BECAUSE A CENTRAL MISSION of social studies is to foster citizens, and because world history is a social studies subject, one might expect world history teachers to incorporate ideas of citizenship into their courses. However, in this study, I find that the three high school world history teachers from the same Midwestern state frequently missed opportunities to draw on, identify explicit references to, or connect with topics related to citizenship in teaching the subject matter. This is not to say that the teachers did not discuss ideas of citizenship, but they often did so without intentionality. Also, when questioned about the place of citizenship in their K-12 teaching, they gave several reasons for omission: they felt pressured by coverage of the curriculum; they did not envision their role in terms of citizenship; and they perceived limited space for going beyond the provision of factual historical information.

For the purposes of this study, “citizenship” is defined as “membership in a particular community.” While broad, this definition goes beyond the common idea that citizenship involves rights and responsibilities, and implies that citizenship is flexible in the size and number of communities with which one identifies.
These memberships might be global in nature or nation-oriented, the latter of which is used to denote ideas of citizenship that are tied to a particular state. These ideas may be nationalistic, but may also be framed in terms of a particular country’s conception of citizenship. In this study, the participants were asked not only about a range of nation-oriented ideas, but also about global concepts that include human rights and international agreements. The participants held beliefs about citizenship that aligned with the field’s expectations, but were hesitant to explicitly enact any of these ideas. Why, then, was there an apparent disjuncture between the world history teachers’ stated beliefs about citizenship and how they specifically brought these topics into their classes?

World history has been considered as an ideal place to examine global notions of citizenship. Brian Girard and Lauren McArthur Harris suggested that world history courses are a logical place to engage global citizenship that better represents the interconnectedness of twenty-first-century society, highlighting the overlap between world history and global citizenship goals in making cross-cultural connections, understanding multiple perspectives, and pursuing inquiry. Carey A. Watt, a historian arguing for a less Western approach to world history, similarly suggested that global citizenship can help students both to make sense of and see relevance in the vast world history curriculum. John P. Myers warned that, in spite of the potential for world history classes to create global citizenship competencies, results are not guaranteed and instead require challenging student beliefs. In his analysis of the shortcomings and possibilities of world history, William Gaudelli theorized that these courses are part of a larger “world curricula” that should include a more global approach that includes citizenship.

If some scholars view world history as a reasonable place to include global citizenship ideas, one might wonder how and if the state in this study indicated that to teachers. Did the world history standards specifically include conceptions of citizenship—global or otherwise? In this Midwestern state, there were no specific content standards about citizenship in the world history standards. Yet there were process and skill standards connected to all high school courses that included citizen involvement and action in local, regional, and global issues and policies. Additionally, the standards in effect at
the time of the study began with an explanation of how global and national citizenship were important concepts in all social studies courses. In essence, the state suggested that global (and national) citizenship mattered in world history courses, but did not center it in specific content.

While this paper includes ideas of global citizenship, I also broaden the scope of citizenship beyond global to include other ideas that are present in the participants’ world history classes. This allows for the consideration of how the participants thought about and enacted principles of citizenship that are not global, but nation-based. Some may assume that world history teachers would only draw on concepts of global citizenship in their classes. World history educators likely teach or were trained to teach more subjects than this one. As a result, they may identify more broadly as history or social studies teachers who value and invoke nation-based ideas of citizenship in their classes. By only looking at global conceptions of community and membership, I would be limiting the examination of how the participants see themselves.

In summary, the purpose of this paper is to explore how three world history teachers, despite their stated rationales, nevertheless addressed and reinforced notions of citizenship in their classrooms, both implicitly and explicitly. In doing so, I address the following questions: (1) How do the research participants talk about their beliefs about citizenship? (2) How are these ideas of citizenship manifested in their world history classes? (3) How do the teachers’ beliefs and praxes compare to ideas of citizenship found in scholarly literature?

**Framework**

Given the centrality of citizenship to social studies education, I draw on two bodies of literature as important to framing and analyzing the research results of this study: teacher decision making and figured worlds (a sociocultural learning theory that assumes that individuals adopt culturally influenced roles and identities in order to engage in interactions with others). Although the teachers’ dispositions toward citizenship and its place in social studies education are important, the ways in which teachers decide what to include and how to conceive of their roles as teachers also shape the learning opportunities that students have.
**Teacher Decision Making**

The choices that teachers make in part determine how and what students will learn. Teacher decision making is affected by many contexts, ranging from one’s understanding of the subject to one’s understanding of self. Practitioner choices about what to include and exclude from the mandated state standards shape how the curriculum is delivered and what students have the opportunity to learn. These choices are often influenced by teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning, among other factors.9

A teacher’s orientation toward her subject matter directly impacts the decisions that she makes for her lessons and their enactment. Hugh Munby and Tom Russell’s study revealed that the way novices learn to teach is affected by their understanding of the content.10 Some conceptualize social studies as disciplinary-focused (such as history), rather than an interdisciplinary effort infused with citizenship. Pamela Grossman, Suzanne Wilson, and Lee Shulman’s work reinforced this idea through their finding that an individual teacher’s conception of content contributes to the ways they think about their subject and the instructional choices they make.11 Research on the teaching of history affirms these studies. Suzanne Wilson and Samuel Wineburg found that subject matter knowledge and beliefs shaped participant approaches to history teaching.12 Additionally, Catherine Cornbleth’s study built on that finding by showing that teachers’ historical understanding led to greater inclusion of marginalized groups in U.S. and world cultures curriculum, especially as enacted through separate curriculum units rather than curricular integration.13 Although this research is not especially recent, the challenges of teaching world history still echo these findings. Specifically, teachers draw from world history curriculum that focuses largely on Western Civilization content and leaves out the largest populations of the world.14 Curricular debates over what to include in world history go beyond content-specific questions. For example, Lauren McArthur Harris and Robert Bain found that the vast range of content poses obstacles for teachers in choosing what to teach.15 These studies demonstrate the degree to which teacher choices are influenced by teacher beliefs and understanding of content.
Just as a teacher’s disciplinary orientation affects her teaching, so too does her experience. Scholars do not agree on the role of experience in teaching, which may reflect exposure to specific content or overall years of practice. Some scholars suggest that experienced teachers have more complex understandings of what they teach, but others emphasize individual differences in teacher development. The idea that experience in the classroom leads to fuller understanding of content seems indisputable. Kathryn Cochran and Loretta Jones found that experienced science teachers have more complete pedagogical content knowledge than inexperienced teachers, observing that more nuanced and complex understandings were evident in their study participants. One wonders how this study involving science content, which usually centers around a distinct particular area such as biology or physics, would differ from social studies, which includes many related fields such as history, psychology, and economics. Do these teachers develop the same kind of fluency if they are assigned different content throughout their career? With this in mind, Kelly Carter highlighted the domain-specific knowledge of experienced teachers and a depth of understanding of routines, content, and students, which suggests that teachers benefit from practice with both content and classroom procedures. Pamela Grossman emphasized that experience is itself a benefit because teachers create new knowledge in the classroom. Scholars like Deborah Britzman, however, questioned how this highly developed knowledge occurs by suggesting that there is no clear trajectory or pattern to demonstrating such skills.

These studies reflect the individual development of teaching fluency, both in content and routines. A subject such as world history, with its expanse of content—chronological, regional, and thematic—raises questions of coverage, in addition to the ways teacher experience shapes instructional choices. All of these studies point to the challenges of developing and fostering a level of teacher comfort with content or classroom practices. Exposure to specific content as opposed to overall length of teaching career may play into the role that experience affords teachers. In this study, experience can be considered through opportunities to teach either citizenship-related content or world history content, or through duration of teaching career, among other factors.
Teacher decision making takes on many forms, from the specific details of classroom management to more general curricular choices. In curricular decision making, world history teachers operate like other social studies teachers who function as “curricular-instructional gatekeepers.” According to Thomas Misco and Jung-Hua Tseng, the ways in which teachers operate as gatekeepers are dependent upon the context in which they are teaching. Even in the face of a prescribed curriculum, mandated textbooks, pacing guide, and final assessment for world history courses in a school district, teachers enact the curriculum, making daily choices about what to emphasize or what to ignore or downplay. Moreover, Cornbleth noted that teachers play an important role in curriculum in use and can be seen as more powerful determinants than instruction documents and materials. Their choices regarding content and strategies affect student learning—not just about subject matter, but also about the dispositions and values that inform students’ understanding of citizenship and their civic responsibilities.

Figured Worlds

One way of thinking about the situative nature of teaching (and learning) is through figured worlds, a theory asserting that people adjust their role in relation to their interactions with others. Dorothy Holland and Jean Lave’s interest in these relationships and activities focused on “how individuals develop in practice.” Holland et al. argued that individuals commonly develop personal identities from roles and positions that align with a particular cultural activity. Individuals shape the world around them, while also being influenced by the world that they are helping to create. Researchers were able to view the impact of social processes on individual’s roles and identities; these impacts are traceable through people’s ideas, as well as artifacts such as official school records, essays, and photographs. The role of power structures is critical to the theory as well. Dorothy Holland and Kevin Leander expressed that power dynamics are visible in the ways in which people are positioned to each other, as well as within the hierarchies of institutions. They elaborated on this by saying that not all actors have the same access to spaces, and they challenge those structures differently as well.
et al. borrowed from both Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu in their concept of power; they employed Foucault in an individual’s agency to challenge authority, while they borrowed Bourdieu’s idea of separate social universes that have their own sets of rules. In applying this idea to education, Rosemary Russ, Bruce Sherin, and Miriam Gamoran Sherin explained that such theories position the individual teacher as part of broader systems across time and space. Individual teachers are part of the power structures present in the schools, though they may adopt roles of authority in some cases and subordinate in others. World history teachers determine the content that their students are exposed to in class, but also shape that content based on what they see as valued beyond their classrooms—the social and cultural capital that schooling is supposed to provide students.

While Holland et al. suggested that figured worlds could relate to any number of settings, many scholars employed this framework in educational settings specifically. In the context of schooling, figured worlds implies that learning occurs through interactions with others; the curricular choices that teachers make shape those interactions. Classrooms are constructed spaces in which teachers and students assume various roles. In Indigo Esmonde and Jennifer Langer-Osuna’s study, the researchers examined how power dynamics and hierarchies shifted between traditional math classrooms and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics’ 2000 standards-based classrooms. The implications of the study suggest that teachers play a critical role in classrooms by recognizing power structures at play and facilitating student agency. While much of the educational research on figured worlds focuses on student identity, others have explored teacher identity, as this study does. Within world history classes, both teachers and students may be part of figured worlds that result from studying the world’s history through nationalist lenses that are part of larger societal conversations about allegiance to one’s nation-state or adoption of a more globally oriented identity as part of the classroom culture.

If one applies the idea of figured worlds to secondary teachers, specifically in world history, one can imagine the situative factors at play. World history teachers in the U.S. operate within a figured world shaped by multiple demands: the school context; the state or district curricular framework; their own self-understanding as citizens and as teachers, etc. A world history teacher who is
rooted in a certain understanding of citizenship education or deeper knowledge of U.S. history might (deliberately or inadvertently) teach world history by positioning U.S. events as a focal point, even in lessons ostensibly about other parts of the world.

Making Connections

Each of these sets of ideas help explain how teachers enact the curriculum in their classrooms. Teachers hold ideas about what it means to be a citizen, which are shaped by their individual identities. James A. Banks labeled those identities as national, global, and cultural; these are cross-cutting factors that influence how an individual teacher considers citizenship, both for themselves and their students.38

In an ideal setting of perfect congruence between teachers’ ideas of citizenship and their practice, a classroom observer would see alignment between these two elements. Of course, given mandated curriculum standards, pressures on daily practice, and a host of other factors, such congruence is rarely achieved. To take one example: if a teacher believes that universal human rights protection is important, then he might design lessons about the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. However, a teacher might avoid this topic in a given school district due to news about the recent reconsideration of the declaration by the United States that creates a political context for teaching that makes the teacher uncomfortable. Thus, the teacher is bound by the context of the figured world in which he sees himself. Whatever the state or school district says about the curriculum, the teacher will, on a daily basis, act as a gatekeeper by deciding what information and opportunities students have to learn about specific content.

Teachers will always navigate classroom dilemmas and the tensions between what they are supposed to teach, what they might wish to teach, and what they feel pressure not to teach. Other factors, such as the role of master narratives or identity politics as manifested in a school setting, may also inform a teacher’s approach to citizenship education. Many forces influence teacher beliefs, behavior, and curricular enactment, to be sure, but the focus of this study is on ideas about citizenship and their place (or lack of place) in the teaching of world history.
Method

This study, conducted in the spring of 2018, included three world history teachers from a Midwestern industrial state. The teachers and their districts are profiled below, but each participant taught world history courses composed of tenth graders in a district outside of a midsize industrial city. All three teachers received their teacher preparation at the same large Midwestern university. All names of teachers and districts are pseudonyms.

Participants

Justin Hill, Eagleton. Mr. Hill was an experienced teacher of twenty-three years, approximately the last fifteen of which he taught at Eagleton High School. His certification endorsement is History. He previously taught in a nearby school district in which he predominantly taught Civics in addition to U.S. History. During the period of this study, he taught World History and Advanced Placement U.S. History, two courses he teaches regularly. Mr. Hill identifies professionally as a world history teacher and prefers teaching world history to other subjects. On the days of the observations, Mr. Hill’s classroom was set up for a Paris Peace Conference simulation activity. The students were seated in clusters of desks with a group of four in the middle of the classroom for the country leaders (e.g., Woodrow Wilson and David Lloyd George).

Eagleton High School is a suburban, public high school. The enrollment of Eagleton is just under 1,000 students, and over 80% of the student population is identified as White, non-Hispanic. The rest of the population is divided as follows: less than 1% American Indian/Alaska Native; 5% Asian; 3% Black, non-Hispanic; 5% Hispanic; and 3% identifying as two or more races. Additionally, 20% of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The 2016-2017 graduation rate for Eagleton was 96.5%.

Scott Louis, North Boyle. Mr. Louis was a novice teacher, having just completed his fourth year of teaching. He has taught in North Boyle for the length of his career and is a graduate of the high school as well. His teaching endorsement is Social Studies. During the study, he taught four sections of World History and one
ninth-grade U.S. History section. Mr. Louis prefers to teach world history in part because he wants to be able to focus on one content area. His background is in political science and he prioritizes student engagement in planning his lessons. Mr. Louis’ classroom was set up in seven “tables” of four desks each during the observations, although this was the regular configuration of his classroom.

North Boyle High School is located in a small city adjacent to a midsize industrial city. North Boyle has just over 1,100 students. The school is predominantly White, non-Hispanic, comprising 60% of the student population. The rest of the population is comprised of less than 1% of American Indian/Alaska Native; 7% Asian; 18% Black, non-Hispanic; 7% Hispanic; and 7% identifying as two or more races. At North Boyle High School, 29% of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The 2016-2017 graduation rate for North Boyle was 92.9%.

**Nora West, Greenville.** Ms. West was an experienced teacher of twenty-two years. She has endorsements in History and Journalism. For the first fifteen or so years of her career, she taught journalism before switching to teaching history courses only. During this study, Ms. West taught five sections of World History, including one section of Honors. The observed classes did not include the Honors section. Ms. West prefers U.S. history to world history, as that reflects her coursework. Ms. West’s classroom was set up in rows with desks in groups of two; the classroom was not set up specifically for the observed lessons.

Greenville High School is considered a suburban school. The enrollment is just over 1,000 students. It is the most diverse of the three schools that were part of the study. The student population is comprised of 33% White, non-Hispanic; 31% Black, non-Hispanic; 17% Hispanic; 4% Asian; less than 1% American Indian/Alaska Native; and less than 1% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. An additional 13% of students identified as two or more races. Greenville High School had 45% eligibility for free and reduced-price lunch. The 2016-2017 graduation rate for Greenville was 90%.

It should be noted that the participants in this study did not share the focus on citizenship that the researcher brought into these interviews. The teachers were willing to discuss their notions of
citizenship and how they impacted the lessons that I observed, but they were not a point of emphasis for them. As acknowledged by the participants in their follow-up interviews, they were more concerned with the curricular pressures that they felt, which rarely were centered on teaching ideas of citizenship, whether global or nation-oriented. I am sympathetic to their challenges as world history teachers, because I taught social studies and primarily world history in my seventeen years of teaching public middle and high school. This experience affected my role as researcher, both because it added to my perspective and because the teachers were aware of my teaching experience. It gave me credibility with them, but in at least two cases, the teachers made statements acknowledging my experience in ways that noted the discomfort or pressure they felt by having me in their classrooms. These sentiments made me careful about my actions or statements to the participants. I was conscious of making statements that might suggest that my experience gave me greater authority or expertise than they had.

Data Generation

The study had three phases of data generation. First, each of the teachers completed a Likert scale questionnaire comprised of statements representing various conceptions of citizenship (see Appendix). These questionnaires were completed electronically before the classroom observations, and were not discussed or consulted prior to the observations (the replies, however, informed some questions posed in the follow-up interviews). It is important to note that the questionnaire did not offer the opportunity for the participants to clarify statements, though the teachers were given this opportunity during the follow-up interviews.

The second source of data was field notes taken during classroom observations. I observed two sections of each teacher’s classes for three to four days each. I allowed the participants to pick a set of connected lessons that they felt constituted a unit. I did not ask the teachers for particular content, just that the lessons were connected content from their view. Assessments or school holidays constrained the number of days of observation. I audio recorded the observations and consulted them for the sole purpose of cross-
checking the field notes as needed. In the case of Ms. West and Mr. Louis, I was also provided with materials from the lessons that I observed.

Finally, the third data source consisted of semi-structured follow-up interviews with each of the participants. We scheduled these at the convenience of the participants, approximately a month after the observations. I reviewed both the questionnaire responses and the field notes to contextualize and add questions for the follow-ups. Mr. Hill and Mr. Louis each had an interview approximately 50 minutes in length, while Ms. West had two interviews due to a scheduling conflict during the first interview; the two interviews totaled approximately 65 minutes and contained repeated questions.

Data Analysis

With data generation complete, the follow-up interviews were transcribed using NVivo Transcription software. The responses to the Likert scale questionnaire were analyzed separately for individual responses and comparison between participants. The transcripts, lesson materials, and field notes were reviewed several times and then coded with software, using a mix of open and closed coding. Because I was interested in the participants’ attitudes about citizenship and whether/how they might inform their teaching of world history, I used a priori codes that included “cosmopolitanism”; “global citizenship”; “nation-oriented”; “participatory”; and whether a topic was excluded from the curriculum. These codes developed out of the types of citizenship noted in the literature and served as the basis of the items in the questionnaire. Even with these initial themes, codes were added as the researcher identified relevant ideas in the reading of the data. Some of the other codes added during the second and third phases of the coding process included references to classroom citizenship as well as missed opportunities to include citizenship ideas during a lesson. Within the parent code of “opportunities missed,” two child codes denoted whether that opportunity was acknowledged by the teacher or the researcher. These codes were added as an attempt to offer a fuller picture of the ways in which the curriculum was enacted. In examining these codes, I sought themes and patterns that drew on teacher thinking and the roles they expressed. Additionally,
I considered how these themes showed how teachers make decisions about teaching citizenship ideas in their context as world history teachers. Through elaboration of the teachers’ explanations, as well as examination of their lessons, readers will be able to relate this case to other world history classes and teachers.41

**Limitations**

This study has clear limitations. Essentially a pilot study, it had three participating high school world history teachers. However, the findings are still representative of the ways many world history teachers think about citizenship in their classrooms. These particular teachers paralleled how other world history teachers spoke about incorporating U.S. elections in their classes in my previous work, as well as Carly Muetterties’s mixed methods study in which teachers said in a survey that they believe citizenship is part of their job, but in follow-up interviews said that they don’t teach it.42 This limited case study confirms that, while these participants also acknowledge the value of citizenship education, their teaching of citizenship concepts is limited or unintentional.

The data included in the study represent limited observations in the participants’ classrooms. I recognize that limited lessons and discussion do not provide a full picture of the teachers’ instructional practices, nor of their opportunities to incorporate citizenship ideas into other units. The questionnaires, interviews, and observations serve to offer insights into the teachers’ understandings and their application in a specific lesson, with the opportunity for the participants to provide context and understanding.

The study is also influenced by the ways in which I, as the researcher, think about world history instruction, particularly as a former teacher of the subject. My own experiences shaped not only how I viewed the instruction of my participants, but also the ways in which we discussed citizenship and instruction. I am certain that my experience as a teacher influenced how the participants spoke with me about their own instructional practices and ideas. There were moments where the teachers acknowledged my teaching background in their comments or asked questions that related to my practices as a former teacher or current teacher educator.
Findings

The participants’ teaching practices did not fully depict their beliefs about citizenship. While these world history teachers showed interest in global concepts of citizenship, they also embraced a variety of national ideas of citizenship. The participants identified curricular constraints or pressures as inhibiting factors to including ideas of citizenship. These perceived pressures varied among participants, although all mentioned the overwhelming nature of the curriculum. Despite that each participant did teach lessons that seemed to offer opportunities to elaborate on ideas of citizenship (although as a national construct), they often did not take up the themes of citizenship at all. The following findings depict how these world history teachers view citizenship generally, as well as how—despite these constraints—they see it as relating to their teaching of world history.

Citizenship is Valued, But Not Enacted

Based on the answers in both the questionnaire and follow-up interviews, the participants were supportive of ideas of citizenship. All three participants stated that citizenship is important as a goal of schooling, especially in social studies. World history courses in particular seem like a logical place to incorporate global citizenship ideas, and one might argue that these courses can also address nation-based ideas of citizenship. For example, as students study the world, they might consider the rights that all humans have and the connections between human beings, regardless of national origin. In this study, each participant taught lessons that allowed for the exploration of citizenship ideas, but not necessarily in robust ways, including lessons on parts of the United Nations. The teachers did not widen their discussions in ways that would have connected the historical content with aspects of citizenship, past or present. For example, in a simulation of the Paris Peace Conference, there was narrow discussion of self-determination for groups of people, but this was not mentioned beyond its presence in Wilson’s Fourteen Points.

In the questionnaire, all participants agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:
• A social studies teacher’s job is to help students acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function in their own country and in an interdependent world.

• Students’ lives are affected by others, inside and outside their own countries. Schooling can provide students with ways for addressing injustice globally.

• Nations should guarantee human rights and join international agreements to defend them.

• Students should learn to recognize and understand cultural differences, so they can work together with other people towards shared goals.

These statements imply both a global and nation-based perspective; in doing so, they also imply a “rooted” idea of global citizenship, an aspiration to value others through an understanding of one’s localized experiences. In this way, the statements represent the bridging of national understandings of membership while making connections across borders. The teachers may have been more comfortable with these statements because of their nation-based elements.

Similarly, participants implied the significance of global understandings in helping a nation to resolve its own problems. While this idea is not specific to ideas of global citizenship, it does imply an interconnectedness between the United States and other places. A statement from the questionnaire read, “Understanding how people in other countries address their problems does not help us solve our own nation’s problems.” The participants all disagreed with this statement, which suggests that they see applicable knowledge between nations. This is a common application of history: the expectation that people can learn from the past actions of others. This approach may also imply that the teachers view these ideas as only applicable to historical content due to their own comfort and orientation to the content.

The participants espoused global ideas during the interviews as well. Mr. Louis was focused on how applicable he found the questionnaire statements to his thinking about his teaching. He connected the questionnaire ideas to lessons that he planned to teach about genocides and human trafficking. Mr. Louis explained how he connects to global citizenship through action: “You know, to get thinking about these problems and see what they can do,
however big or small. I mean I always try to tell them, whatever you can do about something.” For Ms. West, she saw her school’s diverse ethnic and racial make-up as preparing her students to better understand the world; her view again emphasized the idea that global citizenship begins in the local community.46 Mr. Hill’s belief in the need for global ideas was based on concerns over U.S. involvement in the rest of world. He said, “You need to be a global citizen because the United States is a global power. Whether you want to agree with that or not or how we get involved, we simply are.” Mr. Hill’s concern was less rooted in the local, instead focusing on how the U.S. factors into the global community/polity or international relations. In each case, although less directly for Mr. Hill, each participant considered the students’ local situation tied to a need for an understanding of what it means to be a member of a global community. More than just what the participants valued in thinking about citizenship, their teaching was likely framed by why they valued those ideas in the first place and shaped by their initial understanding of the concepts or content.47 Yet, how do these ideas held by the participants’ translate into their teaching? Do the teachers bring these viewpoints into their courses? Ms. West’s lessons centered on post-World War II issues and actions, including the topic of European refugees. During Ms. West’s preview of a lesson that students completed online, one student asked about refugees and whose responsibility they were. The student related the issue to the Syrian refugee crisis. Ms. West replied that what was happening with Syria’s population was the responsibility of Syria because that was where they had lived. The conversation then quickly returned to the historic content at hand. This treatment of refugees did draw on ideas of national citizenship, but it might have done so more robustly, for example, by referencing U.N. positions on the Syrian refugee crisis or the potential rights of the refugees. The student’s question indicated interest in what individuals or organizations were responsible for helping these people who found themselves without a nation-based claim of citizenship. By limiting the conversation to a single nation’s responsibility instead of engaging more broadly with the student’s question, Ms. West exercised a role as gatekeeper.48 She curtailed what might have been a discussion of contemporary human rights and ushered it back to the logistics of the assignment.
While the issue of refugees largely concerns ideas of global citizenship and human rights, participants were also asked specifically about their convictions with respect to nation-based ideas of citizenship. Believing in ideas of global citizenship does not preclude one from identifying with national affiliations as well. The participants echoed this approach. The three world history teachers agreed with the following statements from the questionnaire:

- Citizenship education should include teaching about American ideals and Constitutional principles.
- Citizenship education should focus on voting rights and electoral participation.

While these statements do not indicate where these concepts should be taught, the teachers saw value in teaching American concepts of citizenship education. Because citizenship is so often equated with nation-based views (for example, current debates over who should be allowed to claim citizenship at birth in the United States), it is unsurprising that the participants would find these important. It may also be unsurprising that they see these ideas as particularly relevant to U.S. history or civics courses. It may also relay the resistance to change from their own education experiences that Virginia Richardson saw in her study of pre-service teachers.49 For example, Mr. Louis discussed that his university education was largely centered on the study of U.S. government and principles of democracy.

With this mind, it is less surprising that participants shaped discussions of citizenship from a nation-based perspective. Mr. Hill identified with voting: “So when we vote, when we participate in government, it impacts us. It impacts the world.” With this statement, Mr. Hill underscored how U.S. rights of citizenship have ripple effects on other countries and, thus, he prioritized national rights over global ones. Ms. West included CNN’s school news program to keep her students aware of current events. She specifically mentioned that, through CNN, students could learn about Supreme Court decisions, among other events. Therefore, while students might learn about world events from the broadcast, Ms. West’s instruction focused on the implications of these events for American society. Mr. Louis did not elaborate on the specific U.S. principles he saw as important, but spoke of different national responsibilities for ensuring human rights of their citizens. In these
ways, the participants reinforced citizenship as a nation-based concept. Each not only acknowledged the nation-based statements in the questionnaire, but also indicated the significance of this in their elaborations about their answers and courses.

These beliefs were on display in the participants’ instruction. In class, Mr. Louis reinforced the responsibility aspects of citizenship, emphasizing this aspect over rights. This focus on responsibility to fellow citizens showed during a group project on Latin American countries. Mr. Louis introduced and assessed the project based on tasks that each partner was to complete, including specific topics such as holidays and foods. In part, Mr. Louis structured the assignment this way for the purpose of individual accountability, but he also explained to students that they were responsible to complete their tasks for their partner. During the follow-up interview, he stated the ability to work in groups was an important way in which he was preparing students to be productive citizens. He made decisions about classroom activities that reinforced American ideas of what it means to be an active member of society, but did so without explaining this connection and seemed to assume that students would associate these experiences with being a productive national citizen. This might have been an articulated lesson for students in what it means to belong and be part of a community, but Mr. Louis did not express his system in this way.

Why might the teachers’ stated beliefs about global citizenship have not been more vividly reflected in their teaching? Possibly, they felt that these were the views that the researcher saw as “right,” although they had not discussed any citizenship concepts with the researcher until the follow-up interviews. Mr. Louis suggested during the follow-up interview that he thought about the researcher’s beliefs, “I mean I felt like a lot of the questions, the answer that you’re probably looking for in terms of like what would make for a good citizen, I feel like I really try and push that stuff, so I felt like the questions were pretty easy to answer.” This implies that Mr. Louis’ answers were part of a role he assumed in response to the researcher’s presence, creating a figured world based on what he felt the researcher believed to be the responsibilities of a world history teacher. By contrast, in his teaching, Mr. Louis’s identity was no longer shaped by his participation in the research, but rather may have reflected his regular practices that include some indirect qualities of the types of citizens that he hopes
his students would become. However, he did not directly share this goal with the students themselves. The students, as with the discussions of refugees with Ms. West, were unlikely to link these ideas to citizenship. As a result, even as the participants considered the global concepts that were endorsed in the questionnaire, these ideas were most likely unrecognized by the students in the classroom.

**Notions of Citizenship are Present**

Although the participants largely discussed how they did not specifically incorporate their beliefs about citizenship into their world history courses, they still sent messages about citizenship through their instructional choices. Some of these instances were intentional, such as how they perceived classroom communities through rules. Other concepts of citizenship were unintended, but no less significant in their classrooms.

Each of the teachers had ways in which they saw students as citizens of their classrooms—often about responsibilities to classmates or the learning environment. Ms. West and Mr. Louis considered these ideas when prompted by the researcher, yet Mr. Hill was more intentional. He described each of his classes as a microcosm of larger society. In so doing, he hoped to foster citizenship. This was evident in the Paris Peace Conference simulation. On the first day of simulation, Mr. Hill introduced class by asking students to note if their seat partners were in class. He framed it as mutual responsibility of the students to look out for each other, to see if students were present and help each other after an absence. Part of this, as Mr. Hill acknowledged, is practical for taking attendance, but also reinforces what he sees as part of the responsibilities of being part of a community. Another aspect of this belonging that Mr. Hill sought to nurture through his classroom activities and routines was decision making:

> I think it is an active part of citizenship in a sense in a pluralistic, democratic society because they also have voice and I hope agency. And, sometimes I’ll put in front of them: “I could take a fork in the road and I’m leaning in a certain direction, but I can make a couple directions work, here are our two directions, let’s vote on it.”

Mr. Hill was infusing ideas of participatory citizenship into his classroom that echo American ideals. His conscious use of notions of citizenship provided a way for him to model his vision of what a
good citizen is: one who votes and one who cares for his community. He did not express these as ideas of citizenship explicitly to the students, but he did articulate the dispositions that he wanted students to develop.

Mr. Hill also reinforced participatory views of citizenship in the running of the Paris Peace Conference simulation. The students were organized into four groups: France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Italy. Each group had their own cluster of desks and was represented by one leader at the negotiating table in the center. Each country had one vote, and the country groups were to reach consensus as they voted on different post-war solutions. The solution that had the most votes passed. The manner of conducting the simulation emphasized voting by simple majority as opposed to the actual events of the Paris Peace Conference, which were dominated by France and the United Kingdom, with Woodrow Wilson seeing few of his Fourteen Points considered and Vittorio Orlando feeling Italy had been disrespected by the process. By not including these aspects, Mr. Hill demonstrated to students that voting by simple majority is how solutions are reached, in spite of the actual events of the conference. Mr. Hill remarked that he would have liked to have taken more time to explore more accurate representations of the conference, but he wanted each country group to feel that they had an equal voice. He also felt constrained by finishing the simulation before spring break. Yet these were his curricular choices; he had decided both to enact the simulation and how to have students engage in it. He was acting as a curricular gatekeeper,50 but he was also responding to the pressures he felt to package and structure content in certain ways based on how his school calendar is developed. He appeared to be influenced by an expectation that his students’ break would mark the end of the unit, so they would begin something new after the break. It is hard to tell if this was his perception of how best to manage student learning or if the expectation came from outside—parents, administrators, or even students—but his role in managing student learning was impacted by his perception of his role in making those decisions.51

The participants reinforced ideas of citizenship often without saying they were doing so, and possibly without thinking about their actions in that way. When asked to consider their actions, participants did see them as consistent with values they equate
with citizenship. The ways in which they framed these ideas encouraged students to follow rules and recognize this as their place in the classroom community. In turn, the classroom community represented how they should act in the school as a whole and, one might assume, beyond the school walls as well. In some cases, this was deliberate, but in many other ones, these largely nation-based views of responsibility and voting were unconscious reflections of the teacher’s views.

**Opportunities for More Explicit Teaching of Citizenship**

The teachers and researcher found that the observed lessons contained ready connections to citizenship in spite of the previously mentioned constraints that participants experienced. While reflecting on the observed lessons, two participants mentioned that there were additional opportunities to draw on citizenship principles. Mr. Louis mentioned that the observed lessons did not include much about citizenship, but that his future lesson on human trafficking would allow students to consider human rights violations across international borders. He had an activity with articles about human trafficking planned, but lamented that he would not be able to have students do something about the problem: “That makes me want to have them do a human trafficking awareness video that they could post online, but they’re going to jigsaw and then they’re going to discuss some common questions…” Mr. Louis admitted that he could do more to encourage activism in his students, but he expressed time constraints. Mr. Hill similarly saw potential for lessons infused with citizenship, but felt that he had to make other choices. In the simulation of the Paris Peace Conference, he commented that he might have done more to raise issues of human rights in the student debates or emphasize civic participation. Clearly, these teachers valued citizenship through action, aligning with both the C3 Framework as well as Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne’s social justice element in their typology of citizenship education. Social justice represents the most robust form of citizenship education, which shows that these teachers aspired and saw the opportunities to develop these ideas in students. Yet their belief that if they do not cover certain content then their students may seem unprepared on the state test has a stronger pull on their curricular choices.
As an observer, I also noted opportunities that the teachers had to infuse their lessons with discussion about citizenship. In Mr. Hill’s simulation, students discussed Wilson’s Fourteen Points, allowing for consideration of self-determination and the right of groups to choose a national identity. There was some discussion of this section from Wilson’s peace plan during the simulation, but students did not really have the opportunity to delve into what self-determination could mean beyond the interests of the countries that decided the treaties that resulted from the Paris Peace Conference. While this is a nation-based orientation to citizenship, it had the potential to bring in issues of choosing one’s connections to others, of building rights and responsibilities of citizenship that make sense to people. Activities such as these shape student learning not only through the materials and opportunities given to students, but also through those not made available.

In Ms. West’s class, students had several opportunities to engage in issues of citizenship through discussion of human rights. Students completed a series of online lessons during the observations, including one on the Tiananmen Square uprising in China. It might be more challenging to focus the students on global citizenship or cosmopolitanism through this lesson, and Ms. West seemed to be concerned about revisiting Chinese history another time during the World History course. As she explained to the class:

We’ve talked about China a little bit, but now we’re going to be looking at their more recent history. The first section is opinion. Do you think it is important to have information about your friends? Do you think it’s important to know about Chinese history? Of course, the answer is yes, but talk about why it’s important.

Ms. West’s approach to studying Chinese history was more related to showing why China is important to them, with the reason being that China is/was an important trading partner of the United States—as opposed to considering the Tiananmen Square uprising as a human rights violation that the rest of the world witnessed. Ms. West’s choice echoes her concerns about covering the historical content that is in the intended curriculum as she saw it.

These opportunities, while apparent to me or in retrospect to the teacher, were steered away from discussions about citizenship due to other priorities, perceived time limitations, or competing pressures. Whether noted by the participant or researcher, ample opportunities
existed in the observed classes to include ideas about citizenship in these teachers’ lessons. So why didn’t they include citizenship more often? In part, these teachers have a compartmentalized view of social studies in which the study of history is separate from civics. They have created a figured world in which history—particularly world history—is in its own bubble. The concern over coverage of eras and regions in terms of historical content is their primary focus.

**Discussion**

A significant aspect of the findings of this study is that all three participants identified with a range of citizenship ideas. They embraced concepts of citizenship that were both nation-based and global in nature. One might expect that in-service social studies teachers would believe in these ideas of citizenship since the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) encourages the active preparation of informed citizens in all social studies disciplines (although it is important to note that not all teachers have an affiliation with, are familiar with, or follow national or state organizations of social studies teachers).\(^{54}\) Based on both the questionnaires and follow-up interviews, the participants agreed with NCSS’s stance generally. Still, they all acknowledged that they were hesitant to enact these beliefs in their courses. It is this hesitancy to enact concepts of citizenship in their courses that suggests a significant disconnect between world history and citizenship education.

This discrepancy seems to lie in the distinction between abstractly valuing citizenship as a purpose of social studies education and not seeing it as an expected part of world history instruction. The roles that these teachers assumed as both social studies and world history educators appeared to impact their actions of approaching their world history classes as a discipline only. Teachers with a general social studies orientation tend toward integrating all of the disciplines within a course, but a specific disciplinary orientation focuses on one subject. Wilson and Wineburg suggested that experienced social studies teachers have deeper understandings of content the longer they teach, but, in another publication, they also indicated that pre-existing understandings of history among pre-service teachers influence how they approach history education.\(^ {55}\) Viewing history as a distinct subject from the rest of the field has
clear implications. History classes have too often been framed as merely studying a succession of facts. This perception of history drives the ways in which these teachers configure their classes, not just because of what might be on a state test, but also in how they operationalize an intellectual paradigm about the teaching of world history that does not prioritize citizenship education. Yet history is part of the domain of social studies and, therefore, this separation between history and citizenship is artificial.

One way to consider how these educators construct their roles as world history teachers in relation to citizenship is through their experience. Contrary to the notion that more years of teaching corresponds to overall greater skill with content and management,\textsuperscript{56} years of service was only one factor in the enactment of citizenship ideas.\textsuperscript{57} The more uncomfortable a teacher is with the curriculum or content, the more unlikely she is to look beyond coverage issues, it might appear. Ms. West’s lessons were full of connections to citizenship, but her concern was over testable content. While she had taught for over twenty years, world history was a new subject for her, one that she was less than excited to embrace. Mr. Louis had far less teaching experience than the other participants, and this showed in his approach; he wanted to fuel student engagement and this sometimes led to general questions that were challenging to connect to content or citizenship. Unlike the other two, Mr. Hill’s comments and instruction indicated a more nuanced understanding of the curriculum, but he did not push students to explore global ideas of citizenship. His years of teaching world history and some experience with civics showed in his outlook on the classroom, but he was still limited in how he included global citizenship during the observed lessons. These observations illustrate that years of experience alone do not equal an integrated approach, but, rather, experience is relative to involvement with either world history or citizenship content.

Finally, the willingness of world history teachers to include citizenship directly relates to their perceptions of their role in delivering curriculum. The incongruity between the participants’ views of citizenship and inclusion of them lies in the constraints they felt. Russ, Sherin, and Sherin stated that teachers and their roles do not take place in a vacuum, but are enacted within broader structures.\textsuperscript{58} Undoubtedly, for these world history teachers, local and
state power structures exert influence on their instructional choices to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the factors previously described. Ms. West looked to the state curriculum for what it allowed and prescribed her to teach; the state standards and tests clearly impacted how she thought of her role as a world history teacher. Avner Segall explained how several teachers, in spite of their disdain for state testing, still looked to the test in guiding their instruction, as Ms. West did. Mr. Hill was constrained by his concern over other culturally accepted practices, such as trying to remain politically neutral. Conversely, Mr. Louis was confined in some of his teaching practices by what he believed were the expectations of him as a relatively new teacher. As Holland and Lave suggested, the participants were shaped by the expectations they brought to their role while simultaneously shaping the learning of their students. Although outside of their classrooms, these teachers lauded the importance of citizenship skills and education, they neglected those sentiments in the roles they assumed as world history teachers. Their ability to navigate the blurred lines between specific content and more general purposes was lost to the figured world of teaching world history amid state testing and state curriculum.

**Significance**

As previously stated, a goal of social studies education is to foster citizenship. This implies that all disciplines within social studies have a role in this development. World history is one such area, but one that is complicated by its apparent focus beyond the U.S. and national contexts of citizenship. Still, while this study does not seek to produce generalizable results, it does offer insight into how the participating teachers made decisions about and engaged with the expected curriculum. These are ideas that extend beyond the frame of citizenship into how teachers identify as educators of a particular discipline such as world history. This approach demonstrates a tension between disciplinary and social studies orientations, which affects how narrowly curriculum is enacted. World history teachers navigate a uniquely complicated path among the vast historical content associated with the course, but they can also lose the ability to make broader connections that aid student understanding.
Considering the possibilities of incorporating conceptions of citizenship into courses where connections are not as obvious as in government, civics, or U.S. history provides an opportunity for reflection about the place of citizenship principles throughout social studies curriculum. A way of considering this is to use citizenship as a tool to examine issues in society, such as access to drinkable water or technology. This opens ways for both teachers and students to frame world history content to allow for questioning of how nations and their residents interact, as well as notions of global constituencies. Additionally, it would help teachers to fulfill this stated purpose of a social studies education if they had clear content-linkage in their standards. Aspirational sentiments or process standards offer opportunities for teachers to include citizenship in their world history courses, but, realistically, with the constraints of a packed curriculum, world history teachers need more than hopeful expectation that the standards of many states offer.

Beyond including citizenship in the curriculum, there is a need to consider how social studies teachers are prepared for their classrooms. Research suggests that practitioners do not develop at the same trajectory, nor will they acquire the same skills based on their personal practical knowledge. Still, teacher preparation programs might emphasize contextualizing historical knowledge with other disciplines within the field of social studies. With this in mind, how can teacher preparation programs help pre-service teachers navigate the demands of content disciplinary knowledge with broader goals of social studies education?

Conclusion

For many social studies teachers, the concept of citizenship belongs in certain spaces, such as government and U.S. history courses. Citizenship is, however, regarded by academics as a core concept of the field. Likewise, knowledge about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship is viewed by the field’s professional organizations and by many individual teachers as an important outcome of a complete social studies education. As a social studies subject, world history offers opportunities to reinforce and foster citizenship in students. While this may present creative challenges for world history teachers, the inclusion of citizenship ideas in world history courses serves
to complicate and deepen student understandings of their roles as citizens, nationally and globally. With this in mind, world history teachers should consider the following:

1. A lot of world history standards might not include citizenship, but states often discuss citizenship, national and global, as a goal for students in the introductions to the standards. Teachers can use these ideas to justify including citizenship ideas.

2. Historical content allows teachers to draw in ideas of citizenship, making this content more meaningful than through memorizing dates. Whether it’s the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, war crimes trials like at Nuremberg or those that followed the Rwandan Genocide, or even millets in the Ottoman Empire, there are ideas about citizenship that students can analyze.

3. Another place to build in or even focus ideas of global citizenship in world history classes is in the global issues or post-modern era units, which often include sections on environmentalism (sometimes even highlighted in textbooks), which is a natural connection to issues of global efforts for sustainability.

4. Citizenship, as the participants in this study showed, is also evident in how teachers run their classroom. As world history teachers build classroom norms and expectations, they can build the language of being participatory citizens into their classroom routines.
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Appendix

Pre-Observation Likert Scale Survey Statements

These statements will be accompanied by a standard Likert scale for participants to rate prior to observations of their classes. The statements and responses will not be discussed prior to fieldwork.

Statements Representing Various Conceptions of Citizenship

A social studies teacher’s job is to help students acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function in their own country and in an interdependent world.

Schools are places to learn the curriculum, but not necessarily to learn how to be a citizen.

Students’ lives are affected by others, inside and outside their own countries. Schooling can provide students with ways for addressing injustice globally.

Understanding how people in other countries address their problems does not help us solve our own nation’s problems.

Teachers should encourage students to take pride in their nation because national pride motivates citizens to improve their nation.

Social studies teachers should base their curriculum on national values.

Students should learn to recognize and understand cultural differences so they can work together with other people towards shared goals.

Citizenship education should include teaching about American ideals and Constitutional principles.

Nations should guarantee human rights and join international agreements to defend them.

Citizenship education should focus on voting rights and electoral participation.