions along these issues, reflecting an unbundling of citizenship vis-à-vis the nation state in light of globalization. As Tomlinson (1999) has suggested, globalization creates “complex connectivity” that “affects people’s sense of identity, the experience of place and of self in relation to place” (p. 20). Thus, the apparent contradictions and tensions in the students’ statements can be attributed in part to the nature of these issues and the tenuous process of constructing their own vocabularies of citizenship. For example, both DC and IM students favoring universal rights and global citizenship struggled with the problem of maintaining diversity in light of these universal concepts. They attempted to reconcile their hopes for universal rights and their identifications with a global community without leading to cultural homogenization and the dominance of weaker nations. The students favoring a stronger role for national citizenship and culturally relevant rights understood universal values as a threat to the sanctity of cultures, especially “traditional” cultures. Yet, they tended to understand “other,” traditional cultures as at risk of homogenization while overlooking the effect on the diverse cultures within a modernized nation.

The curriculum of the PGSIS also played an important role in the development of these students’ beliefs. While the students’ backgrounds seemed to be the strongest factor, the curriculum facilitated these beliefs by introducing a broader conception of citizenship that allowed for multiple allegiances. As the findings showed, the majority of

the students had complex combinations of global and national views on citizenship and human rights that contrast with the strictly legalistic notions presented in civics classes. In the interviews and observations, students explored and reflected on these topics that they learned about during the program. In this sense, the PGSIS curriculum provided the students with a space to compare the scholarship on citizenship with their previously-held beliefs. Sometimes this connection was direct and sometimes it provoked further questions that led them to re-think their place in the world.

Conclusion

By highlighting the beliefs that diverse youth have about the relationship of citizenship with the nation state, we argue that in light of this research the question of education for either national or global citizenship makes little sense. Instead, this research suggests that new and differentiated forms of citizenship education are needed if all youth will have access to full citizenship. If these students' beliefs are at all typical, then these findings suggest that one-size-fits-all civic education programs concentrating primarily on national patriotism may push away linguistically and culturally diverse students.

We view the PGSIS as a model program for adapting civic education to meet global conditions. Drawing on this research, we propose two approaches for teachers and educators to consider in their efforts to reconceptualize civic education. The first approach is to integrate the globalization scholarship in civic education by focusing on the intersection of national with global issues and on transnationalism, such as immigration, the environment, human rights, poverty studies, and politics and civil society (see Author Reference; Olmedo, 2004; Parker, 2004). This approach would get around the simplified binary of civic education as either national or global, and would

recognize the experiences and insights of immigrant youth. As well, we suggest concentrating on the controversies and tensions in these topics in order to draw out the range of perspectives and interpretations.

Second, civic education should address, in addition to civic behaviors, attitudes, skills and knowledge, a conscious effort to help adolescents build flexible and multiple civic identities. Civic identity-building would recognize adolescents' public identities, teach them to see their diverse roles in an interdependent role, and help them to switch between these identities.⁶ Such an approach would facilitate all adolescents, especially children of immigrants, to connect their experiences and understandings of the world with the school curriculum and allow teachers to make the curriculum reflect their experiences (see Epstein, 2000; Suárez-Orozco, 2004a). The emphasis would be on the ways that global identities articulate with national and cultural identities. This approach is also significant for the DC students to understand the worldviews of minority group students and to counteract majority views that work to exclude minority adolescents from full citizenship.

We argue that adolescents' vocabularies of citizenship, especially the ways that they make sense of their civic knowledge based on their cultural and ethnic backgrounds, experiences and socio-economic position vis-à-vis the world system, are inherent to the notion of civic competency. The adolescents in this research did not simply receive information but actively interpreted and took positions on the knowledge and issues represented in the PGSIS curriculum, often with different conclusions. They are evidence that at least some youth understand citizenship through complex relationships of national and global elements and that, in contrast to the current civic education camps, the nation

Negotiating the Global and National

state is neither obsolete nor all-encompassing but is being recast in a different, still-evolving role. One of the broad goals of civic education is to respond to these changes.

References

- Adams, J. M., & Carfagna, A. (2006). *Coming of age in a globalized world: The next generation*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Anderson-Levitt, K. (2004). Reading lessons in Guinea, France, and the United States: Local meanings or global culture? *Comparative Education Review*, 48(3), 229-252.
- Anderson, B. (1992). *Long-distance nationalism: World capitalism and the rise of identity politics*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Centre for Asian Studies.
- Appiah, K. A. (1993). Citizens of the world. In M. J. Gibney (Ed.), *Globalizing rights* (pp. 189-232). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Appiah, K. A. (1998). Cosmopolitan patriots. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation* (pp. 91-114). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Archibugi, D., & Held, D. (Eds.). (1995). *Cosmopolitan democracy: An agenda for a new world order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Archibugi, D., Held, D., & Köhler, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Re-imagining political community: Studies in cosmopolitan democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Asanova, J. (2005). Educational experiences of immigrant students from the former Soviet Union: A case study of an ethnic school in Toronto. *Educational Studies*, 31(2), 181-195.
- Author Reference. (2006).
- Avery, P. G., & Simmons, A. M. (2000-2001). Civic life as conveyed in United States civics and history textbooks. *International Journal of Social Education*, 15(2), 105-130.
- Banks, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Bauböck, R. (2003). Reinventing urban citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 139-160.
- Beal, T., & Sos, F. (2001). Asian nationalism in the diaspora: The case of Taiwanese astronauts. In R. Starrs (Ed.), *Asian nationalism in an age of globalization* (pp. 124-143). Richmond, UK: Curzon Press.

- Bennoune, K. (2002). 'Sovereignty vs. suffering'? Re-examining sovereignty and human rights through the lens of Iraq. *European Journal of International Law*, 13(1), 243-262.
- Bernard, H. R. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Lanhan, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boyte, H. C. (2003). Civic education and the new American patriotism post-9/11. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(1), 85-100.
- Brysk, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Globalization and human rights*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Brysk, A., & Shafir, G. (2004). *People out of place: Globalization, human rights, and the citizenship gap*. New York: Routledge.
- Carens, J. H. (2000). *Culture, citizenship and community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carnoy, M. (2001). The demise of the nation-state? *Theoria*, 97, 69-81.
- Castles, S. (2000). *Ethnicity and globalization: From migrant worker to transnational citizen*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Routledge.
- Cornbleth, C. (2002). Images of America: What youth "do" know about the United States. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 519-552.
- Cowan, J. K., Dembour, M.-B., & Wilson, R. A. (Eds.). (2001). *Culture and rights: Anthropological perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruz, B. C. (1994). Stereotypes of Latin Americans perpetuated in secondary school history textbooks. *Latino Studies Journal*, 1(1), 51-67.
- Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66-89.
- della Porta, D., et al. (2006). *Globalization from below: Transnational activists and protest networks*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- della Porta, D., & Tarrow, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Transnational protest and global activism*. Lanham, MD Roman and Littlefield.

- Donnelly, J. (2003). *Universal human rights in theory and practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Dower, N. (2002). Global citizenship: Yes or no? In N. Dower & J. Williams (Eds.), *Global citizenship: A critical introduction* (pp. 30-40). New York: Routledge.
- Dower, N., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Global citizenship: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Doyle, M. W., & Gardner, A.-M. (2003). Introduction: Human rights and international order. In J.-M. Coicaud, M. W. Doyle & A.-M. Gardner (Eds.), *The globalization of human rights* (pp. 1-19). Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Eisikovits, R. A. (2005). Perspectives of young immigrants from the former USSR on voting and politics in Israel. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 33(4), 454-475.
- Epstein, T. (2000). Adolescents' perspectives on racial diversity in U.S. history: Case studies from an urban classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 185-214.
- Faist, T. (2000). Transnationalization in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture. 23(2), 189-222.
- Fox, J. (2005). Unpacking "transnational citizenship". *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 171-201.
- Fry, R. (2003). *Hispanic youth dropping out of U.S. schools: Measuring the challenge*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gee, J. P. (2000-2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.
- Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hahn, C. L. (1999). Challenges to civic education in the United States. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA civic education project* (pp. 583-607). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Held, D. (1995). Democracy and the new international order. In D. Archibugi & D. Held (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan democracy: An agenda for a new world order* (pp. 96-120). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Held, D. (2002). The transformation of political community: Rethinking democracy in the context of globalisation. In N. Dower & J. Williams (Eds.), *Global citizenship: a critical introduction* (pp. 92-100). New York: Routledge.
- Hoeder, D., Hébert, Y., & Schmitt, I. (Eds.). (2005). *Negotiating transcultural lives: Belongings and social capital among youth in comparative perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Howard, S., & Gill, J. (2001). 'It's like we're a normal way and everyone else is different': Australian children's constructions of citizenship and national identity. *Educational Studies*, 27(1), 87-103.
- Huck, S. W. (2004). *Reading statistics and research*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ichilov, O. (2005). Pride in one's country and citizenship orientations in a divided society: The case of Israeli Palestinian Arab and Orthodox and Non-Orthodox Jewish Israeli youth. *Comparative Education Review*, 49(1), 44-61.
- Ichilov, O. (Ed.). (1998). *Citizenship and citizenship education in a changing world*. London: The Woburn Press.
- Ignatieff, M. (Ed.). (2005). *American exceptionalism and human rights*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnston, P. (2003). Transnational citizenries: Reflections from the field in California. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 199-217.
- Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between two nations: The political predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Junn, J. (2004). Diversity, immigration, and the politics of civic education. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 253-255.
- Law, W.-W. (2004). Globalization and citizenship education in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(3), 253-273.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (2000). The only generalization is: there is no generalization. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case study method*. London: Sage.
- Lister, R., et al. (2003). Young people talk about citizenship: Empirical perspectives on theoretical and political debates. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2).

- Massey, D. (1995). The new immigration and ethnicity in the United States. *Population and Development Review*, 21(3), 631-652.
- McConnell, M. W. (2002). Don't neglect the little platoons. In M. Nussbaum (Ed.), *For love of country?* (pp. 78-84). Boston: Beacon Press.
- McDonough, K., & Feinberg, W. (2003). *Education and citizenship in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Merryfield, M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.
- Mirel, J. (2002). Civic education and changing definitions of American identity, 1900-1950. *Educational Review*, 54(2), 143-152.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship: Transnationalism, multiculturalism, and the limits of liberalism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 51-78.
- Mitchell, K., & Parker, W. (in press). I pledge allegiance to... Flexible citizenship and shifting scales of belonging. *Teachers College Record*.
- Muetzelfeldt, M., & Smith, G. (2002). Civil society and global governance: The possibilities for global citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(1), 55-75.
- Nash, M. A. (2005). "How to be thankful for being free": Searching for a convergence of discourses on teaching patriotism, citizenship, and United States history. *Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 214-240.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2002). Patriotism or cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review*, 19(5), 3-6.
- Oldfather, P., et al. (1999). *Learning through children's eyes: Social constructivism and the desire to learn*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Olmedo, I. (2004). Raising transnational issues in a multicultural curriculum project. *Urban Education*, 39(3), 241-265.
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 243-254.

- Parker, W. C. (2004). Diversity, globalization, and democratic education: Curriculum possibilities. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 433-458). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. n. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ramos-Zayas, A. Y. (1998). Nationalist ideologies, neighborhood-based activism, and educational spaces in Puerto Rican Chicago. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(2), 164-192.
- Ravitch, D. (2002). September 11: Seven lessons for the schools. *Educational Leadership*, 60(2), 6-9.
- Reimers, F. (2006). Citizenship, identity and education: Examining the public purposes of schools in an age of globalization. *Prospects*, 36(3), 275-294.
- Sassen, S. (2003a). Citizenship destabilized. *Liberal Education*, 89(2), 14-21.
- Sassen, S. (2003b). The repositioning of citizenship: Emergent subjects and spaces for politics. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 3(2), 41-66.
- Sassen, S. (2004). Going beyond the national state in the USA: The politics of minoritized groups in global cities. *Diogenes*, 51(3), 59-65.
- Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shulha, L. M., Wilson, R. J., & Anderson, J. (1999). Investigating teachers' assessment practices: Exploratory, non-foundationalist, mixed-method research. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 45(3), 304-313.
- Smith, R. C. (2003). Diasporic memberships in historical perspective: Comparative insights from the Mexican, Italian and Polish cases. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 724-759.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spring, J. (2004). *How educational ideologies are shaping global society: Intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, and the decline of the nation-state*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stokes, G. (2004). Transnational citizenship: Problems of definition, culture and democracy. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. (2004a). Formulating identity in a globalized world. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millenium* (pp. 173-202). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. (2004b). Imperial feelings: Youth culture, citizenship and globalization. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education for a new millennium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigrants*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Szelényi, K., & Rhoades, R. A. (2007). Citizenship in a global context: The perspectives of international graduate students in the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 51(1), 25-47.
- Tamir, Y. (1993). *Liberal nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2005). *The new transnational activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1998). Where do rights come from? In T. Skocpol (Ed.), *Democracy, revolution and history* (pp. 55-72). Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Torney-Purta, J., et al. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Torres, C. A. (2002). Globalization, education, and citizenship: Solidarity versus markets? *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 363-378.
- Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty-first century*. New York: Routledge.

Negotiating the Global and National

- Westheimer, J. (2007). Politics and patriotism in education. In J. Westheimer (Ed.), *Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools* (pp. 171-188). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilinsky, J. (2000). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*.
- Young, I. M. (2004). Modest reflections on hegemony and global democracy. *Theoria*, 103(1), 1-14.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). The 'multi-layered citizen:' Citizenship in the age of globalization. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1(1), 119-136.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Students

	Total Number of Students	Percent of All Students
Gender		
Female	50	65
Male	27	35
Race/ Ethnicity		
African American	2	3
Asian American	7	9
Caucasian	58	75
Hispanic/Latino	6	8
Mixed Race	1	1
Other	3	4
Immigrant Background		
	19	25

Table 2: Participants' Evaluations of their Global Knowledge

	Immigrant Origin	N	Before	After	Average Difference	Sig. Level	η^2 (before and after)
I am knowledgeable about contemporary international and global issues	Yes	19	3.00	3.32	.316	.111	1.2%
	No	58	2.84	3.16	.310	.010	0.8%
I understand how economic, political, cultural, technological and environmental forces impact current global issues and problems.	Yes	19	2.84	3.32	.474	.070	0.1%
	No	58	2.90	3.17	.276	.044	0.8%
I understand the complexities of intercultural relationships and communication	Yes	19	2.37	3.47	.105	.000	3.2%
	No	58	2.72	3.05	.328	.031	6.7%
I have been exposed to ideas about how the world could be organized in the future (differently or "alternatively") in order to better address some of the world's major global problems and issues	Yes	19	2.26	3.21	.947	.003	0.0%
	No	58	2.22	3.05	.828	.000	0.8%
I am knowledgeable about how history has shaped the global problems and issues of today.	Yes	19	2.84	3.16	.316	.285	0.1%
	No	58	2.90	2.88	-.017	.905	2.1%
I understand how the process of globalization (global interdependence) affects the national interests of the United States and those of other countries	Yes	19	2.95	3.37	.421	.042	1.1%
	No	58	2.74	3.40	.655	.000	0.1%
I understand how policy decisions on international issues are made	Yes	19	2.42	2.95	.526	.096	1.2%
	No	58	2.18	2.79	.614	.000	0.7%
I am knowledgeable about other languages and cultures	Yes	19	2.84	3.32	.474	.132	0.2%
	No	58	2.76	3.03	.276	.062	3.2%
I am good at seeing issues from another person or group's perspective	Yes	19	3.37	3.47	.105	.682	3.1%
	No	58	3.07	3.19	.121	.411	2.2%
I can place myself in the shoes of someone who has had very different life experiences than me.	Yes	19	3.26	3.47	.211	.297	3.1%
	No	58	2.95	3.16	.207	.214	2.9%

Table 3: Students' Beliefs about Human Rights and Global Citizenship

		<i>Students' Beliefs About Human Rights</i>			<i>Students' Beliefs About Citizenship</i>		
		Universal Rights	Culturally-Relevant	National-mediated	Post-National	Cosmop. Patriotism	Liberal Nat'lism.
U.S. Male							
	Robert						
	Steven						
	George						
	Thomas						
	Stuart						
U.S. Female							
	Irene						
	Angela						
	Rita						
	Susan						
	Theresa						
U.S. Totals		3	6	1	3	6	1
Immig. Male							
	Simon						
	Victor						
	Luis						
	Franklin						
	Samir						
Immig. Female							
	Gabriela						
	Roberta						
	Cristina						
	Isabel						
	Nesrin						
Immig. Totals		7	1	2	6	3	1

Notes

¹ This research was funded in part by a Hewlett Grant from the University Center for International Studies of the University of Pittsburgh.

² All names of the students have been changed to protect their anonymity.

³ Others scholars suggest that citizenship should be considered postnational, arguing that the role of the nation state in providing citizenship is disappearing (e.g., Soysal, 1994).

⁴ National, state-centered citizenship is also being challenged from below. Some scholars have called for “urban” citizenship that embodies a formal status of local citizenship independent of the nation state as a basis for cross-national, cosmopolitan citizenship (Bauböck, 2003).

⁵ We also examined the questionnaire data according gender and ethnicity and found only minor differences for both of these categories, which were often less than 0.10. This is unsurprising because the program attracted students who were highly motivated and knowledgeable about the world, typically some of the top students in their grade year, which would level differences otherwise evident in a larger student population.

⁶ Gee (2000-2001) discusses this approach in terms of the individual constructing their own identity and in relation to others, which he describes as “discourse-identity” and “affinity-identity” (p. 100). Here we refer specifically to adolescents’ civic identities, in the sense of understanding their roles or potential roles in different political settings, rather than as general subjectivities. While researchers have given considerable attention to the former, there has been little research or theorization on the concept of civic identity that moves beyond national identity.