

5-2009

The Effects of a Short-Term Teacher Abroad Program on Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves and their Responsibilities as Global Educators

Raquel Cook
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cook, Raquel, "The Effects of a Short-Term Teacher Abroad Program on Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves and their Responsibilities as Global Educators" (2009). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 375.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact dylan.burns@usu.edu.



THE EFFECTS OF A SHORT-TERM TEACHER ABROAD PROGRAM ON
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEMSELVES AND THEIR
RESPONSIBILITIES AS GLOBAL EDUCATORS

by

Raquel Cook

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Education
(Curriculum and Instruction)

Approved:

J. Nicholls Eastmond
Major Professor

Sherry Marx
Committee Member

Edward Reeve
Committee Member

Kurt Becker
Committee Member

Barry Franklin
Committee Member

Byron Burnham
Dean of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

2009

Copyright © Raquel Cook 2009

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The Effects of a Short-Term Teacher Abroad Program on Teachers' Perceptions
of Themselves and Their Responsibilities as Global Educators

by

Raquel Cook, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 2009

Major Professor: Dr. J. Nicholls Eastmond
Department: Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences

In October 2007, 200 American educators traveled to Japan for 3 weeks as guests of the Japanese government under the Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund (JFMF) Teacher Abroad program. The purpose of the trip was to increase understanding between the people of Japan and the United States; to enrich American and Japanese curricula with international perspectives; to encourage appreciation for the people, culture, and educational system of Japan; and to expand professional development opportunities for educators.

Broadly speaking, these are the goals of global education. The question this qualitative case study examined is whether teachers who participate in isolated, short-term international professional development programs (such as JFMF) become more competent global educators or if the experience remains an isolated incident, referred to during a single, obligatory lesson presented to students each year. Questions pursued

were how teachers incorporate such experiences into their curricula; how an isolated, short-term experience can contribute to the development of a global educator; and how teachers' perceptions of themselves and their responsibilities change as a result of cross-cultural experience.

This study examined eight K-12 teachers as they experienced Japan and then returned to implement self-designed "follow-on plans" in their classrooms. Data were gathered through application materials, observations, interviews, and follow-on plans and revealed three categories: Anticipation details why the teachers applied for the JFMF program and what they expected to gain from the experience; Direct Impact examines the effect the experience had on teachers' curricula, students, and selves; and Deep Impact portrays the multiple realities experienced by the teachers through an anti-colonialist lens.

In sum, a short international sojourn can positively affect teachers' perceptions of themselves and their responsibilities as educators. Beyond the obvious effects on these teachers, their curricula, and students, the experience underscored the need for more Americans to engage in international experiences. While being privy to the voices and perspectives of other nations and cultures can help us in our global social, political, and economic dealings, the greatest benefit from a program such as this is that it helps us gain a more accurate picture of ourselves, as individuals and as a nation.

(233 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A friend once introduced me to a Chinese character pronounced *jang*, for which English bears no equivalent. She explained it like this: Imagine yourself rolling around in a mud puddle. When you get out, most of the mud rolls off of you. But some of it sticks—in your ears, under your toe nails, in your belly button—and even when you bathe, the mud doesn't completely wash away. This is *jang*, except with people. I have spent time with so many people in so many places, and they have affected me in such profound ways. I no longer associate with many of them, but they are under my nails and in my hair.

Some of the people who are stuck to me, to whom I owe thanks, are the members of my committee: Nick, my chair, for his patience and encouragement; Sherry, for helping me define my theoretical perspective; Ed, for making me apply to the JFMF program; Kurt, for introducing me to theories of international education; and Barry, for promoting curriculum change.

I am indebted to the Japanese government for generously hosting the JFMF Teacher Abroad program, as well as to the educators with whom I traveled and who allowed me to pry into their lives. I further cannot forget the myriad hosts and fellow trekkers I have associated with as I have repeatedly circled the globe.

I appreciate tremendously the support of my cohort for not letting me drop out and to numerous teachers who kept telling my parents I had potential. Thank you Chrys, for helping me keep things in perspective; Coral, for supplying the caffeine; Mom, Dad,

and family for entertaining (raising) my daughter; and most of all Belle, for still calling me mom. I love you, Toots!

Raquel Cook

PREFACE

On September 11, 2001, I stepped off the train at the World Trade Center and was met with a not-so-typical workday. The platform was in chaos—people running up and down the stairs screaming, pushing to get on and off the train; a disoriented, middle-aged blind man with outstretched arms; and panicked outbursts of “Bomb! Another bomb!”

Before I could orient myself, or get a grip on what was happening, the doors of the train had closed, and I had no other option but to move up the stairs into the unknown. Those who decided to wait on the platform for another train were disappointed, because that train never came. We herded ourselves, instead, up to the underground mall and the Trade Center concourses, where lights were flickering and random sprinklers were spraying for a fire an hour away.

I will not go into detail as far as the next 7 or 8 hours of my life (squatting in a basement with coworkers, the sound of 100 plus stories of collapsing concrete and glass, or the 12-mile walk home) or the next few months, for that matter (the smell of concrete ash, burnt jet fuel, and decaying flesh that hung over southern Manhattan for months; the incessant bag-piping of “Amazing Grace” that makes me hate that song to this day; or the collective patrons of an outdoor café who spontaneously burst into panic and tears when a host dropped a tray of silverware and glasses, the sound of which reminded us of a collapsing building). No, this is not the appropriate venue for that discussion.

However, I will say this: September 11 changed my life.

That sounds cliché, almost to the point that I am embarrassed to say it, so let me explain. Shortly after the terrorist attacks that killed my friends, I came to terms with the

idea of airplanes crashing into buildings. What I have not come to terms with—yet—is America’s collective reaction in the days and months (and years) following. I spent enough time backpacking around Asia, the Middle East, and Europe between degrees to recognize an ugly American when I see one—and hence to cringe every time I hear an overweight, mid-western woman with star-spangled earrings say, “Them Ay-rabs just did it ‘cause they’re jealous.”

I am convinced that increasing airport security and building big walls between ourselves and our neighbors is not going to solve America’s woes. I do not feel safer because the guy in front of me takes off his shoes before he boards. The answer as far as I am concerned lies in education—in teaching our young people to embrace the differences between our diverse neighbors, at home and abroad—to communicate, to listen, and to empathize. To recognize, as Faulkner did, that the same heart beats in every human breast.

Therefore, in the wake of 9/11, in an attempt to come to terms with the collective reaction, I moved out West and became a public school teacher—specifically, of secondary Language Arts and ironically, at the same high school I had graduated from over a decade and a half earlier. What I found when I entered the classroom absolutely horrified me. I found the exact same curriculum (plus a few standardized tests) that had been crammed down my throat when I was a student. A curriculum that did nothing for us then and is certainly doing nothing for us now. The epitome of that curriculum—the theoretical justification, perhaps—was embodied in a class I took as a high school junior

in the very same room I was assigned to teach in. The class was called American Problems, and my teacher was Mr. Hoggard.

The focus of American Problems was—you guessed it—American social problems, like teen pregnancy, suicide, and a newly identified plague called AIDS. But the crux of the semester was spent memorizing types of missiles, their ranges and obliterating effects, what countries manufactured them, and what types of missile defense systems were most effective. We even watched a movie called *The Day After*, a fictionalized account of nuclear war in suburban America.

One of the most popular movies at the time was *Red Dawn*, about a group of teenagers who avenge their fathers against the invading Russians; and the theme of our Junior Prom was “Forever Young,” by Alphaville (“Are you going to drop the bomb or not?”)

I did not realize it then, because I am not sure if it had a name yet, but I was living during a time of war. I did not realize that Russian children did, in fact, go to school and did not stand in bread lines all day every day with their parents. I thought that diving under my desk and covering my head with my arms at the sound of three elongated siren bursts would somehow save me from nuclear fallout. In addition, I was completely stupefied when Sting released a song that suggested, against the common conception, that Russians might actually “love their children, too.”

Through the books I read in English, to the way and what I was taught about history, to what I was never taught (John Hancock was a smuggler!), I feel like my mind was colonized into believing in the superiority of my race, my class, my religion, and,

preeminently, my nationality. Today, the Russians have been replaced by anyone wearing a turban; but the tone remains the same: us/them, good/bad. The curriculum in our public schools continues to pit American ideology against the rest of the world as if we are still elbowing for hegemony.

As early as 1934, Pierce reported nationalistic bias in over 400 interdisciplinary texts. The books, she reported, were “shot through and through with national spirit... American customs, institutions, and ideals [were] treated as sacrosanct” (Giordano, 2003, p. 34). In 1955, McMurray and Cronbach assessed “fear of the Soviet Union as one of the social and political forces that most influenced textbooks after World War II” (as cited in Giordano, p. 56). According to Giordano’s survey of twentieth-century textbook wars, the misunderstanding and prejudice of peoples, religions, and cultures beyond and within our borders continues unabated.

That is why, when I returned to the classroom on the other side of the desk, I vowed not to replicate the disservice my schooling had done me. That is not to say I did not have fabulous teachers—I understand now what they sacrificed for me. I am simply explaining why I have not let a day of teaching go by that I have not somehow extolled the virtue of or attempted to perpetuate curiosity about another country, culture, or point of view.

My vindication as a teacher has been and continues to be a wall of postcards from former students who go on to live, work, study, travel, or serve in foreign countries.

Alyssa worked in Ethiopia, Nathan in Malaysia, and Jonathon in Japan. Jenny, Lindsey, and Chalise served with humanitarian teams in Ecuador, Danielle in Romania, and Jeff in

the Dominican Republic. Jordan and Kelsey backpacked through China, and Joey and Shaun went Eurailing. Pete will study in Lebanon and Stacey is headed to Italy.

I have gathered over 60 postcards now. Many of the senders express gratitude to me for sharing possibilities with them—they would not have considered international experiences without my prodding. Idealistic as it may seem, I believe that by gathering those postcards I am keeping the promise I made to my friends who died on 9/11 that I would not let such an atrocity happen again.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
PREFACE.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
Problem and Purpose Statements.....	5
The Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Abroad Program.....	6
Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Program Details	8
Dissertation Overview	10
Definitions.....	11
II. EXISTING LITERATURE	14
Globalization and Education.....	14
Global Education as a Response to Globalization	22
Global Educators.....	26
Study Abroad	28
Conclusion	45
III. METHODOLOGY	47
Objectives	47
Study Design.....	47
An Emergent Design.....	57
Summary	58
IV. JAPANESE FULBRIGHT MEMORIAL FUND PROGRAM AND PARTICIPANTS	60
The Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Program	60

Study Participants	72
V. OUTCOMES: ANTICIPATION AND DIRECT IMPACT	82
Anticipation.....	83
Direct Impact	95
Conclusion	121
VI. OUTCOMES: DEEP IMPACT	122
The Anti-Colonialist Theoretical Framework.....	127
Deep Impact	131
Conclusion	160
VII. NATURALISTIC GENERALIZATIONS (CONCLUSIONS).....	162
Anticipation.....	164
Direct Impact	166
Deep Impact.....	169
Conclusion	174
REFERENCES	176
APPENDICES	184
Appendix A: Bracketing Interview.....	185
Appendix B: Brief Summary of Japanese Colonialism.....	195
Appendix C: Informed Consent.....	210
Appendix D: Rationale for Photographing and Recording Participants....	213
Appendix E: Address to the Japanese People	215
CURRICULUM VITAE	217

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Study Participants	73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Map of Japan with key cities identified	7

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

If you look in one direction, your neck will be stiff. (Nigerian proverb)

Over the past few decades, and particularly since the September 11 terrorist attacks in the United States, myriad social, political, technological, and economic events have contributed to what columnist Thomas Friedman (2006) referred to as the “flattening” of the world—in other words, the leveling of the playing field in an age of rapid globalization. Advancements in technology and changes in the way we communicate and conduct business, for good or for ill, have intertwined countries and cultures now more than ever before. The world that today’s students are living in and preparing to live in is much different from the world their teachers grew up in. As a result, U. S. Presidents, governors, state educational officers, and professional education associations have called for improved international competence on the part of elementary and secondary educators and their charges (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 1983; American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], 1986; American Council on Education [ACE], 2002; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges [NASULGC], 2004; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 1990; National Governors’ Association [NGA], 1989; Pickert, 2001; Tucker & Cistone, 1991).

Friedman (2000) and others have asserted that the traditional American elementary and secondary curriculum perpetuates an isolationist perspective (Anderson,

1982; Hunter, 2004), a perspective that Tucker and Cistone (1991) posited was perhaps necessary to build up our national identity in the wake of two global wars, “but it is increasingly counterproductive during the global era, when cooperation and consensus better serve our national interests” (p. 7). Former President Clinton agreed; in a 2000 Memorandum calling for broader understanding of the world, languages, and cultures, he stated that this isolationist philosophy serves no purpose anymore (as cited in Hunter).

According to University of Denver Chancellor Daniel Ritchie, a few decades ago students could get away with being ignorant and isolationist. However, today they have no choice but to be willing and able to engage with the world beyond America’s borders (Bollag, 2004). “Public policy inevitably has an international component. If young people are going to be part of the world we’re living in and will live in, they need to have a cross-cultural capacity” (“Future of International Education,” 2004, p. 3).

Americans are at a particular disadvantage in this capacity because, according to Gannon (2001), we simply are not culturally sophisticated. Currently, Americans fall short on virtually every indicator of international knowledge, awareness, and competence. On a national survey of 1,006 adults, aged 16 and older, only 71% of respondents named both Mexico and Canada as countries bordering the United States; 15% could name neither of the bordering countries (Hayward & Siaya, 2001). Given multiple-choice options, only 23% correctly identified the current Secretary General of the United Nations, and 39% identified Cuba as a Socialist state (14% claimed it a monarchy). Further, in a 2002 National Geographic-Roper poll of geographic knowledge among young adults in nine industrialized nations, Americans finished next to last. Fewer

than 25% could name four countries that acknowledge having nuclear weapons, and less than 1 in 10 were studying a foreign language (NASULGC, 2004).

Educators of young people cannot, in good faith, ignore these figures. Rather, they have a formidable role in preparing students to cross borders linguistically, culturally, politically, and racially, because “border crossers” are more capable of social and economic success (Guilherme, 2002).

While the economic and political necessity of developing international competence is a common theme in the literature on global education (ACE, 2002; Anderson, 1982; Hunter, 2004), Kofi Annan, former Secretary General of the United Nations, articulated the additional moral imperative of border crossing, stating that today’s challenges are “problems without passports” (NASULGC, 2004, p. 1). “The public health, social, and environmental challenges that recognize no boundaries—like SARS and AIDS—require research expertise that crosses institutions, disciplines, and borders” (p. 2). Bernard Goldstein of the University of Pittsburgh School of Public Health went so far as to assert that not having a global dimension to programs was “unethical” because international outreach can contribute to agricultural, medical, educational, and economic solutions in developing countries (NASULGC, p. 11). He asserted that we in developed nations have a moral and ethical obligation to assist these people as fellow world citizens.

While it is naive to assume that educators can prepare their students for every possible linguistic, economic, or cultural need they could ever encounter, it is realistic to teach particular cognitive and affective knowledge and skills, to present alternative

viewpoints, to expand paradigms, to reduce prejudice, to increase openness to diversity, to encourage cultural participation, and to build empathy. These are some of the goals of global education, which became a mainstream concern in the 60s and 70s (Tucker & Cistone, 1991). The literature on global education encompasses content, delivery, and professional development, and attempts to infuse a global perspective into all subjects and all classrooms, beyond foreign language and geographic study.

A large segment of the literature on global education is devoted to the benefits of study, work, and service abroad programs (hereafter “study abroad”), asserting that study abroad opportunities provide the most “authentic” cross-cultural experiences for participants (see for example, Hansen, 2002; Kitsantas, 2004). Study abroad profoundly affects language and interpersonal skills, global competence and competitiveness, and self-confidence and perception (Black & Duhon, 2006; Bremer, 2006; Hadis, 2005; Smiles, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005, and others). Newer and hence smaller segments of the literature examine the benefits of short term immersion programs and the contributions pre- and inservice teachers’ cross cultural experiences can make in globalizing elementary and secondary curricula (Merryfield, 2002; O’Brien, 2006; Wilson, 1983).

With regard to the mission of global education, the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction Internationalization Task Force asserts that the ability to function in our global society is enhanced by knowledge of different cultural contexts. The task force states, “We can ill afford to exclude any child from knowledge about customs, traditions, and societies, for these are the foundations not only for the cultures of others but also for

his own understanding of himself, his past, and his present” (Durtka et al., 2002, p. 21).

Problem and Purpose Statements

Because educators bear a large burden in preparing citizens who can navigate an increasingly interconnected world, they must be able to communicate in languages and cultures other than English to reverse the trends of “parochialism” and “multicultural ignorance” so pervasive in American educational culture (Pickert, 2001, p. 4; see also Bottery, 2006; Tucker & Cistone, 1991). Yet despite the seemingly obvious benefits of study abroad programs previously mentioned, less than 3% of American university undergraduates earn credit while living abroad; and of that number, only 4.1% identify themselves as education majors (Institute of International Education, 2004).

Global educator Merry Merryfield stated, “I know that my cross-cultural experiences affect my teaching, my research, and other facets of my professional and personal life” (1995, p. 19); she further urges teachers to seek cross-cultural experiences and develop the expertise in diversity and global understanding they need in their classrooms.

Most in the field agree that long-term study abroad programs provide the most in-depth learning for participants (Hulstrand, 2006; Zamastil-Vondrova, 2005); unfortunately, these are seldom a viable option for educators, who bear particular employment and family constraints. Angene Wilson (1984), however, a long-time promoter of teacher abroad programs, suggested that a short-term experience may not be enough to adequately affect teachers’ long-term global commitment.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine how teachers experienced a singular, short-term, cross-cultural professional development opportunity and how that experience might contribute to the goals of global education—in particular, to the development of global educators. Was the experience just that—a singular experience or or was it enough to influence the educators to reconsider and reorient their responsibilities in the classroom? Questions that guided the research were:

1. How do individual teachers infuse a singular international cross-cultural experience into their classroom practice?
2. In what ways can an isolated, short-term experience contribute to the development of a global educator?
3. How do teachers' perceptions of their responsibilities as educators change as a result of a cross-cultural experience?

To this end, I specifically examined the case of eight K-12 classroom teachers who traveled to Japan for 3 weeks as guests of the Japanese government.

The Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Abroad Program

In October 2007, I was one of approximately 200 primary and secondary school teachers and administrators who participated in the semi-annual Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund (JFMF) Teacher Abroad Program (200 others traveled in June). We began our 3-week study tour in Tokyo, where we were introduced to Japanese culture and education, met Japanese government officials and educators, and visited museums and governmental and historic landmarks. Then we were divided into smaller groups of 20,

with whom we traveled to various other cities to visit local schools and teachers' colleges and stay with Japanese families. My particular cohort (from which study participants were selected) traveled to Tainai, Niigata, 250 km northwest of Tokyo. Other groups traveled to Chiba, Ota, Inagi, Sakai, Shimada, Himeji, Hiroshima, Kagoshima, and Okinawa. After 10 days in our host cities, we returned to Tokyo for debriefing sessions and to develop strategies for disseminating our experiences once we returned to the United States. Figure 1 identifies the major cities or areas mentioned this study, including Tokyo, Niigata, Hiroshima, Kyoto, and Okinawa.



Figure 1. Map of Japan with key cities identified.

Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Program Details

The JFMF Teacher Abroad program was established in 1996 by the government of Japan to demonstrate appreciation for the U.S. government-initiated Fulbright program. The U.S. program was created in 1946 by Senator William Fulbright to foster global understanding through international student, faculty, and researcher exchange. More than 6,000 Japanese people have participated in the Fulbright program, and many returned to Japan to become leaders in government, business, and academia. The Japanese Fulbright program was hence created to further the objectives of the Fulbright program by hosting American educators in Japan.

Objectives

According to the Institute of International Education (2006), the contracting agency that coordinates the JFMF Teacher Program, the objectives of the overseas experience are to:

1. Increase understanding between the people of Japan and the United States of America,
2. Enrich American and Japanese elementary and secondary curricula by presenting teachers with the opportunity to integrate international perspectives and methodologies and to relate actual experiences from the JFMF Teacher Program,
3. Encourage more Americans to appreciate the people, culture and educational system of Japan, and
4. Expand professional development opportunities for American primary and

secondary educators.

Program organizers believed in the importance of globalizing education at an early age, which is why the program is focused on elementary and secondary teachers and administrators in the United States. The ultimate goal of JFMF, like that of similar programs, is the creation of a more peaceful world through education and mutual understanding. The question that arises, then, is how a singular, short-term, cross-cultural experience focusing on one country can contribute to such a lofty goal.

Selection Criteria

Those who apply to the JFMF program must demonstrate a long-term commitment to education, serious interest in curriculum development or teaching methodology related to Japan, and personal adaptability and flexibility. The three-part applications, consisting of an on-line application, essays, and letters of recommendation, are screened by regional panels of teachers and administrators who select participants on the basis of “who will benefit most.” Panelists attempt to choose educators who demonstrate potential for success, giving special consideration to the following:

1. Degree of impact or benefit participation will bring to the applicant’s school and community;
2. The quality and feasibility of the applicant’s follow-on plan for applying elements of the Japan experience to his/her classroom, school, and community activities, and the projected benefits of such programs for students, other district teachers and members of the community;
3. Evidence of a capacity to carry out the follow-on program;

4. Demonstrated commitment and potential to be an innovative and effective long-term educator; and

5. Overall quality as demonstrated through the applicant's Statement of Purpose and letters of recommendation. (Institute of International Education, 2006)

A minimum of four individuals from each state and Washington D.C. receive JFMF awards each year.

Dissertation Overview

As stated, the purpose of this study was to examine how a select group of K-12 classroom teachers experienced a short-term, cross-cultural professional development opportunity and whether that singular experience was enough to influence their perceptions of themselves and their responsibilities as global educators. The results were positive, but not without some harsh lessons.

In Chapter II, I examine the literature in which this study rests. I first introduce globalization as a framework for curriculum change, following which I introduce global education as a response to this phenomena and the responsibilities and traits of global educators. Finally, I review literature on study abroad.

Chapter III presents the research design and methods used, in particular the qualitative approach to collecting data and the case study method for conducting and disseminating the analysis; Chapter IV introduces the JFMF program and participants.

In Chapters V and VI, I present the study's outcomes. Chapter V contains outcomes that follow directly from the proposed framework and design—those that

neatly answer to the questions I posed. I examine what participants sought to gain from the study-abroad program, as well as the direct impact the experience had on their curricula, students, and self-perceptions. However, much of the impact and reflection that resulted from participation in the program did not fit within the bounds of the proposed theory or framework, thus necessitating the articulation of a broader theoretical perspective and the admittance of myself, the researcher, as an additional subject.

Chapter VI examines this tangent and some of the painful, unexpected events that led to learning. Finally, Chapter VII provides concluding thoughts and suggestions for further research.

Definitions

Some terms utilized in the following sections may prove problematic, so for purposes of clarity, I offer the following definitions.

Anti-colonialism: A theoretical perspective through which dominating and oppressive relationships emerging from structures of power and privilege are analyzed. Anti-colonialism is meant to extend, not replace, other theories of colonialism (e.g., post-colonialism) by allowing each side of the power relationship to speak for itself. Anti-colonialists claim that post-colonialism in and of itself is limiting because it is generally articulated through a privileged, Western lens, rather than by the voice of whose story is being told. Anti-colonialism sees legitimacy in all narratives, from wherever or whomever the voices originate (see Chapter VI for further discussion).

Cross-cultural: The term “cross-cultural” will refer to international experiences and activities, as opposed to the term “multi-cultural,” which will refer to the cross-

cultural dimension within the borders of an individual country, such as the United States or Japan.

Curriculum: Unless stated otherwise, the term “curriculum” will refer to the actual “curriculum-in-use,” as articulated by individual teachers—in other words: what teachers actually do in their classrooms. The term “American curriculum” refers to federal, state, and district mandated objectives.

Educator: A broad term encompassing multiple roles of influence in school systems, including, but not limited to, school and district administrators, classroom teachers, media specialists, counselors, trackers, and teaching assistants.

Experiential/authentic learning: learning from personal experience. Learning by doing.

Follow-on plan: unique unit or daily lesson plans created or adapted by individual teachers to disseminate the JFMF experience to their classroom, school, and community.

Global competence/global literacy: A broad knowledge of the world, its people, politics and cultures, as well as the skills to comprehend, analyze, evaluate, and contribute to that knowledge (NASULGC, 2004). Such skills include foreign language, the ability to function in other environs and value systems, business, environmental, and personal (ACE, 2002).

Global education: internationally oriented curricula and activities that infuse multiple perspectives into learning and that prepare students to perform personally and professionally in a cross-cultural context. Global education includes but is not limited to curriculum and assessment, professional development, study abroad, and international

research and scholarship. The Review of Literature will discuss global education as a response to globalization.

Globalization: The increasing flow of peoples, cultures, values, and ideas across borders as a result of advances in communication and technology. This concept will be further discussed in the Review of Literature.

Post-colonialism: a theoretical perspective through which structures of power are analyzed, particularly with regard to race, gender, and class (see *anti-colonialism* and further discussion in Chapter VI).

Study abroad: a significant educational experience (study, service, or internship) in a foreign country, including preparation and orientation activities as well as intensive assessment and reflection. Missionary and military experiences are excluded from this definition on the basis of their coercive nature, as are non-educational vacation experiences, based on the non-academic nature of preparation, activity, and reflection. This is not to say that these experiences cannot have an effect on a person's global understanding; they are simply excluded from this definition.

Teacher (or classroom teacher): For purposes of this study, a K-12 educator assigned to particular grade level and/or content area instruction. The role of teacher is encompassed in but is not interchangeable with the broader term *educator*.

CHAPTER II

EXISTING LITERATURE

*The more that you read, the more you will know.
The more that you learn, the more places you'll go. (Dr. Seuss)*

In this review of literature, I first introduce globalization as a framework for curriculum change, following which I introduce global education as a response to this phenomenon. Next, I describe the responsibilities and traits of global educators; and finally I review the academic, personal, and cultural impact of study abroad, narrowing to short-term programs and to pre- and inservice teacher opportunities specifically. This literature provides a backdrop for the initial stages of interpretation of the JFMF experience.

Globalization and Education

The definition of globalization, its extent, and its effects, are hotly debated. For some authors, the term refers to the rise of super-institutions that control policies for various nation-states; for others it refers to international economic trends, from production to consumption; and for others it refers to the blending of cultural forms, media, and communication. For purposes of this discussion, I define globalization as the increasing flow of peoples, cultures, values, and ideas across borders as a result of advancements in communication and technology.

The editors of the 1998 *International Handbook of Educational Change* state, “There is no greater context for educational change than that of globalization, nor no

grander way of conceptualizing what educational change is about” (cited in Waks, 2006, p. 835). Yet the editors admit, “few educational researchers or theorists have attempted to make connections between the economic, political and cultural dimensions of globalization and the policies and practices of education.”

Several significant titles have since been published as exceptions to this, namely *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Nicholas C. Burbules and Carlos Alberto Torres (2000); and *Education, Globalization, and Social Change*, from Oxford University Press editors Lauder, Brown, Dillabough, and Halsey (2006). Burbules and Torres presented a group of international authors who discuss how globalization is affecting educational policy in nation-states around the world. The purpose of their book was to identify, clarify, and characterize some debates surrounding globalization as well as to try to understand the multiple and complex effects of globalization on educational policy and policy formation. In *Education, Globalization, and Social Change* (2006), editors Hugh Lauder and colleagues bring together over seventy papers addressing fundamental problems in the sociology of education with particular regard to globalization.

Although none of the authors can agree on a definition (much less a theory) of globalization (a fact that makes assessing its impact on education difficult), they do generally agree that marked changes have occurred over the last few decades that tend to promote and reinforce a more global perspective on social policy (Bottery, 2006; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Friedman 2000, 2006). At least six overlapping categories of globalization are identified in the literature with explicit implications on educational

practice. These categories are economic, political, cultural, environmental, demographic, and American.

Economic Globalization

At the economic level, these changes include changes in trade relations (e.g., G-7, NAFTA); banking and credit practices (e.g., international ATM machines, currency exchange); increases in international lending agencies (e.g., the IMF, the World Bank); global corporations; the mobility of companies and labor; and patterns of consumption (Burbolos & Torres, 2000; Kamat, Mir, & Mathew, 2006). These forces prevent nation states from protecting their own welfare agendas and influence national government policies through the ability to relocate capital (Bottery, 2006). So powerful are these international market forces that “national governments can no longer control their national economies, although they still engage in...futile attempts at protection and regulation,” ultimately rendering national economies redundant (Green, 1997, p. 152). Economic globalization impacts educational policy decisions such as whether or not to promote a market approach to school choice (e.g., vouchers), school management, performance assessment, and school commercialization (e.g., Channel One; Burbolos & Torres, 2000; Perrucci & Wysong, 2006).

Political Globalization

While some of the most convincing arguments in favor of globalization theories are economic, political scientists argue for their own version, which focuses on the erosion of national sovereignty and autonomy in the new global order (Green, 1997).

Political globalization encompasses the spread of political ideas, particularly those concerning democracy, anticolonialism, and feminism (Bottery, 2006; Blackmore, 2000). According to Burbules and Torres (2000), this required nation-states to balance responses to transnational capital; global political structures (e.g., the UN and other NGOs); domestic pressures; and to their own needs and self-interests, hence burdening education with the crucial role in addressing problems of global conflict, crime, terrorism, and environmental issues, not to mention the pressure to define what “education for world citizenship” requires (p. 21). Bottery added that the spread of democratic discourse could increase the numbers who compete for more than a basic education (see also Marginson, 2006). He predicted that educators would experience greater control over their work but also increased complexity and fragmentation of the world they are to help others understand.

Cultural Globalization

Cultural theorists of globalization generally agree with the political theorists that national sovereignty or identity in the traditional sense is a thing of the past; “what they cannot decide is exactly what globalization is putting in its place” (Green, 1997, p. 155). Most commonly, cultural globalization asserts that the world is becoming more standardized “through technological, commercial and cultural synchronization emanating from the West, and that globalization is tied up with modernity” (Pieterse, 1995, p. 45, as cited in Green, p. 155).

This can be interpreted in two ways: first, as the kind of cultural globalization that allows “an ability in one location to eat virtually any national dish, attend any religious

ceremony, listen to any kind of music” in any setting in the world (Bottery, 2006, p. 97); and second the cultural standardization, or McDonaldization, “where the ‘best bits’ of a culture are extracted, reformulated, and packaged for quick, cheap and easy consumption” and “sold as a profit-making activity.”

Bottery (2006) posited that the first version, cultural globalization (or globalization of cultural variety), recognizes that such opportunities can provide new perspectives for students, who can then realize that people pursue different roads to the same truth. Conversely, some students may see diverse meanings as roads to relativity and fragmentation. “Faced with too many choices, they cease to see meaning in any.” Third, some may see variety as a threat against personally held beliefs and reason to retreat into more rigid, fundamentalist attitudes. Like cultural globalization, cultural standardization stems from the West and can threaten the insecure. “The educator, living with both kinds of cultural globalization, must be keenly aware of their causes, their synergies, and their effects” (Bottery, p. 98).

In cultural terms, global changes which impact educational policy include global media (e.g., the Internet, satellite, cable); commercial culture (e.g., Coke, McDonalds, Nike); increased mobility/travel and tourism; communication technology; the distribution of media, film, television, and music; increased visibility of global religions; and the global world of sports (e.g., Olympics and World Cup; Burbolos & Torres, 2000). This cultural dimension presents major benefits and hurdles to education; for example, the definition of “multiculturalism” and “community” have expanded to encompass a global context, resulting in a much wider gulf of difference; and debates such as those over

education's role in preserving culture and bilingualism flare (Lai & Byram, 2006; McCarthy & Dimitriadis, 2006).

Green (1997) believed the implications of cultural globalization on education are enormous, "since the very foundations for national education would have ceased to exist" (p. 156). He reasoned that if governments would no longer control their education systems, nations might lose their public and collective character, since these would cease to be recognizable.

Other Globalizations defined

A fourth category is environmental globalization, which concerns "ecology and global interdependence of living things," particularly humanity's influence upon the environment (Bottery, 2006, p. 97). Environmental globalization transcends national borders and encompasses issues such as global warming, the depletion of the ozone layer, and transnational diseases and infections, such as AIDS. Environmental globalization does not threaten educational institutions and the political stability of nations as do other forms of globalization, and as of yet "only marginally impinges upon the work and values of most educators" (p. 97).

Fifth, demographic globalization concerns the tensions between increasingly aging populations and those with younger profiles, affecting health, welfare, and educational policy in particular. For example, Bottery (2006) explained the problematic consequences of increased longevity and decreased fertility in the West and in the tiger nations: first, a smaller percentage of the population is paying taxes to sustain social welfare systems; and second, because the populations are aging and requiring health care,

those strained social welfare systems will be under even more pressure. An older population is more likely to spend public money on the needs of the elderly than on investing in education and other services for the young.

Sixth, American globalization measures globalization in terms of power and reach: the United States spends more on military expenditures than the next eight countries combined, has a 27% share of the world product (“equal to the next three largest economic powers combined”), houses half of all internet users, and has a military presence on 153 of the 189 countries that were registered with the UN in 2002 (Bottery 2006 p. 101). Nevertheless, while America may be too powerful to be challenged by any other state, it is not powerful enough to deal on its own with issues like terrorism or nuclear proliferation.

Nye (2002 as cited in Bottery, 2006) addressed the implications of American globalization for educators by distinguishing between “hard” and “soft” US power. America’s “soft” power is seen in its influence on the fashion, films, food, and politics of other cultures, whether enthusiastically adopted or aggressively resisted. “Hard” US power is represented through its economic and military influence, “which are likely to raise tensions wherever they occur” (Bottery, p. 102).

Globalization Summary

Globalization theories are not without their critics. Green (1997) summarized the challenge to credibility as the need “to demonstrate that the phenomenon is both historically distinctive *and* truly global—or at least that it is likely to be so in time” (p. 157). With regard to the critique of historicity, he claims that globalization theory lacks

historical depth, stressing too much the economic at the expense of other forms, and that its claims can be counter-intuitive. For example, realists find it implausible that the nation state is disappearing. Not only is there too much history to just disappear, “but empirically it is clear that national states are still with us and, indeed, multiplying. More than 100 nation states have been established in the last 40 years and since 1991 18 new states have been officially recognized” (p. 157).

With regard to the second critique, Friedman (2000) stated that globalization is not yet global, meaning it does not affect all corners of the globe equally. The movement affects countries differently based on their history, traditions, priorities, and global position (Knight & DeWitt, as cited in Hayward & Siaya, 2001); and many places in the world have remained untouched. Green claims it is “intuitively plausible that countries like the UK and the USA are becoming increasingly globalized” (p. 157). However, he finds it “far less obvious” that the phenomenon is impacting other European states, like Germany, or the East Asian states, “all of which appear to remain quite ‘national’ in their outlook and institutions.”

My purpose in this review of literature is not to position whether the phenomenon called globalization is good, bad, or neutral, or to measure its effect in various locales, but to demonstrate that public education in the United States is undoubtedly affected in major ways by the increasing flow of peoples, cultures, values, and ideas across borders as a result of advances in communication and technology.

Waks (2006) argued that unlike earlier social and economic developments, globalization will cause fundamental rather than merely incremental change in the

American curriculum—including subject matter selection, instructional methods, technology utilization, organization, and administration—and that we must control the direction of our response to it. However, Bottery (2006) claimed that “the degree of standardization and inflexibility in education is increasing” in response to globalization, hence “raising the possibility that education systems are being created, and educators conditioned in ways which make them singularly ill-equipped to help their students deal with these challenges” (p. 104). Waks, Bottery (2006), and others agree that the established American curriculum does not provide the sort of learning needed by workers in today’s global network economy (Anderson, 1982; Friedman, 2006; Gannon, 2001; Guilherme, 2002).

Global Education as a Response to Globalization

The literature on global education as a response to globalization is replete with evidence of America’s dismal status quo with regard to geographic and worldly ignorance, as well as calls to globalize curricula (ACE, 2002; Friedman, 2006; Gannon, 2001; Hayward & Siaya, 2001; NASULGC, 2004; Tucker & Cistone, 1991). However, what exactly is global education, and what are its goals?

Anderson (1982) stated that global education requires increased foreign language competency and the infusion of global dimensions into all curricula. According to Hunter (2004), a globally educated person has a general knowledge of history and world events, is able to cope with different cultural values and attitudes, and appreciates diversity. Lambert (cited in Hunter, 2004) believed that a globally educated person has a general

knowledge of current events, is empathetic, has a positive attitude, is competent in at least one foreign language, and can understand the value in something foreign. In addition, Brustein (as cited in Hunter, 2004) asserted that a globally educated person can work effectively in international settings, is aware of major currents of global change, is knowledgeable of global organizations and business activities, can communicate beyond cultural and linguistic borders, and is adaptable.

In his landmark article “An Attainable Global Perspective,” Robert Hanvey (1982) argued that a global perspective is not quantifiable, “something you either have or don’t have” (p. 162). Rather, it is a variable trait possessed in a degree determined by a person’s capacities, attitudes, and predispositions. The article, which arguably has influenced global education more than any other single document, identifies five dimensions, the development of which can move a student in the direction of a more global perspective. As defined by Hanvey, these dimensions are as follows.

1. Perspective Consciousness: The recognition or awareness on the part of the individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world has been and continues to be shaped by influences that often escape conscious detection, and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one’s own.

2. “State of the Planet” Awareness: Awareness of prevailing world conditions and developments, including emergent conditions and trends, e.g., population growth, migrations, economic conditions, resources and physical environment, political developments, science/technology, law, health, inter-nation and intra-nation conflicts, etc.

3. Cross-Cultural Awareness: Awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and practices compare, and including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points.

4. Knowledge of Global Dynamics: Some modest comprehension of key traits and mechanisms of the world system, with emphasis on theories and concepts that may increase intelligent consciousness of global change.

5. Awareness of Human Choices: Some awareness of the problems of choice confronting individuals, nations, and the human species as consciousness and knowledge of the global system expands.

Hanvey acknowledged that his dimensions are merely a collage of ideas shaped by his own prejudices and that numerous other perspectives exist. His perspective, however, continues to serve as a baseline for the goals of global education.

The majority of global education movements documented in the United States are occurring at institutions of higher education (AASCU, 1986; Green & Olsen, 2003; NASULGC, 2004; NGA, 1989; Pickert, 1992), though this is not to say that global education is not happening in the K-12 curriculum at all. Since President Jimmy Carter's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies issued its 1979 report, increased emphasis in the curriculum in foreign language, geography and world history requirements have been noted (Smith, 2002). More than 100 international magnet schools and 420 International Baccalaureate (IB) programs are operating, and states such as Michigan and Florida have articulated position statements on global education (Tucker &

Cistone, 1991).

Nevertheless, as impressive as these programs are, “they reach far too few students, teachers, and schools” (Smith, 2002, p. 40). Global education is needed in *all* classrooms and in *all* disciplines, and at *all* levels, so as not to be relegated to geography and foreign language study. It should not be a separate subject in itself. Rather, global education should be a thread “woven into the fabric of the entire school curriculum” (Durtka et al., 2002, p. 2). Some specific challenges related to the development of global curricula include the need to rethink the delivery of content, integrating new sources of information; the need to favor the development of skills alongside knowledge; and the need to adapt curricula to the needs of different socio-cultural groups while promoting common values (Hallak & Poisson, 2000).

Recognizing these and other challenges, the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction Internationalization Task Force compiled a planning guide, *Planning Curriculum in International Education* (Durtka et al., 2002), to help teachers at all levels and in all discipline areas encompass global challenges, global cultures, and global connections in their classrooms. The guide is based on work taking place in Wisconsin classrooms and is aligned with Wisconsin’s Model Academic Standards. It is an example of one state’s efforts to bring the world to their students.

The curriculum guide articulates Wisconsin educators’ goals for global education and the four “global competencies” they wish their students to develop (Durtka et al., 2002). The first of these competencies is “deep understanding,” which incorporates a student’s ability to understand the complexities of culture, to recognize variety in

cultures, and to demonstrate comparative thinking. The second competency is “knowledge and skills,” which refers to the ability to master the knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate to specific cultural contexts. Third, students strive for “cultural participation,” which suggests the ability to function comfortably in other cultures and to communicate across boundaries. Fourth, students should demonstrate empathy to people of other cultures. Further, the Wisconsin curriculum guide describes four interlinking processes of learning global competence that can be applied in many subject areas. These processes are inquiry, action, dialogue, and world languages (Durtka et al.).

Global Educators

Global education plans and goals, such as those articulated through the Wisconsin planning guide, are more truly effective if disseminated through global educators (Merryfield, 2002, and others). Traditionally, the role of educators has centered on core values of subject expertise, public service, and professional judgment; but in light of globalization, Bottery (2006) added six further value requirements to their responsibilities to solidify educators’ relevance in the twenty-first century. The first of these values is increased ecological and political awareness, which encompasses an awareness of “the factors beyond their institutions which constrain, steer, or facilitate” educators’ practice, without which awareness they are blind to the forces affecting their societies and their classrooms (p. 106). In this regard, Bottery called for longer and more authentic professional development very different from the short-term versions so predominant.

The second value is that of supporting notions of public good, which refers to

educators' striving to make a difference in the quality of society. Manifestations of this value would include an increased sense of responsibility for others. Third, Bottery asserted educators must embrace accountability to the public domain; fourth, they must build trust among stakeholders; fifth, it is imperative that educators embrace epistemological provisionality (meaning recognize the importance of listening and of recognizing that they alone do not possess the truth); and sixth, they must engage in a greater degree of professional self-reflection, during which they consider the purposes of their profession.

According to Merryfield (2002), global educators who are grounded in such values share certain instructional strategies: first, they confront stereotypes and exotica and resist simplification of culture and issues. Second, they examine multiple perspectives; third, they teach about power, discrimination, and injustice; and fourth, they provide cross-cultural experiential learning. Global educators use these methods despite differences in the communities in which they teach, the variation in the student bodies they address, or the curriculum mandates of their particular districts or states.

Merryfield (2002) also discussed the difference global educators make in the lives of their students: They help their students develop open mindedness, they teach their students to anticipate complexity and to resist stereotypes, and they train them in cross-cultural communication—all essential skills in a global society and work force.

So where do global educators come from? Where do they learn these skills? The Wisconsin State Internationalization Task Force authors essentially answer these questions for us, stating, “Scientists teach via experiments; mathematicians teach by

probing for solutions; swimming coaches get wet. It is impossible to teach globally and culturally without exploring the globe and investigating cultures oneself” (Durtka et al., 2002, p. 40). I now turn to the impact of study abroad experiences in the development of global educators, particularly classroom teachers.

Study Abroad

Study Abroad Impact

Senator William Fulbright stated that exchange programs are intended “to bring a little more knowledge, a little more reason, and a little more compassion into world affairs and thereby to increase the chance that nations will learn at last to live in peace and friendship” (as cited in ACE, 2002, p. 17). On this line, the literature on study abroad is replete with both qualitative and quantitative testimonial of the academic, career, personal, and cultural benefits of participation.

Academic impact. Hadis (2005) used retroactive questioning in administering an online questionnaire to 95 students who were admitted to study abroad programs through the New Jersey Consortium for International Studies between the fall of 1997 and summer of 2002. Using multivariate analysis to control for age and maturation, he concluded that study abroad has a positive academic impact on university students. The alumni in his study returned worldlier, more interested in international affairs, read newspapers more, increased second language fluency, and increased knowledge of their host countries.

In his literature review introducing the study, Hadis (2005) cited over 10 other

studies documenting second language acquisition gains. Furlong and Hardin (2000), in a survey of international education programs offered through the Florida Community College System, also report foreign language gains through study abroad, as well as a deeper understanding of history and politics.

Career impact. Akande and Slawson (2000) and Hadis (2005) reported a positive impact on careers, findings which support Bremer (2006), who asserted that international educational experiences improve business acumen “and the development of a network of global connections essential for conducting business internationally” (p. 42). In 2006, the Council on International Educational Exchange surveyed representatives from 352 firms, organizations, and agencies via online questionnaire. Respondents to that survey placed “significant value” on education abroad with two biases: first, employers feel that the longer the program the better; and second, they place higher value on experiential learning, meaning internships and service work (“Employers,” 2007). The survey of the Florida Community College offerings further found that student gained an understanding of work environment behavior through cross-cultural internships; and of the 1006 students surveyed by Hayward and Siaya (2001), 90% agreed that international education would help them work with people of other cultures, and 88% said it would give them a competitive edge in the work force.

Personal impact. Employing a mixed-methods case study to examine alumni from fifty years of programs at the Institute for International Education of Students (IES), Akande and Slawson (2000) found that study abroad teaches participants about themselves, makes them more comfortable interacting with people from different cultural

backgrounds, contributes to a better appreciation for the arts, and causes them to seek out a greater diversity of friends. Further benefits to personal development include maturation, increased self-confidence, exposure to different points of view, and the ability to change perceptions of own values.

Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) randomly surveyed 1,487 undergraduates of all ages and majors at Northern Arizona University, asking them to compare their exchange programs to programs at their home institution on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Their findings demonstrate an increase in maturity, compassion, understanding of other cultures, and appreciation for home culture. Through their literature review they further demonstrate that cross cultural experience changes stereotypes and exposes participants to alternative views of the world.

Black and Duhon (2006) conducted a third study to measure ability to adjust to cross cultural situations. They used the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) developed by Kelly and Meyers to determine if students gained tolerance, empathy, self-confidence, and independence. They administered the survey to 200 students one day after arriving in London on a business study abroad program. They then explained the survey and gave students a guidebook on how to improve in each area. Students were given a second inventory at the end of the program a month later. Students then scored both instruments and were given time to decipher their scores and take notes on changes that had occurred. The results indicated percentile increases in every instance. Differences in cross-cultural tolerance, self-confidence, and independence were significant at the .05 level, and increases in cultural empathy and total score were

significant at the .01 level.

Cultural impact. Many cultural benefits of study abroad have already been mentioned. In sum, benefits include the opportunity to gain international perspectives, to recognize contributions of diverse societies, to develop appreciation of other countries and cultures, and to realize that other cultures may do things differently (ACE, 2002; Black & Duhon, 2006; Bremer, 2006; Hadis, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Additionally, students gain new perspectives on American cultural values and biases (Smiles, 2001). “It is hard to explain to those who have not been abroad,” states Connie Perdreau, director of Ohio University’s Office of Education Abroad. “You think differently, you act differently. You have a greater awareness of humanity.... And that is the best way to have world peace—to see each other’s humanity” (as cited in Smiles, p. 27).

Short-Term Programs

The question brought up in much of the literature is whether participants in short-term programs are academically, personally, and culturally impacted to the same degree as participants in longer programs. A growing segment of the literature testifies they can be. Sarah Spencer and Kathy Tuma, editors of NAFSA’s *Guide to Short-Term Programs Abroad*, define short term study abroad programs as those lasting one to eight weeks, usually faculty directed, and sponsored by a home institution or a consortium (as cited by Hulstrand, 2006). Short-term sojourns are ideal for students with family or job constraints, students with limited financial resources, community college students, and those not ready (emotionally, linguistically, or otherwise) for a long-term immersion

program. Further, short-term programs are cost effective and well-received by participants (Zamastil-Vandrova, 2005).

According to the Institute of International Education's 2003 *Open Doors* report, more and more students are choosing short-term programs as the number and diversity of offerings increase. More than 50% of U.S. undergraduate and Masters students who participated in study abroad in that reporting year chose summer programs, internships, and January terms over academic year programs (as cited in Chieffo & Griffiths, 2003). These programs tend to bring in more and different students who would not have studied abroad before; but notably, this is not the traditional population. The numbers of students going for a full academic year are not dropping; they are just dropping as a percentage of the whole (Hulstrand, 2006).

This trend warrants more research in the impact of short-term programs. More institutions are offering short-term sojourns, and faculty and administrators have strong feelings about their impact; but many institutions are proceeding on the good-faith assumption that they are a valuable investment of money, time, and effort. More reliable data are needed in order to garner continued support for short-term excursions; further, programs will not improve until they are put under the microscope (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2003; Zamastil-Vondrova, 2005).

A few studies have begun scrutinizing short-term programs. Chieffo and Griffiths (2003), for example, conducted a survey at the University of Delaware Center for International Studies, which sends over 1,000 students on short-term programs each year. (The University of Delaware is ranked sixth by *Open Doors* in the number of students

sent abroad). The survey included some Likert-type questions and some frequency questions and relied entirely on student perceptions of attitudes and activities. The surveys were administered to students enrolled in 32 programs abroad and 32 sections of 22 similar courses on campus. The researchers conducted a multivariate analysis of variance, adjusting for inequalities of gender, class, GPA, and major.

Cheiffo and Griffiths (2003) found that short-term programs provide broad-based benefits to participants, regardless of program specific goals and structure. The majority of benefits they reported related to greater sensitivity to language and culture. Specifically, 70% of the study abroad participants demonstrated strong interest in learning a foreign language, while only 50% of the at-home population expressed interest. The study abroad group also demonstrated more tolerance with non-English speakers in the U.S. Further, of the study abroad participants, 41% reported a new appreciation for the arts, compared to 22% of the on-campus students; and 90% of the study abroad participants reported thinking more often about the differences and similarities between themselves and foreign peoples, compared to 50% of the on-campus survey respondents.

Zamastil-Vandrova (2005) reported similar participant perceptions in her qualitative study of international business majors on a three and a half week sojourn to the Czech Republic. Zamastil-Vandrova analyzed participant journals, in which they responded to open-ended questions, as well as individual interviews. She then reported her data as narrative to capture the participants' experiences in their own words.

Participant perceptions in this study fell into four major categories: linguistic

awareness, cross-cultural perspectives, attitudinal reflection, and academic skill development. Under increased linguistic awareness, which does not include language acquisition, participants self-reported more patience with foreign language speakers, personal frustration for their own and Americans' monolingualism, and the development of linguistic coping mechanisms. Their cross-cultural perspective development was also significant, as students reported an increased awareness of global events, recognition of their prior cultural misconceptions, and the feeling that Americans need to better learn to adapt to unfamiliar circumstances.

The third category of improvement, attitudinal reflection, left the most profound impact on the short-term participants in Zamastil-Vandrova's study. These reflections focused on what it means to be an American. Overwhelmingly, participants felt that Americans are too monolingualistic and cross-culturally deficient, too consumer-oriented, and too "proud to be an American." Fourth, with regard to academic skill development, participants on the Czech Republic business study abroad program felt their experience would benefit their career. They reported increased knowledge about their host country, as well as increased confidence and self-esteem and readiness for an independent cross-cultural experience.

A third examination of short-term study abroad was conducted by Lewis and Niesenbaum's (2005), who surveyed six years' worth of participants in an environmental and cultural conservation service learning project in Costa Rica. Their subjects, who spent a semester on campus preparing for the 2-week component abroad, revealed an increased interest in interdisciplinary studies upon their return. Biology majors, for

example, studied Spanish and nonscience majors enrolled in upper-level biology courses. The researchers also felt that participants came away with a more sophisticated understanding of the costs and benefits of globalization.

Obstacles and challenges to short-term programs. Zamastil-Vondrova (2005) does admit to some downsides of short-term travel. These include the limited time with host-country nationals and hence limited cultural immersion, and less focus on academic outcomes, which are perceived as shallow compared to intrinsic benefits gained. Further, she observed that while students did gain confidence with travel, they still relied too heavily on their advisors. Hulstrand (2006) asserted that these potential challenges to short-term programs can be prevented or lessened with good predeparture preparation.

Reiterating the challenge of cultural immersion, Guerrero (2005) noted that students on short-term sojourns “have to make a concerted effort to get significant exposure to local culture and community” (p. 44). With heavy workloads, which require ten weeks worth of work to be completed in four, students have fewer opportunities for interaction with locals and less time overall. Hulstrand (2006) claimed that the best way to tackle this challenge is through service learning because students are more likely to interact with locals if they are directly serving them than they would if they spent their time studying in dormitories or sightseeing with other English-speaking Americans.

A much more serious problem than lack of cultural immersion occurred on a Fulbright Group Projects Abroad program that took a group of elementary and secondary teachers to Egypt (Newman, 1989). Participants on this short-term excursion spent 6 weeks attending lectures, visiting schools, industries, and historical sites, and studying

Arabic; yet despite a rigorous selection process and predeparture orientation, some participants reinforced their negative stereotypes. They did not develop empathy, but rather increased in isolationism and ethnocentricity. Newman employed a qualitative descriptive single case embedded analysis to reach the conclusion that these participants had not taken on the role of “cultural diplomat” for the excursion, but rather had assumed the role of “cultural imperialist” instead.

Short term programs as appetizers. Ultimately, the few studies that have been conducted on short-term programs have concluded that students use the experience to get their feet wet—to discover what an amazing experience study abroad is—particularly first generation college students with little or no travel experience. “Students who go abroad on short-term programs come back and talk about going again,” concludes Hulstrand (2006, p. 54). Short-term programs make living in foreign cultures easier and less threatening and give students confidence to participate in longer programs (Lewis & Niesenbaum, 2005); so in terms of increasing numbers and building awareness, short-term programs are the best way to “get the ball rolling” (Hulstrand, p. 51). Respondents to Lewis and Niesenbaum’s survey of short-term program participants replicated this sentiment. Almost half of the participants in their 2-week Costa Rica program had traveled or studied abroad again within a few years, and those who did made a clear connection to their experiences in Costa Rica.

Preservice Teachers Abroad

A growing body of literature examines large-scale efforts in teacher preparation programs to give preservice teachers authentic cross-cultural experiences. One study,

Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done, by Schneider (2003), is an in-depth exploration of current practice. For this study, Schneider conducted 174 interviews on 250 subjects on 24 campuses coast to coast. These campuses represent a solid cross section of institutions engaged in teacher training, particularly in secondary education. They include 10 comprehensive universities (1 private, 9 public), two private liberal arts colleges, 10 public research universities and two private research universities. Schneider also interviewed 65 current teachers. The interview protocols varied for deans, faculty, and student advisors in departments of education and departments of arts and sciences, as well as for administrators. Schneider did not mention how her interviewees were selected.

A second report, *Changing Views about International Activities in Teacher Education*, is an historical overview of international education trends in U.S. teacher education programs, beginning in the 1970s. In 2000, author Pickert (2001) sent a survey to 735 members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, to which 59 institutions from 29 states responded. This sample was evenly balanced between public (58%) and private (42%) institutions. The survey examined institutional demographics and the presence or absence of several international activities, such as recruitment of international students, curriculum, and mutual agreements. Pickert then compared results to similar surveys distributed in 1970 and 1990. This study is limited in that institutions not interested in international education were not likely to have responded, so results may be biased.

Common themes. In these two studies and in other policy papers and anecdotal essays, several common themes emerge with regard to globalizing teacher education.

These include movements to revise curricula to include more international content and to increase foreign language requirements, as well as to engage pre-service and inservice teachers in authentic cultural experiences. Debate ensues on what exactly constitutes an “authentic” experience, but the generally accepted definition is an educational international experience beyond the “two-week vacation” (Schneider, 2003). Merryfield (1995) claimed that an academic component is tantamount, and Citron and Kline (2001) asserted that, to be effective, the experience requires adequate orientation, assessment, and reflection.

Pickert’s (2001) historical analysis confirmed that faculty and student study abroad are gaining in priority, and Schneider (2003) found in her campus visits that some practice teaching abroad was considered an important vehicle for prospective teachers to gain international understanding. Pickert’s survey asked subjects the three ways students can best achieve an international perspective; and of the available responses, 73% said this could be accomplished by providing opportunities for students to study or work abroad. Another 67% replied that sending faculty abroad would impact global awareness. Likewise, in Schneider’s study, “All but one (an education dean) of nearly 100 interviewees who were asked felt that overseas experience, of any kind, has an impact on teaching” (p. 32). Two thirds of the current teachers she spoke with felt that study abroad should be required as part of the undergraduate curriculum, and nearly half felt that student teaching abroad should be required. Unfortunately, this is rare because most states require student teaching to be completed in the state offering the certification.

Departments of education also support study abroad programs more than other methods of globalizing education, such as increasing foreign language or globalization requirements, because study abroad does not require reconstruction of the curriculum, and confrontation with institutional values is therefore kept to a minimum (Pickert, 2001). The institutional values embodied by a curriculum are the result of hard fought political battles with state accrediting agencies and professional associations, in addition to university faculty and administrators. Because education students who study abroad can do so while completing their other requirements, administrators can avoid confrontation with those values.

Barriers to study abroad. If study abroad has such wide support with the public, administrations, and prospective students, why do fewer than three percent of American university students go abroad? In particular, why do so few pre-service teachers engage in academic, cross-cultural experiences?

Among the incoming students Schneider interviewed, 11% claim the problem is money or job related, both issues that a short-term program could help to alleviate; and another barrier is time. Although students are increasingly interested in study-abroad programs, as the Schneider (2003) and Pickert (2001) studies demonstrated, many do not pursue the opportunity because they are uncertain how much academic credit they will receive, and they fear that going abroad will lengthen the time it takes to graduate (Bollag, 2004; Marcum & Roochnik, 2001). They instead rush through tightly structured programs viewing any time away as an interruption of their studies rather than as a necessary component of a solid education. Education deans in Schneider's study also

cited pressure “not only to train teachers quickly but also to meet increasing numbers of mandates from accrediting agencies, as well as the movement toward standards testing” (2003, p. 210). Programs are losing flexibility as they become less localized and more nationalized toward No Child Left Behind, which, tragically, excluded an international component.

To compound the problem, it is now illegal in many states for colleges to advise students to prolong their teacher training, including certification, to more than four years (Schneider, 2003). Yet interestingly, more than 60% of the current teachers in Schneider’s study responded that the undergraduate training of teachers “could, and probably should, be expected to take more than eight semesters” (p. 21).

A third barrier to participation in study abroad is a lack of faculty role models. Faculty should be more proactive in supporting authentic, cross-cultural experiences for their students by themselves engaging in international exchanges. “Studying abroad gives professors a life, a new perspective,” says Carolla Smith, director of international studies at SBCC. It can be a “vital element” in professional development, no matter what the field (Orchowski, 2004). Professors who spend time abroad, either as students or as faculty, provide an international perspective to their subject matter, which then touches their students.

Finally, preservice mentoring emerged as a critical barrier in the preparation of global educators. Students need mentoring about international opportunities; yet to many who were interviewed, the concept seemed new. Nearly 30% of those interviewed by Schneider (2003) reported that some mentoring by globally minded teachers is

happening, but such placements are “haphazard” and checking the mentor-teachers’ qualifications on this point is “low priority” (p. 35). More than 80% of respondents said student advising needs improvement, particularly within the early years of education and for students with little or no overseas experience. Over 20 interviewees suggested targeting fresher orientation to bring more attention to international opportunities.

The most frequent suggestion to improving mentoring was better training for advisors (Schneider, 2003). Suggestions included special workshops about international opportunities, increased discussion at regular faculty meetings, annual briefings about international development, and sending more faculty and professional advisors abroad so they can gain better appreciation for the value and feasibility of international programs and their relationship to on-campus programs.

Summary—preservice teachers abroad. Cushner (2007) summarized the imperative of overcoming these barriers to provide pre-service teachers with authentic international experiences in his review of international student teaching. He notes that while technology allows for almost instantaneous communication between anyone, there is no substitute for real, person-to-person immersion experiences.

If teachers are truly architects of educational experiences and opportunity they must understand how closely intertwined the relationship between cognition and experience or affect is—they are just inseparable when it comes to culture learning. A deep understanding and commitment to living and working with others is not achieved in a cognitive-only approach to learning—it develops only with attention to experience and the affective domain. (p. 35)

Citing Merryfield, who interviewed 80 teacher educators reputed for their success in global education, Cushner emphasized the impact living outside their own country can have on European American teachers. While teachers of color have generally experienced

discrimination and racism in one form or another in daily interaction, European American teachers rarely experience life as “Other.” A significant international experience can lead them to “new, firsthand understandings of what it means to be marginalized, to be a victim of stereotypes and prejudice, and how this might affect people” (Cushner, p. 36).

Experience in a foreign context ultimately allows people “the opportunity to experience what happens to their identity when they are no longer in control” and the contradictions between their beliefs and the realities of others (Cushner, 2007, p. 36). Cushner pointed to teacher educators as a critical link in providing authentic encounters for the preservice teachers in their charge.

Inservice Teacher Abroad

To learn specifically about the benefits of study abroad for practicing teachers, Wilson (1984) organized a survey, which she then distributed to 55 elementary and secondary teachers who had participated in cross-cultural experiences sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education or by Ohio State University. Wilson organized the 38 responses she received into three specific advantages that teacher-sojourners have over their nontraveling counterparts. First, teachers who have been abroad teach “more accurately, authoritatively, creatively, enthusiastically, and with more understanding about places they have visited” (p. 155; see also Cushner, 2007). Second, they are generally committed to disseminating their knowledge and experience to their students and community; and third, teachers who have sojournd internationally tend to extend themselves to people of different cultural backgrounds.

In her 1993 book, *The Meaning of International Experience for Schools*, Wilson

presented multiple case studies of teachers with international experience and demonstrates through them that a teachers' global perspective can be passed on to students and the wider school community. For one of the studies, Wilson followed the classroom practice of two sixth grade teachers for 1 year. The teachers both had extensive cross-cultural experience, and the impact of their experiences on their classroom activities and material culture was "obvious." The impact on their classroom goals, however, was more subtle.

At the conclusion of the year, Wilson individually interviewed 50 students from the two classes about the teachers' global knowledge and teaching ability. The interviews elicited common responses, which Wilson simply themed "they know more." This student insight triangulated with her extensive observation notes and the transcripts of informal and formal interviews with the teachers, who positively self-assessed. Wilson concluded that the students "became apprentices to the role of cross-cultural traveler. They learned that such travel would be a valuable and possible experience" (Wilson, 1993, p. 44).

For her dissertation defended at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, O'Brien (2006) implemented an embedded case study design to examine how a small group of teachers' perceptions of Islam and East Africa were transformed as a result of a 4-week educational sojourn to Tanzania and Kenya. The 10 teacher-participants in this program were subject to a rigorous selection process, participated in predeparture and follow-up activities, and were committed to integrating their experience into their classroom practice. O'Brien's central question was how an intense cross-cultural

experience would impact the participants' personal and professional lives.

What O'Brien found in her participants' classrooms was, in her words, "inspiring" (2006, p. 158). While many of the teachers faced various administrative or other obstacles in implementing their experience into their curricula, the teachers profiled developed a variety of creative yet intellectually demanding lesson and project plans reaching students, peers, and community members. The participants "initiated a range of conversations and discussions supporting their need to think deeply about their profession and how they can use global and multicultural perspective to connect with and influence their students" (p. 158-159). O'Brien summarized that, based on her experience, teachers can become better global educators and more creative and compassionate human beings with even short-term cross-cultural experience.

Delving deeper into the possibility of connecting with and influencing students, one teacher-abroad participant in another study emphasized the benefits of studying somewhere other than Europe: "For White faculty, it gives them an opportunity to see non-Whites in positions of leadership and to see themselves as the minority.... For minority faculty, the case is reversed. They can see where they are the majority instead of spending a lifetime in a minority status" (as cited in Smiles, 2001, p. 23). Evans (2004) agreed that this appreciation for diversity lends itself to more effective interactions with parents and students in her mixed methods case study of teachers sojourning in China.

As stated previously, short-term programs are gaining in popularity and diversity and are a more viable option for inservice teachers than are long-term programs (see Guerrero, 2005; Hulstrand, 2006); yet they still provide for lasting benefit. Furlong and

Hardin's (2000) survey of Florida's Community College system summarized these benefits for faculty who participated in study abroad programs as instructors, facilitators, or learners. These included:

- increased understanding of subject matter, which led to increased enthusiasm in the classroom;
- exposure to different cultures and points of view;
- better understanding of American culture in relation to other cultures;
- professional growth;
- revitalization and stimulation of new interests;
- new level of international competence and global awareness;
- satisfaction in process and opportunity to work with students and colleagues in a unique experience;
- ability to watch growth and development of students;
- reward of teaching in an environment where students actually practice what they learn in class;
- renewed vision for discipline and role as faculty member; and
- increased mastery of material. (p. 17)

While teacher exchange programs are not the only option available for teachers who wish to expand their global understanding, they are opportunities the U.S. State Department has determined "essential to the diplomatic process" (Jenkins, 2001, p. 34). With few exceptions, the overall literature testifies to the personal, academic, and language benefits of study abroad for participants. In addition, while the majority of these studies have investigated faculty of institutions of higher education, a growing segment of the literature addresses inservice elementary and secondary teachers' implementation of experiences on their curricula.

Conclusion

This literature review first examined the impact of globalization on education through six particular lenses: economic, political, cultural, environmental, demographic,

and American. I then summarized the goals of global education as a response to globalization, as well as traits considered essential for global educators to be effective. Finally, I examined study abroad in its many forms as a preferred professional development option for educators seeking a more global perspective. The assumption from the literature is that cross-cultural professional development opportunities help teachers develop the traits necessary to prepare their students to be socially and economically successful in an age of rapid globalization. This study was intended to contribute to the deficiency in the literature with regard to the effectiveness of short-term programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

*The knowledge of the world is only to be acquired in the world, and not in a closet.
(Lord Philip Dormer Stanhope Chesterfield)*

Objectives

The purpose of the present study was to examine whether and how a singular, short term cross cultural immersion experience for teachers can contribute to the development of global educators, hence furthering the cause of global education. Specific questions addressed in the study were as follows.

1. How do individual teachers infuse a singular international experience into their classroom practice?
2. In what ways can an isolated, short-term experience contribute to the development of a global educator?
3. How do teachers' perceptions of their responsibilities as educators change as a result of cross-cultural experience?

Study Design

Motivated by these questions, I implemented a qualitative, embedded case study design (hereafter “case study”) to analyze the experience of eight JFMF Teacher Abroad participants and the impact the experience had on their perceptions of themselves and their development as global educators. I wanted to know if the experience helped the

teachers feel more qualified to prepare their students for a life framed by globalization and if their personal perceptions of their role changed in light of the experience.

Qualitative designs lend themselves to more sensitive, in-depth studies than do quantitative designs, and they allow researchers to see through the eyes of participants, hence illustrating “multiple realities.” According to Stake (1995), whose case study methodology served as the pattern for this study, “qualitative advocates place high priority on direct interpretation of events, lower priority on the interpretation of measurement data” (p. 40). Qualitative designs are the preferred method when investigating “how” and “why” questions, particularly when the researcher has little or no control over the event or phenomena being investigated.

I chose a qualitative approach because I felt the emerging design would best help me understand how each of the teachers experienced Japan and integrated that experience into their self-perceptions as teachers. I approached the data gathering with the understanding that each of the teachers would experience an individual reality that would differ from the others’ and mine.

Case studies are a common approach to qualitative inquiry, though case study itself is defined by interest in an individual case, not by the method of inquiry (quantitative or qualitative) used (Stake, 2000). Yin (1989) defined a “case” as a “real life context” bounded by time and space, and Stake (1995) stressed the importance of studying a particular case within its bounded or naturalistic setting. The eight subjects of this study were bound by their participation in the JFMF October 2007 cycle in Japan. All participated in the same orientation sessions and cultural activities in San Francisco and

Tokyo, and all were sent to the same city (Tainai, Niigata) for a week of professional development activities. Each was sent to a different family for the home stay, and all attended the same debriefing sessions at the close of the program. Subjects then returned to their home states and schools to continue with their follow-on plans and reporting for the next six months. Hence, while the participants closed the study in various stateside locations, the JFMF program itself was bounded by time and place. Finally, the specification of an embedded case study simply implies that the primary unit of analysis (the individual) is embedded within a larger case (a program with 200 participants per semi-annual cycle), and the study includes more than one such unit of analysis—in this case, eight.

Sample Selection

To be accepted to the Japanese Fulbright Memorial Teacher Program, educators must have demonstrated through their applications a long-term commitment to education and to the goals of the JFMF program. The Tainai, Niigata, cohort with whom I traveled consisted of 20 educators (5 male and 15 female) who fit this criteria. The group included one superintendent, an elementary school principal, two media specialists, a transition support specialist, and 15 classroom teachers. We represented public, charter, private, and parochial schools. Six of the teachers taught at the elementary level, four at the middle or junior high school level, and six taught high school. Two were on academic year sabbatical when we traveled.

Because I specifically wanted to examine the experience of practicing teachers, I removed the names of the media specialists, principal, and superintendent before

randomly selecting eight teachers to participate in the study. I chose members of my cohort because our geographical proximity in Japan throughout the experience allowed a certain level of intimacy and trust to develop between me and the participants. It also allowed for more convenient on-site gathering of preliminary demographic data. I offer full descriptions of the teacher participants in Chapter IV.

Data Collection

Creswell (1998) claimed that case studies involve the widest array of data collection of any of the qualitative methods because the researcher must build a deep picture of the case. According to Merriam (1998), “Any and all methods of gathering data, from testing to interviewing, can be used” (p. 28). Throughout the duration of this study, I relied on five particular sources of data collection: documents, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts. Documents constitute materials such as those provided by JFMM in San Francisco and Japan, such as our “blue bible,” as well as application essays and follow-on plan proposals, which all but one of the participants provided. Also included as documentation is an initial demographic questionnaire, which was completed in Japan by the eight randomly selected subjects.

Next, I conducted two semistructured, individual interviews with each participant (see Appendices C and D for informed consent form and rationale for photographing and recording of participants). The first interview took place in Japan while we were visiting our host city, Niigata, and was a face-to-face interview. I met with each subject individually, in her or his hotel room, on the train traveling to or from Tokyo, or during our free time in the baths or over dinner. I transcribed on my laptop as the interview took

place, asking for clarification as necessary. I gave the teachers the option of reading their transcripts, but all but one declined, saying they trusted me.

The second interview took place between 5 and 6 months after our return to the United States, after participants had the opportunity to decompress from the experience and implement their follow-on plans. This interview was conducted via email, with clarification phone calls placed and emails sent as needed; again, all but one of the participants responded.

Electronic interviewing, with its unique challenges, posed certain limitations on this study, although there were advantages as well, such as low cost and more time for me to phrase effective follow-up questions and probes. The major disadvantages were the speed of return and the elimination of face-to-face interaction and the ability to read non-verbal behavior and cues. “It remains to be seen whether electronic interviewing will allow researchers to obtain ‘thick descriptions’ or accounts of subjective experiences” and whether it can provide the detailed context necessary to construct a successful case study (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p. 667).

In addition, the timing for the second interview was necessary but difficult because of constraints of end-of-year scheduling. First and foremost, teachers needed to have the opportunity to implement their follow-on plans in order to self-assess the impact of their experience. Second, follow-on reporting was due to JFMF on June 1, just as most teachers were finalizing their school years. The end of the year is hectic enough for most teachers; wrapping up a 6-month project to report back to our Japanese sponsors as well as trying to respond to email interviews compounded the end-of-the-year frenzy. Three

teachers, including myself, were also leaving their current duties and moving on to other schools or jobs, so we had the additional burden of packing up our belongings from our classrooms.

Despite the fact that this timing issue may have limited the depth of the responses, I also feel that the teachers needed time to process the Japan experience in order to respond honestly to the questions. While we were in Japan, and shortly after our return, we were on a “high,” so to speak. We were fired up by the experience and the program objectives. However, once we got back into the reality of our lives and responsibilities in the United States, and the difficulties of implementation set in, teachers’ commitment to our personal goals and to the JFMF objectives were put to the test. Some teachers met with resistance from formerly supportive administrators, one teacher dealt with the death of a family member, and still another had to plan a daughter’s wedding. This is not to mention the challenge of adding on to already burdened curricula. The timing of the second interview, therefore, was difficult; but I feel the responses were more honest with more time having elapsed.

As advised by Stake (1995), I approached each interview with a short list of issue-oriented questions that allowed each individual participant to construct her or his case. Issue-oriented questions are those that allowed me to analyze whether and how the JFMF experience impacted teachers’ perceptions of themselves and their responsibilities as global educators. At the initial face-to-face interview in Japan, these questions included the following.

1. What other cross-cultural experiences have you had, professional or

otherwise?

2. How do you integrate your previous cross-cultural experience(s) into your classroom practice?

3. How do you feel your students are affected by this curriculum enhancement?

4. Why did you apply for the JFMF program?

Questions for the second interview included

1. How was the JFMF experience similar to or different from prior cross-cultural experiences you may have had (professional or otherwise)?

2. Specifically, how did you integrate your JFMF experience into your classroom practice?

3. How do you feel your students were affected by this (JFMF) curriculum enhancement?

4. What are your responsibilities as an educator in an age of rapid globalization?

5. How has this perception changed, in one way or another, as a result of your JFMF experience?

6. Do you intend to pursue other cross-cultural professional development opportunities? Why or why not?

By keeping the interview questions open, I allowed each interviewee the opportunity to express her or his unique experience while I stayed in control of the data gathering and maintained focus. This approach allowed for their multiple realities to emerge; the need for understanding of those realities rendered imperative the trusting rapport I developed with my subjects while in Japan (Fontana & Frey, 2000).

Stressing the importance of direct and participant observation as further methods of data collection, Stake (1995) advised researchers to look for unique moments to reveal the complexities of the case and to relay those moments with “thick description” (a term he borrows from Geertz). Stake is a situationalist, claiming meaning resides within a specific context, and asserts that researchers should record even the most mundane of details so as to give their readers a vicarious experience. I recorded specific observations of both planned and personal activities while in San Francisco and Tokyo. I did this longhand in a daily journal because this method was less cumbersome and intrusive than using a laptop computer. Further, recording longhand is informal and not intimidating to those around—at least not to these fellow participants. I also used a small digital camera and video camera to aid my memory and to record presentations and question/answer sessions. These notes provide the majority of the “thick description” required in case study research. The sense of “being there” that I created from these descriptions will allow readers to share in the interpretation of the case.

I should note that as a cohort, we spoke openly about our experiences. These open and honest discussions took place over saki and raw fish, and they took place under the stars in natural hot springs. They also occurred spontaneously as we traveled to and from the schools by bus, while we were observing school activities, or on the train to and from Tokyo. I never felt like members of my cohort or study participants were censoring their comments to me as we spoke, and they never seemed self-conscious or apologized for what they said. While I did not always have my journal with me during these spontaneous debriefing sessions, I recorded the crux of them as soon as time would allow.

Finally, follow-on plans, reflection materials, resulting lesson plans, assessments, and student work gathered during and at the close of the study constitute the physical artifacts for analysis. These sources proved to be less informative than the other forms of data collection; nevertheless, I did gather final follow-on reports from five of the eight participants. These reports were simply photocopies of what they sent to JFMF as required. Some teacher-subjects chose to imbed their experience into existing lesson plans, some to broaden the scope of existing lesson plans, and some to create entirely new daily or unit plans and assessments for implementation.

Participants did not include as much personal reflection in their final follow-on reports as I had hoped, but rather focused their presentations and discussions on implemented activities and lesson plans. This is not to say they did not reflect, as most wrote vigorously and consistently in personal journals and we were constantly reflecting as a group. Participants simply did not formalize those reflections in the materials sent to JFMF. By far the most useful sources of information for me were the application essays, the interviews, and the observations.

Analysis

In qualitative research, analysis begins at the same time data collection begins (Stake, 1995). Both processes proceed simultaneously and are ongoing—a characteristic of qualitative methodology that allows meaning to emerge but that makes separating the processes of gathering and analyzing difficult. I made a preliminary sorting of the data shortly after I returned from Japan as a way to anticipate further themes. Then I set the data aside and spent 6 months implementing my own follow-on plan and catching up

with my regular responsibilities until the second round of interviews.

Using the preliminary data, I compiled what Yin referred to as a “case study database” (as cited in Tinkler, 2004), which I added to as I conducted the second round of interviews. Tinkler advised organizing the database in chronological order, which I did, so that changing views and progressions from beginning to end are evident. While I was constantly recoding throughout the process (hence becoming intimately familiar with the data), the chronological approach was useful for me because very often the subjects’ follow-on proposals bore little or no resemblance to the new or revised curricula they actually implemented. It also helped me track teachers’ thought processes throughout the duration.

According to Stake, final analysis of the database takes place in three stages: description, categorical aggregation, and assertion. As stated, a program’s physical space is fundamental to its meaning, so “thick description” of that space and the creation of a vicarious experience is necessary for readers to share in the interpretation of the teachers’ perceptions (Stake, 1995).

The second component of analysis, categorical aggregation, is essentially the process of coding the data by issue or theme and searching for patterns. Through this process, as common elements emerged, so did the patterns or themes that connected them. Often the patterns were anticipated, drawn from the research questions, and sometimes they emerged unexpectedly (Stake, 1995). Regardless of how or when the themes emerged, the final analysis of the data is based upon them.

While a lot of coding software is available, I am a traditionalist. I kept two hard

copies of everything I gathered, including interview transcriptions, application materials, and observation journals, so I could have one clean copy and one working copy on which I could code and recode with colored pencil.

The final stage of qualitative case study analysis is to draw assertions, or what Stake (1995) referred to as “naturalistic generalizations.” While qualitative research may not pass the empirical tests that characterize formal scientific generalizations, the information gathered has practical and functional use. If a research report is properly descriptive, readers will intuitively recognize similarities to their own experience and establish the basis for generalizations (Myers, 2000).

An Emergent Design

Marshall and Rossman (1999) stated that case studies offer an opportunity to delve into meaning, and that meaning “rests on both the researcher’s and participants’ world views” (p. 61). While I know it is not possible to be entirely objective during an experience such as this, I must admit that I struggled at times, both in Japan and during the analysis process, to keep my own worldview in check. I went into the JFME experience with a stash of prior knowledge and experience that the other teacher participants were not armed with, and that experience burdened me with some very strong biases, not all of which were positive. That prior experience included four years I spent living and traveling in former Japanese colonies (particularly South Korea, but also China, Southeast Asia, and Micronesia) and my experience as a graduate student researching Japanese colonialism and the legacy of the World War II Comfort Women

(see Appendix B).

For the most part, my prior perspective did not impede analysis of the initial objectives of this study; however, the individual realities that emerged from the teachers' experiences in and post Japan went far beyond the framework of the original proposal, and my perceptions played heavily into the deeper layers of interpretation. For this reason, I have divided the analysis into two parts. The first, Chapter V, responds to the study questions and remains within the bounds of the proposed study and the framework introduced in the Review of Literature section.

In Chapter VI, however, the analysis takes on a life of its own. As I explained earlier, the realities that emerged could not be contained within the original framework, and I struggled to find a lens through which I could interpret my and the other teachers' experience. The result is a narrative through which I attempt to make meaning of our time in Japan and in the months afterward. At that point, I introduce my own bias in depth, as well as a new framework for interpreting how teachers' perceptions of themselves and their roles as educators were affected as a result of the JFMF experience.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine how classroom teachers integrate a short-term, cross-cultural experience into their classroom practice and how the experience impacts their perceptions of themselves as global educators. The hope is that such interdisciplinary professional development and direct exposure to another culture will help teachers (and other educators) prepare their students adequately for life in our

increasingly complicated and connected world. I now turn to a description of the JFMF program and study participants.

CHAPTER IV

JAPANESE FULBRIGHT MEMORIAL FUND PROGRAM
AND PARTICIPANTS

Seek knowledge, even unto China. (Mohammed)

In this chapter, I provide a detailed description of the Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Abroad program and study participants to help readers gain a sense of “being there” (Stake, 1995). This authenticity is necessary in order for readers to share in the analysis of the multiple realities that emerge.

The Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Program

In the 11 years the JFMF program has been operating, it has become a masterpiece of stereotypical Japanese precision. Shuffling 200 Americans around a country where punctuality is imperative is no small task; many participants were simply grateful we were not forced to wear matching hats and follow a flag.

When we arrived in San Francisco for our orientation, we were each given a bound informational booklet (color coded by cohort), which included contact information, hotel maps, participant profiles, and a detailed itinerary. The book quickly became known as the “blue (or yellow, or green, or red) bible,” and we were told that a replacement would cost ten dollars. Our luggage was coded by colored ribbons, indicating flight orders and host city destinations; and we were directed on cultural trivialities such as how to hail a cab, what to wear around the hotel, how and when to

swap business cards, and how to heat a toilet seat.

Our initial perusal into our bibles brought naïve chuckles. The itinerary indicated, for example, that we would arrive at the hotel from the airport at 5:10 and that we would arrive at a certain destination another day at 9:25; and we could not fathom why the organizers had not simply rounded to the nearest half hour. Sure enough, and to our awe, we later pulled into those parking lots at 5:09 and 9:25, respectively, after artistic, extended negotiations of Tokyo traffic.

The assertiveness with which directions were given throughout the trip and the precision with which we were required to follow them was quite off-putting to many of the Americans who had not familiarized themselves with proper *katas*, or rules of behavior, prior to the trip. (I surmise from predeparture email discussions that more teachers were concerned in their departure preparations with exchange rates and slippers than with understanding their host country's national character). We were repeatedly told to clarify the distinction between the *Japanese Fulbright* and the *Fulbright* to our family and co-workers, as if confusion between the two would cause an embarrassing international incident (most in my family had never even heard of the Fulbright); and we had to sign out and back in if we left a lecture to use the restroom. Attempts to avoid the log were reprimanded, and I was chased to the loo more than once by an official with a clipboard.

This attention to detail was all a part of the cultural experience, of course; and I did not meet an American on the trip who was unwilling to conform to a rudimentary understanding of Japanese cultural norms in exchange for the access we had to educators,

politicians, artists, cuisine, and fine hotels. In fact, the majority seemed to comment on how nice it was to *not* have to be in charge for once. In addition, we were given plenty of free time in the evenings to explore at our leisure.

While in Tokyo, the entire group of 200 was subject to the same schedule; cohorts' schedules then varied once we got to our host cities, depending on accommodations, transportation time, school and university scheduling, and host family stays. I follow with a brief summary of activities, as experienced by the Tainai, Niigata, cohort.

Day 1

We arrived at varying times on the first day at San Francisco International Airport and from there were shuttled to the Sheraton Gateway Hotel for lunch and orientation. That evening, we crowded into the hilltop residence of Consulate General Yasumasa Nagamine for our official welcoming reception. This was one of only two nights that we shared accommodations. (I roomed with the one other participant from Utah.) For the remainder of the trip, we had the luxury of private accommodations.

Days 2 and 3

The next day, we broke into groups for our flights to Japan. Because we crossed the International Date Line, we arrived at Narita International Airport the afternoon of Day 3. We checked into the luxurious Tokyo Prince Hotel; and that night, we had dinner on our own, with the option of meeting Fulbright alumni. (While most meals were provided by the hotel or were otherwise covered, JFMF participants were given a

generous stipend for meals that were not provided.)

Day 4

We spent most of Wednesday sightseeing Tokyo as a group by bus. We visited the Akasaka Detached Palace, the Supreme Court, the Diet, the Imperial Palace, and Asakusa Temple; then we were given free time to roam the shopping district of Asakusa before returning to the hotel for an introduction to traditional Kyogen theater. That evening, we attended another welcoming reception at the hotel, where we were again reminded not to confuse the *Japanese Fulbright* program with the Fulbright!

Day 5

On Day 5, we had access to members of parliament and higher education via lectures (in English) and question-answer sessions. We began the day with a keynote lecture by Tsutomu Kimura, President of the National Institution for Academic Degrees, followed by a lecture on the Japanese economy by Takahiro Miyao, Economics professor at the International University of Japan. After lunch, we learned about the organization of the Japanese government from a panel of Diet members, including Representatives Yuji Tsushima and Kuriko Inoguchi.

Day 6

Participants could choose among break-out seminars on this day. We had the option of learning about special education from a professor of teacher education, women's status in Japan from a university president, math education from the curriculum director of the National Institute for Educational Policy Research, or peace education

from an atomic bomb survivor from Hiroshima. Consummate to my personal teaching philosophy and follow-on intentions, I chose the lecture on peace education, which was a profoundly moving experience. We were pleased to hear from a high school English teacher from Hiroshima, who spoke about movements, progress, and resources in peace education; a woman whose father had died the previous year from atomic bomb-related cancer; and Keijiro Matsushima, an atomic bomb survivor, or *hibakusha*.

I learned from this gentle man that the term “*hibakusha*” is a discriminatory label placed on survivors of the atomic bomb, and that many survivors have been repeatedly victimized over the years by the false belief that they are somehow contaminated. Many *hibakusha* have been discriminated against in school in the workplace, and in marriage proposals. Sadly, many Japanese still treat them with contempt (see Tatara, 1998).

The concept of shaming the victim is not unique to Japan. Through the nineteenth century, and into the twentieth, for example, women in Korea carried with them small daggers, called *jangdo*, with which to commit suicide if they were sexually violated. This cultural perception of chastity and shaming explains why many Comfort Women (WWII sexual slaves) committed suicide after World War II and why others remained silent for nearly 50 years.

After an emotionally charged morning, we were introduced to another form of traditional Japanese theater, Kabuki, and then were more intimately oriented to our host cities, our cohorts, and our guides.

Day 7

While our early mornings and evenings throughout the week had been free for us

to explore the fish markets, sumo stables, karaoke lounges, memorials, and shopping districts, we were also given a full day on Saturday (Day 7) to strike out to a further destination of choice. I had traveled to Japan a few times before this experience, so I had already visited many of the popular destinations like Kyoto, Osaka, Okinawa, and Kobe. I decided before I even arrived this time that if circumstances permitted, I would travel to Hiroshima. My 12th-grade World Literature classes for 4 years had read survivor accounts of the atomic bombs, and I had a suitcase full of paper cranes to deliver to the Children's Peace Memorial.

The children's memorial in the Hiroshima Peace Park was built in honor of 10-year-old Sadako Sasaki, who died of atomic-bomb contracted leukemia. In accordance with tradition, Sadako believed that if she folded 1,000 paper cranes, her life would be spared. She died before accomplishing her goal, but her classmates finished folding them for her. The paper crane has since become a symbol of world peace, and schoolchildren worldwide send paper cranes by the thousands to be displayed in glass cases surrounding her memorial at Hiroshima Peace Park. My decision to deliver my students' cranes was compounded by the lecture on peace education the day before; so despite the \$200 round-trip fare, I was on the train by 6:00 Saturday morning.

I spent the entire day in Hiroshima with half a dozen other educators exploring the Peace Museum, the Ota River, and the various victims' memorials. While I thoroughly enjoyed every minute in Japan, I could have gone home after my day in Hiroshima and been completely satisfied. Between the atomic bomb survivor I had met the day before and the day I spent wandering the memorials, I was invigorated by the work I needed to

accomplish when I returned to my classroom.

Day 8

On Sunday, I boarded a bullet train with my cohort and our guide and traveled to Niigata, our host city. We spent that afternoon and evening exploring the city and shopping, stumbling at one point upon a traditional tea ceremony, which we were, invited to observe.

Day 9

On Day 9, we met our translator, who would assist us while we were in Niigata. We also visited Niigata University and Tainai City Hall. At the university, we first met briefly with the president and then with a panel of teacher educators and students. The highlight of this visit was a very insightful presentation (in English) on current trends and issues in Japanese education, offered by Professor Yosuke Yotoriyama. It was obvious by Dr. Yotoriyama's body language that the content of his lecture was considered controversial. As a professor, he seemed a bit of a renegade. He had been a Fulbright scholar himself and was very privy to mistakes in both Japanese and American curriculum development, acknowledging how the two systems fed off each other. He stole furtive glances at his dean on more than one occasion, such as when he spoke on the tendency to exchange submissiveness for money and the need for Japan to acknowledge its colonial legacy; and he had long hair! He acknowledged openly that his views were not popular but that his dean had told him, "You can say anything you want because you are going to make a presentation to foreigners in English."

This lecture was another high point of the JFMF trip for me because of the candor of the presenter and his ability to explain Japanese culture in a way Americans could understand. He focused mainly on issues like school violence, the increased dropout rate, and the mental health of education professionals; overall, he acknowledged a balance of strengths and weaknesses in the Japanese school system. His personal knowledge of the American education system made him more convincing as he related his views to us.

That evening our cohort checked into the Royal Tainai Park Hotel for a week of pampering. The government-owned hotel is located at a mountain resort with natural hot springs, tennis courts, hiking trails, bikes, monkeys, and a masseuse. While we did engage intently in JFMF objectives throughout our days in Tainai, our nights were more than relaxing.

Days 10, 11, 12, and 13

We spent the next four days visiting with the Superintendent, the Board of Education, and the local chapter of the Parent Teacher Association, as well as spending a full day each at Nakajo Elementary School, Kurokawa Junior High School, and Nakajo High School. At the schools, we observed classes, met with teachers, talked with students, and participated in student activities, both during and after school. This meant everything from jump roping and tag to attempting judo and calligraphy. Students and teachers were very accommodating in their attempts to speak English, despite our slaughtering of our rudimentary Japanese; but “official” conversations were moderated through our guide and translator.

Observations that stuck out predominantly for the American teachers regarding

the Japanese students and schools we visited are discussed below.

1. At a certain time each day, students of all ages are released to grab buckets, mops, and rags and clean everything from floors to light fixtures to toilets. Schools do not pay for janitorial staff, and basic maintenance is done by teachers and parents. As a natural result of their responsibility, students demonstrate a tremendous amount of respect for their facilities, despite the age of the buildings. As an extension, I do not recall seeing litter or trash of any kind on sidewalks or streets during my entire stay in Japan. (Recently, here in the United States, I visited the church of a friend, and after the meeting I noticed an older Japanese man picking tiny scraps of paper and string out of the carpet—what I would have left for a vacuum. This observation clarified for me the Japanese trait of cleanliness and order, which manifests itself as a habit of mind and community, and not just as a punishment for school children as is a common practice in America.)

2. The Japanese schools we saw lack much of the basic technology that we enjoy in American classrooms. None of the classrooms I visited was equipped with televisions or projectors, and only the high school had a computer lab. Teachers did not even have their own computers, but rather shared common computers in the teacher work room. This observation not only shattered a major stereotype of Japanese students and schools being techno-savvy but was also consistent with observations made by other cohorts who visited other cities.

3. The high school teachers in particular lacked basic classroom management strategies. Nakajo High School had been described to us as a less-affluent school with a

smaller percentage of students advancing to higher education; however, this did not prepare us for the amount of talking, texting, and wandering that took place while teachers were lecturing—and the teachers made no attempt at modifying students' behavior. This may be partly due to another observation, which was that in the high school we saw no other model of instruction employed than lecture and rote recitation. The teachers we met with there commented that students are becoming “increasingly immature.”

4. Another major observation, which was somewhat expected but shocking nonetheless, was the lack of diversity in the classrooms. In the three schools we visited, we saw one American foreign exchange student and one autistic child. (Mainstreaming students with disabilities is still a very new practice and is being met with much resistance). (See Appendix B for a brief discussion of multiculturalism in Japan.)

5. Principals and vice-principals transfer schools every two to three years, and teachers transfer every six to seven years. Longevity and loyalty to schools is basically non-existent because teachers know they will be moving soon; yet this transience can be good, too, if it means helping teachers to not burn out from years of the same contexts and routines.

Days 14 and 15

On Saturday morning, our individual host families picked us up for a two-day home stay. Through our host families, we were introduced to Japanese family life via whatever activity the family designed. I spent my weekend shopping, hiking, visiting outdoor markets, and bathing in natural hot springs with a beautiful extended family

consisting of Tomoyo, a 32-year-old special education teacher who spoke marginal English and with whom I spent the majority of my time; her 31-year-old engineer husband, Yoji; her 35-year-old brother, Shuji; and her 59-year-old mother, Yoshiko. The most important member of the family was 2-year-old Haruko, who was attached to me from the first moment.

Yoshiko, the matron of the home, was an exquisite woman by all accounts. Her home and garden were peacefully decorated in the Japanese aesthetic, and every meal she placed before me was finer than I could possibly enjoy at any restaurant, no matter the expense. I literally brought my camera to the table every time we ate. Tomoyo's brother, Shuji, spoke no English, so he just looked at me and laughed for 2 straight days. I was the first foreigner Yoshiko or Shuji had ever met, so they were quite nervous about having me in their home. In all, we got along swimmingly, to the point that when I left, we all got teary and Haruko threw a tantrum.

At the close of the home stay, my cohort met for a night at a traditional *ryokan* (Japanese style hotel), where we celebrated an intimate closing dinner and shared our stories. We all agreed that ours was the finest group of all, that we had the most fabulous translator and guide, and that no cohort could possibly have drawn as close or shared the experiences that we had shared.

Day 16

Monday was a travel day, but since our cohort arrived back in Tokyo quite early, we had the afternoon to shop and sightsee. I made it a point on this day to visit the controversial Yasukuni-jinja, the Shrine for Establishing Peace in the Empire. This shrine

is dedicated to the 2.4 million Japanese who have perished in war since 1853 and is the most controversial shrine in Japan. Sherif (2007) explained, “Perhaps more than any other site in Japan, the shrine has, throughout the post-war era, been the focus of debate about Japan’s culture and role in the international community” (p. 122-123).

The personal significance of my visit to the shrine is explained by my prior relationship with Japan (see Appendix B). In sum, Yasukuni-jinja connects the Japanese people to their glorious past and the state religion, Shinto, which until the surrender of Japan in 1945 espoused Emperor as God. It was in the name of the Emperor that many of Japan’s war crimes were committed. Imperial soldiers had been told that “brave sacrifices on the battlefield would earn them a place as *kami* (deities) at Yasukuni” (Sherif, 2007, p. 122); and as a result, and to the displeasure of Japan’s neighbors, Yasukuni enshrines a group of internationally designated class-A war criminals.

In 1953, former Vice-President Richard Nixon visited Japan but refused to visit Yasukuni because he learned of its central role in state Shinto and militarism. Likewise, to many of Japan’s neighbors, the existence of and continued political displays at the shrine bring to light the sharp contradictions of war and memory in Japan (Sherif, 2007).

Day 17

On Tuesday, we broke into groups for various education-related activities. Participants could choose between sessions on early childhood education, special education, art education, or environmental education; and in the afternoon, we met for a final lecture on the state of Japanese education and society by the JFMF Program Director, Kyoko Jones. The evening was ours.

Day 18

On Wednesday, each cohort gave a 15-minute presentation on their experiences in their host city, which was a fun and informative way to learn about the various regions of Japan; and then we were free for the remainder of the afternoon and evening. My group shared a short video we made of the children and the spa (to make everyone else jealous); and then the Native American member of our cohort dedicated a concise but moving dedication of gratitude to the Japanese government and people for their generous hospitality (see Appendix E). We flew home the following morning.

We were in Japan for just 3 weeks; but with such intense coordination, we were able to consume more culture, history, politics, food, music, school, and saki than could ever be possible or affordable for educators without the generous support of the Japanese government.

Study Participants

The October JFMF cycle differs from the June JFMF cycle in that the June cycle allowed for only classroom teachers, while the October cycle was open to administrators and other school personnel. The Tainai, Niigata, cohort I traveled with consisted of 20 educators (5 male and 15 female), including one superintendent, an elementary school principal, two media specialists, a transition support specialist, and 15 regular classroom teachers. The group represented public, charter, private, and parochial schools. Six of the teachers work at the elementary level, four at the middle or junior high school level, and six teach high school. Two were on sabbatical, one to complete a dissertation and one to

develop curriculum and further her education.

This diversity of roles limited the pool from which I could draw my subjects, because I was concerned primarily with teacher and classroom impact. Of the 13 possible subjects, I randomly selected eight, all of whom agreed to help with the study. One of those teachers participated in the initial demographic interview but did not complete the second interview or submit a follow-on report.

Table 1 identifies the eight subjects, plus myself, at a glance, following which I describe them all in greater detail, including their school demographics, current responsibilities, and prior cross-cultural experience.

Table 1

Study Participants

Name	State	Gender, age	Years teaching	Current responsibilities	School demographic
Robin	TX	Female, 55	21	K-5, interdisciplinary Gifted and Talented	Suburban
Michael	TX	Male, 32	8	2 nd grade, all subjects	Urban, IB
Susan	AK	Female, 46	21	1 st grade, all subjects	Suburban
Sam	VT	Female, 29	4	5-8, Language Arts	Rural, charter
Jared	RI	Male, 29	6	9 th grade, World History and Intercultural Communications	Urban, magnet
Barbara	MD	Female, 56	34	9-12, special education, transition support, cooperative work education	Suburban
Denise	GA	Female, 58	14	1-5, special education reading, language arts, and math	Urban
David	SD	Male, 53	33	9-12, U.S. History, Lakota Studies, Lakota Language	Rural, reservation contract
Me	UT	Female, 37	4	12, World Literature, College Preparatory Writing	Suburban

Robin

Robin taught a gifted and talented pullout curriculum for kindergarten through fifth graders at a suburban school in Texas. Of the approximately 700 students at the school, 80% were White, 16% were Hispanic, and 4% were Black. While the school was largely middle class, a few were bussed in from a lower-income area; but there were “not that many really poor kids.”

The curriculum Robin taught focused on depth, complexity, and critical thinking in the four core areas: math, language arts, social science, and science. Every third year (including the current year) she taught a simulation unit on warlords of Japan, where students act out the part of Samurai warriors in competition for land and power. She has taught the unit eight times in 16 years, so her current and former students were particularly excited for her trip.

In comparison with the other interviewees, Robin’s previous cross-cultural experience was about average. She had vacationed in Mexico at least six or seven times and spent 2 weeks teaching conversational English at a private school in China two summers prior to our trip.

Michael

Michael taught second grade at an International Baccalaureate (IB) school, also in Texas. He had taught for 8 years and loved his school environment, where 46 countries and 40 languages were represented among the 640 students. He described the student demographic as 30% Asian, 40% White, and 30% Hispanic, with a spattering of Middle Eastern. The socioeconomic make up was mostly middle-class, with 10% or less

qualifying for free or reduced lunch. Because of the nearby medical school, the Asian population tended to be transient.

Michael's previous cross-cultural experience was varied. He left the country for the first time on his senior trip when he was 18, traveling to London for 2 weeks with some teachers and other students. After college, he traveled to Europe and Mexico, and he returned to Europe for 3 weeks during the summer prior to JFMF. Because he taught at an IB school, he attended an international education conference every summer. The conferences were held in the United States, however; so the JFMF trip to Japan was his first professional development experience abroad.

Susan

Susan had been teaching for 21 years and was currently a first-grade teacher in Anchorage, Alaska. The 475 students served by her school represented a wide range of ethnic, cultural, and national groups, including Caucasian, African American, Alaskan and American Native, Hispanic, South Pacific Islander, Asian (specifically Korean, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Americans), and Eastern European. The percentage of non-Caucasian students approaches 50%, and a significant portion of the student population is comprised of armed forces dependents. The socioeconomic status of their families ranges from lower-middle to middle class. Bilingual tutoring was available in some languages, but the school did not get ESL assistance.

Susan had not had previous professional experience abroad either; however, she has vacationed to Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Cancun. Susan claimed her visit to Nome, Alaska, was a significant cultural experience because the concept of time for

Native Alaskans is “very, very different.” Nome is a remote gold mining town of 3,000 on the Bering Sea, reachable only by air.

Sam

Sam taught language arts to fifth through eighth graders at a small, independent, publicly funded school in Vermont. There were 750 permanent residents of the town, which is located near several major ski resorts and catered to fall and winter tourists. The school’s 65 students (Pre-K through eighth) come from a diverse socioeconomic background. Some are children of second-home owners who have moved there from the city, and some are children of lift operators. While the population is slightly transient, most of the children have lived in the Northeast their whole lives, with limited travel opportunities and infrequent exposure to obvious diversity.

This was Sam’s fourth year in the classroom, having first worked “a boring job in corporate training.” Sam is very passionate about teaching and cannot imagine doing anything else. She is also one of the more traveled members of the group. Growing up, she spent a lot of time in Canada visiting family and vacationing in the Dominican Republic, where her stepfather owns a second home. In college, she spent three summers living with a family and studying Spanish in Mexico; and during her senior year, she spent six months taking university classes in Valencia, Spain, after which she spent 2 months exploring Europe on a Eurail pass.

After leaving her “boring” corporate training job and completing a Masters in Education, Sam spent 8 months teaching at an international intentional community in southern India “doing really alternative things with education.” This “amazing teaching

and life experience” was capped off by a quick vacation to Southeast Asia. Sam’s most recent travel experience was a month and a half summer sojourn to Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Sam was fluent in Spanish and conversational in French.

Jared

Jared had taught for 6 years at a public magnet high school in Rhode Island. He currently teaches World History and Intercultural Communications. Of the 420 students at this academy of international studies, 98% qualified for free or reduced lunch; 55% were Hispanic, 25% were Black, 6% were White, and the rest were Native American or Alaskan Native.

While Jared was in high school, he worked at a summer camp where half of the staff were British, and he was able to visit them in the United Kingdom a few times. He also worked in Macedonia for 7 months with the United States Peace Corps. He was not able to complete the usual 2-year assignment because civil war broke out in Macedonia, so he traveled to Greece and Bulgaria for a month instead, before returning to the United States. He did not reapply for another Peace Corp assignment because of anxiety over the required home stay.

Jared stated in his initial interview that because of his experience in Macedonia, he was anxious about the upcoming home-stay in Tainai.

My biggest angst is the home-stay. I did a home stay for the first few months in Macedonia with the Peace Corps right out of college, and I hated it. It was very uncomfortable—uncomfortable enough that when we were evacuated because of the civil war after only seven months out, I wanted to register again but I didn’t because I didn’t want to have to do another home stay.... The angst mostly comes from the language barrier—not being able to communicate. [That means I’m] not understanding what they value.

Barbara

Barbara was a transition support teacher at a comprehensive, 4-year public high school in suburban Maryland that maintained a particular focus on fine arts and humanities. The 2,000-member student body was 30% White, 30% Black, 30% Hispanic, 10% Asian, and mostly middle- to upper-middle class.

As a transition support teacher with 34 years of experience, Barbara team-taught a cooperative work education class, monitored special education students on their job sites in the community, taught two in-school-work classes, and case-manages 25 senior students with their Individual Education Plans (IEPs). She also coordinated a peer-tutoring program and the EduCorps program. Finally, Barbara assisted graduating students with mental and/or physical disabilities in transitioning to adult roles.

Barbara's intercultural and international experiences began in high school, where she studied French and benefited from having foreign exchange students in her home. She attended a teacher training college in England for a semester while in college, vacationed in Europe, and recently spent a week on a Native American Indian reservation with her daughter's church youth group.

Denise

Like Barbara, Denise was a veteran teacher. She has been teaching for 14 years and currently taught reading, language arts, and math to first, third, fourth, and fifth graders at an urban school in Georgia. The school served about 500 students, pre-K through fifth, 85% of whom are African American and 15% of whom are a mix of White and Hispanic. Denise estimated that 85-90% of the students qualify for free or reduced

lunch. Denise's prior international experience included short vacations to Canada, England, and France.

David

The final subject was David, a mixed-race (European/Sioux) Native American teacher of 33 years. David currently taught U.S. History, Lakota Studies, and Lakota language at a reservation contract school in South Dakota, which served approximately 1,000 Lakota students, kindergarten through 12th grade. The school was a locally controlled community school, and students came from six districts of the reservation—which means that some lived about 35 miles from the school and spend up to 2 hours on the bus each day. The reservation had always been in what has been identified as the poorest county in the United States, though now it is classified as the third to the poorest county. The economic structure of the reservation had not changed, but other counties' structures have lowered, which in turn had increased the reservation's status.

Describing his students, David stated, "Our student population in a large part come from broken families, with backgrounds of alcoholism, although we have some students who are at the other extreme. They aren't wealthy, but are well-off per reservation standards, and they do have many strong, traditional families. So we have a range of backgrounds." David's wife was a Head Start teacher and is full-blood Sioux.

David was mixed-race, born in France to a Sioux mother and a French father when his mother was stationed there with the American military. He subsequently grew up in France and began his teaching career there. For 7 years he was the interpreter and representative for the Lakota Treaty Council to the French government and then to

European parliament. He interpreted for the United Nations in Switzerland, and he traveled throughout Europe for the Treaty Council and for pleasure. For a while, David lived half-and-half between France and the reservation, but he moved to the United States permanently 20 years ago.

Me, Raquel

I did not intend to count myself a subject in this study; however, my participation as a member of the cohort contributed to other teachers' interpretation of the experience. At the time of this study, I taught world literature and college preparatory writing courses to seniors at a suburban high school in Utah. The school is 90% Caucasian, with a spattering of Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, and African American students represented. The students came from mostly conservative backgrounds, as there is a heavy Mormon influence in the area; 31% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch, and the school boasts one of the highest AP pass rates in the state.

I had more international experience than anyone else in the Niigata cohort, having worked, studied, served, and traveled in over 30 countries prior to becoming a classroom teacher. During my time abroad, I taught in language schools, community centers, and refugee camps. I also taught inmates at a prison and at a halfway house in the United States.

Group Summary

Of the 20 educators in the Tainai, Niigata, cohort, I was the only one to have visited Japan before and Sam was the only other one with prior experience in Asia. While

I speak moderate Korean and can read some Chinese, no one else in the group could speak an Asian language. Only three of the cohort members expressed confidence in speaking another foreign language (Spanish and French), and two others expressed minimal ability (Spanish and German). All of the members selected for participation in the study had had some level of cross-cultural experience, however minimal.

CHAPTER V

OUTCOMES: ANTICIPATION AND DIRECT IMPACT

*If we try to understand each other, we may even become friends.
(Maya Angelou)*

As outlined in Chapter III, case study analysis occurs in three stages: thick description, categorical aggregation, and concluding generalizations (Stake, 1995). During the categorical aggregation (or coding) stage, multiple themes emerged, many of which were anticipated, as Stake projected; others, however, took me by surprise. After much shuffling and reshuffling of interview transcripts, application essays, journal entries, and follow-on plans, three umbrella categories emerged: anticipation, direct impact, and deep impact. The realities encompassed under anticipation and direct impact represent the type of information and responses I expected when I structured my research questions. My intent was to determine the effects of a short-term, cross cultural professional development experience on teachers' perceptions of themselves and their responsibilities in an age of rapid globalization. How did they define their roles as educators, and did that perception change as a result of their time in Japan?

As I stated in Chapter III, much of the teachers' experience extended beyond the bounds of my original intent and was entirely unanticipated. As the conversation progressed, it became less about Japan and globalization and more about us and our own histories and stories, which in turn became significant to our interpretation of the JFME reality. Therefore, the unanticipated themes will be discussed in Chapter VI under the umbrella theme "Deep Impact."

In the following discussion of Anticipation, I examine why teachers applied to the JFMF teacher abroad program and what they expected to gain from the experience. These responses were collected for the most part in the initial interviews and in the application essays, which sources provided for interesting comparison. In the Impact section, also in this chapter, I look at how teachers incorporated their experience into their curriculum and philosophy and how they feel that incorporation impacted their students, schools, parents, community, and self-perception.

Anticipation

While some members of the Niigata cohort were traveling abroad for the first time, all eight teachers who were selected to participate in this study had some level of previous international cross-cultural experience they already attempted to integrate into their classroom practice or philosophy. How did teachers integrate their cross-cultural experience prior to the JFMF experience, and what impact did they perceive it having? Further, what did they expect to gain from the JFMF experience, tangible or otherwise, that they did not already possess? In other words, why did they apply?

Integration of Previous Intercultural Experience

Examining the data, I found that the teachers integrated their previous cross-cultural experience on three levels. The first level is in the form of “fun tangibles.” This includes surface integration with the goal of enjoyment or entertainment, rather than lasting or affective impact. Susan, for example, read stories and sang songs from places

she had visited, but did not implement any direct lesson plans. When asked if she thought her students were affected by this curriculum enhancement, she responded, “Maybe a little, but probably not. It’s just fun to do.”

Another incorporated a unit on traditions in December and students and parents were “asked, urged, cajoled to come and share their cultural and family traditions.” Seldom did anybody take her up on it. “Students rarely have anything to say regarding their family heritage.” This teacher speculated the low response rate was because her students are so young they do not really know what to say or because their parents do not talk much about “the old country.” Denise also spoke of offering concrete tangibles “just for fun.”

When I went to London, I visited the Churchill museum, where I got a wealth of information to tie into [World War II]. And one of my classes studied Canada, so that was a perfect time to bring out my photos of Toronto, to show how you can fly in, get on a subway, and do everything without getting out into open air. They have an underground city for winter.

Again, the teachers who were offering tangibles mentioned that it was fun, and that it “heightened the students’ level of interest,” but none mentioned any deeper, lasting impact the photos and artifacts may have had.

A second and deeper level of cross-cultural integration is through an “Attitude of Acceptance.” Barbara stated, “It’s more of an attitude that I bring in. Because of the job I have [as a transition support specialist], I’m not doing multi-cultural activities in general. It’s more in my attitude of acceptance in the variety of students that I have and my desire to work with them.” Jared added, “I integrate through expressing a general attitude of acceptance and understanding.... I can’t teach by building into the curriculum—there’s

not room for it—but I can teach acceptance.”

Finally, Robin’s experiences in Mexico have helped her refine her attitude toward her students who speak no English: “I have a lot of children who come from Mexico, so my experience there helps me know about their language and culture because a lot of them are ESL students.” Even though Robin cannot speak Spanish, her exposure to the culture and language helps her help her students.

The third and seemingly most effective level of integration was “Natural Infusion”—those teachers who inherently infuse a global perspective into their curriculum content and delivery. Michael’s infusion, for example, is part of his job description. While they did focus on attitudes, “sort of like old character education but more refined,” teachers at his IB school focused on a more global perspective and “don’t always focus on American heroes and American things.” His was a natural integration, “pulled into whatever the unit is.” Michael believed his students were “absolutely impacted,” though the school population makes the implementation easier and more effective. He told me,

Last year I had what I called my UN class. These girls were from Pakistan, India, Italy, Israel. In first grade they’d sit and argue about politics and religion. That was the most insane year. I wanted them to just pull each others’ hair! Can we not talk about who’s going to heaven?

So integration came very easy for Michael because of the diverse group of kids that he served and because the philosophy was built into his school mission.

While infusing a global perspective was not necessarily part of Sam’s job description or school mission statement, infusion was inherent in her curriculum because of her extensive travel experience.

Once a week we go around the classroom and express things we're thankful for. That is definitely influenced by my experience. Sometimes they come up with amazing things, like "I'm thankful my grandfather is still alive." ...Making space for that in my classroom has been informed by my travels.

Sam also stressed excitement for foreign cultures, exhibits, and performances. She spoke to her students in Spanish to reinforce what they had learned in other classrooms. In addition, one year, she staged a Thanksgiving "hunger banquet" to give students concrete reference to the unfair distribution of wealth and food in the world. The hunger banquet actually stirred up controversy because many parents believed it was "developmentally inappropriate." The next year students were served an all-you-can-eat buffet on Styrofoam plates and told to "just throw away what you don't eat." Regardless of the periodic backlash, Sam remained committed to her empathetic philosophy.

Her 8 months teaching in India, learning "how to teach anything with practically nothing," had been a strong motivator and resource for teaching. A theme study based on India with her combined fifth- and sixth-grade class was a powerful way to share her experience with her students. They explored the juxtaposition of technology encroaching on cultural traditions, which culminated in an art installation display—students made deities out of recycled materials! She also integrates meditation:

In India, I met a couple from Spain who were doing a Physical Education program, a series of concrete activities to get kids to appreciate their emotional, spiritual and physical bodies. We ask kids to pay attention but we don't teach them how. I integrate meditation, now. I ask my students, "How can you find a pulse in your body without touching it? How can you balance this pie tin?"

Sam apparently had "remarkable success" teaching her students awareness through their bodies.

Like Sam, David naturally integrated his cross-cultural experience into his

classroom. A mixed blood Native American raised in France, he did so regularly and informally, meaning not necessarily through specific lesson plans. David's students were curious about his experiences living in Europe and working with the Indigenous People's Committees at the United Nations, and they asked questions freely. Even students in other classes, like geography or drama, went to him to ask about other languages, cultures, and economics. David was able to use cultural and linguistic examples to help his students approach cultural relativity. He explained, for example,

In Lakota, we put the adjective after the noun, which is a major rule in French as well. I can show them that because most of them speak only English. They put things backward in their reference. I can show that nothing is backward, or that English should be considered backward. I want them to understand that everyone has their own way.

David's experiences affected his students spontaneously and in multiple ways across the curriculum. "My experience," he said, "definitely impacts them."

The three levels of integration practiced by these teachers—fun tangibles, attitudes of acceptance, and natural infusion—closely resemble the continuum articulated in the Wisconsin State curriculum guide, which states that teachers and students can become tourists, travelers, or world citizens, creating together a tourist classroom, a traveling classroom, or a global classroom (Durtka et al., 2002).

The teachers who implement Fun Tangibles resemble the Tourists described by the Wisconsin guide (Durtka et al., 2002). Tourists are those who stay for a short time, usually just passing through to sample foods and festivals, and who are attracted to the exotic and to differences. They stay where they are most comfortable, eat foods with which they are familiar, and keep themselves removed—behind a camera, a bus, or a

language. Likewise, tourist classrooms sample foods and festivals, study about famous people from other countries, focus on differences between others and themselves, and return to their regular curriculum. While this approach may seem simplistic, these experiences are not necessarily bad, as they do open doors and whet curiosity for additional, deeper experiences.

Next, the JFMF participants in this study who focused on developing an attitude of acceptance resembled the travelers described by the Wisconsin guide. Travelers were curious and liked to explore, sometimes allowing for spontaneity. They discovered new ways to work and worship and explored both similarities and differences in cultures. Travelers tried to learn new languages and incorporate new friends and customs into their routines. Their classrooms studied the history, geography, economics, politics, and art of other cultures; invited in cultural guests; engaged in language study; and took longer journeys. Traveling teachers were fellow explorers, sharing the journey with their students.

Finally, the teachers who naturally infused global learning into their classrooms, along with their students, resembled the global citizens described by the Wisconsin guide (Durtka et al., 2002). Global citizens felt at home in more than one culture, and they comprehended that “the world’s problems and solutions have interconnecting parts” (p. 39). Global classrooms that fostered this understanding studied cultures and issues in depth, focusing on contradictions; they practiced democracy and citizenship; engaged in service learning; communicated through world languages, art, and technology; participated in inquiry and action; and experienced multiple perspectives.

Teachers' Motivation for Applying to JFMF

Participants' motivation for applying to the JFMF Teacher Abroad program varied and emerged as another important theme. The eight teachers who were selected to participate in the study all had some level of prior cross-cultural experience, so I was curious as to what they expected to learn or gain from this particular sojourn that they could not or did not already apply in their classrooms.

Participants addressed this question in both their application essays and in the personal interviews that I conducted. As could be expected, the application essays tended to lean toward the cliché altruism that would get them accepted into the program and lacked some of the more selfish motives that emerged in the interviews. That being said, even in the private interviews, the self-centeredness was kept to a minimum and the teachers' motives were largely student centered. I was concerned more with the comments made during the interviews, because I felt they remained much more honest, and the teachers had nothing to gain from their responses.

Barbara and Susan both saw the experience as an opportunity to celebrate life. They both were new empty nesters, and Barbara was preparing for the upcoming wedding of her youngest daughter. The trip was a chance for them to do something for themselves after years of raising families. Likewise, Robin saw the trip to Japan as the opportunity to fulfill a life-long dream.

Sam, on the other hand, had "never had a burning desire to travel to Japan." She had been looking for funding for travel, but was not accepted to her program of choice, which was traveling to Thailand. Nevertheless, her professional development experience

in India convinced her of “the value of going *anywhere* with other teachers.”

Jared was the only teacher whose first response to the question of motives was to highlight the obvious selfish one. “I’m greedy,” he said. “It’s free travel.” He then went on to explain the practicality of a history and political science teacher traveling. In contrast, most respondents mirrored Michael, who turned to himself only after explaining his interest in the Japanese school system.

We always regard the Japanese kids as the ones we want because they’re so well-behaved and well-educated. The Japanese parents are very supportive of us. I was interested to see how that’s done in the Japanese system because most of our Japanese kids have been to school in Japan before coming to the States. And of course [I applied] for self-experience also.

Ultimately, I found in the initial interview that the teachers were as sincere about sharing their experience with their students as they had claimed to be in their essays. The only real differences in the verbal responses were the absence of rhetoric and the more personal tone.

In sum, all eight subjects responded in their interviews that they applied, in one way or another, for their students. Robin’s students, who study Japan in an integrated unit, always assume she has been to Japan before. “When I saw this opportunity,” she said, “I knew I needed to do it for my kids.” Likewise, David had been struggling with whether or not to leave his family for so long, but a co-worker convinced him to accept “for the school. So we can say that one of our faculty had this experience.”

Four of the teachers mentioned their students’ socioeconomic status as a reason for traveling to Japan “for them.” For example, Susan stated in both her application essay and her interview that she applied “because the scholarship would enable [her] to bring a

world to [her] students they might otherwise never have access to.” While many of the students’ families are not in a position economically to travel, their teachers want them to know that socioeconomic status is not an excuse to remain at home. In her interview, Sam stated,

I didn’t grow up with a lot of money, so I want my students to understand that these opportunities are attainable. Most of my opportunities—like this one—were made possible through scholarships and through my own hard work.... We live in a rural area, so I don’t want my students thinking I was only able to do that because I was privileged.

My personal experience growing up was similar to Sam’s. As a young teenager, I once mentioned to my father my dream of traveling abroad, and he sternly yet affectionately informed me “people like us don’t do things like that.” Perhaps partially out of resentment for that comment, I went on years later to explore over 30 foreign countries, proving that people on our side of the tracks can certainly gain a global perspective.

All eight teachers mentioned that opportunities to engage in life-long learning would make them a better teacher for their students—some because of the opportunity to travel with other teachers, some because they could apply it directly to what they do in their classroom or curriculum, and some because it would help them understand their students better. While life-long learning is personally gratifying, they all mentioned they engage to be a better teacher. Sam summarized this sentiment in her application essay:

As a teacher, the most powerful modeling I can do for my students is to demonstrate being a thoughtful, continual learner. The JFMF experience can help me realize my personal and professional goals by allowing me, for three weeks, to be an open and excited student in Japan.

Another application essay read,

My goals in participating in the JFMF program are to continue to learn and

grow...a great sensitivity is required to teach about other cultures...I wish to teach with respect, facts, and with as few stereotypes as possible. Therefore, I feel it's extremely important to gain a first hand view of a culture so I can share appropriately and intelligently with young minds.

Another wrote that the experience would enable her to be a "better ambassador and better teacher." Another was hoping to become a more "capable and culturally sensitive" educator. Jared wrote in his essay, "As an historian and a student of humanity this is an incalculable chance for me to grow as a person, an educator and a role model to my students." Because students are bombarded every day with negative international news and images, Jared later noted in his interview that seeing one of their teachers actively working and participating in an international community would be a powerful message for them.

Ultimately, teachers looked forward to the JFMF experience as a way to disseminate empathy toward their school and global community. They recognized long before the trip that true empathy goes beyond generating interest and enthusiasm for life beyond our borders to "fostering respect and admiration" for the people and cultures to be explored.

With regard to fostering a more empathetic school community, Denise articulated in her interview that one of her goals for participating was "to share the message of greater understanding and tolerance toward others." Barbara stated in her interview, "I hope [my experience] will result in a more caring, understanding environment in my classroom that will extend into the school as my students show more tolerance toward others as role models." In her essay, she had written, "My students will achieve a higher level of understanding and appreciation of people and cultures from other countries that

will be evident in their inclusive acceptance of others.” She committed to creating more caring and considerate individuals in her school and community.

Looking to extend the empathy to the wider global community, Susan wrote in her application essay, “being a member of a team that in some significant way helps bring unity and understanding to our world would be of great personal and professional honor.” Likewise, Sam wrote, “I aim to help my students find their place as members of the world community, and to foster a sense of acceptance, tolerance and excitement for cultural exchange.” In her interview, Denise told me she wanted “to help the generation of today remember the past while they write the sequel of our story with deeper understanding, appreciation and commitment to friendship.” Jared, whose goal was to increase the quality of life for his students through teaching understanding, said that because most conflicts are born of ignorance, we can eliminate the violence by eliminating the ignorance. “Cultural understanding and an acceptance of people that are not within these urban students’ typical interactions can only lead to a more understanding and more internationally cooperative world culture.”

This attitude of acceptance and empathy, the teachers recognize, ultimately comes from students’ understanding of and ability to move beyond themselves. Denise looked to the JFMF experience as a venue for her to learn to help her students define who they are and what they believe. She wanted to “challenge learners with tough questions that require them to make personal decisions about right and wrong, fair and unfair; that teach them to be problem solvers, and help them to realize they have the ability to influence the future.” Likewise, Sam needed her students to understand that “me and my ski chalet and

my Burton snowboard” is not all that is important. “That’s hard for kids to realize,” she stated, “but it’s beneficial to them to see that other things matter and to recognize there is more to live for.”

While follow-on plans focused on only Japan, all of the teachers sincerely hoped that their students began to look at cultural explorations in general with more inquisitive minds.

Then, when we study other cultures, or students hear of other parts of the world, they apply the methods, experiences, investigations they’ve done with Japan to other diverse studies. For example, if we disprove some stereotypes about Japanese people, hopefully students can translate that to stereotypes they might hold about other people.

Is it idealistic to assume that students can understand the goals their teachers articulated in their interviews and essays? To understand that “it is in the best interest of all to live peacefully with others in our community and our world through acceptance of differences and sincere concern for the welfare of each other”? That “We must prevent aggression and discrimination in order to have a peaceful global community”? Or that “Our country shares similar needs, problems, and concerns with many other countries throughout the world”? Apparently, the teachers in this study believe that these goals are attainable in their classrooms.

Anticipation Summary

Even when teachers said they wanted to participate in the JFMF teacher exchange because it was paid for or because it was a good time for their families, each teacher mentioned they applied in one way or another for the benefit of their students. Whether that meant setting an example of moving beyond the confines of socioeconomic status or

of pursuing life-long learning, or being a better ambassador for peace, all eight subjects wanted to participate in the program because they knew it would benefit their students.

These findings position the teacher-participants well within reach of Bottery's (2006) criteria for global educators. Traditionally, educators have been rendered relevant by their subject expertise, their public service, and their professional judgment. However, as stated in the review of literature, Bottery recommended six more traits for educators to develop in order to remain relevant in today's interconnected world. The application essays and interviews demonstrate these teachers' attempts at fulfilling those recommendations, namely: the need to increase ecological and political awareness, to strive to make a difference in the quality of society (and in their students' lives), to embrace accountability for their experience, to build trust with their stakeholders, to embrace epistemological provisionality, and to engage in professional self-reflections. The application process to this short-term excursion opportunity alone was enough to categorize these teachers as global educators-in-progress.

Direct Impact

The second major theme to emerge from the interviews, observations, and artifacts was direct impact, which was further subdivided into curriculum impact, student impact, and teacher impact. What did teachers do in their classrooms to fulfill their follow-on requirement, how did that curriculum enhancement impact their students, and how did the experience impact their self-perceptions as global educators?

With regard to curriculum enhancement, some teachers created all new lesson or

unit plans based on their Japan experience, others infused the experience into existing curricula, and some teachers even began after school clubs. Most teachers extended their intended impact beyond their own subject matter or classroom walls, collaborating with other teachers or schools.

What teachers accomplished with their follow-on plans left me awe struck. The amount of time and effort they put into sharing their experience with their students and ensuring they had a positive learning experience is truly inspiring, despite the fact that six of the teachers commented in one way or another on the difficulty they had implementing their follow-on plans and how “exhausting” the final results were.

Aside from dealing with emotionally consuming issues like death, marriage, and loss of administrative support, teachers are also held to the demands of their regular teaching responsibilities. As Susan stated, “Our regular teaching demands make it very difficult to make big changes.” David commented on all he wanted to do, but that he did not have time to dive into such big projects. For him, cutting back on his intended follow-on plan was a matter of “practical do-ability.”

The practical demands of life also got in the way of teachers in O’Brien’s (2006) study of a Fulbright teacher exchange program to East Africa. While participants in her study learned a great deal about Islam in Tanzania and Kenya and wished to mold their four and a half week experience into their curricula and lessons, the returning teachers encountered a number of obstacles, such as job changes, hostile administrations, changing curricula, and particularly time constraints. “It is trite but real to note that teachers are overworked, schedules are regimented, and classes are short” (p. 131).

Energy and enthusiasm, therefore, were not issues in O'Brien's (2006) study or this one. Teachers in both instances were motivated by their experience abroad to provide authentic and creative activities so their students could experience Africa and Japan in as much the same way their teachers had. The issue, rather, was "trying to fit things in along with regular teaching demands." Sam explained her dilemma:

Of course, during the time we're learning about Japan, that's time that we're not learning about countless other nations, cultures, and histories of the world. There is so much to teach about and explore with students; it's hard to make the decisions about how to pick and choose.

Certainly, JFMF's generous sponsorship of the teachers moved Japan to the top of the curriculum priority list. Without the JFMF Teacher Abroad experience, it is unlikely that most of the students, with the exception of Robin's, would have learned much or anything about Japan this year. Further, it is highly doubtful the learning would have been as creative, out-of-the-box, or engaging. Yet despite the difficulty and extra effort, it takes to teach authentically and creatively, the teachers unanimously feel that their efforts were inspired by their JFMF experience and that they paid large dividends.

Seeing students know a culture, and have depth and experience with that learning, is worth it. It's a ton of extra work. It's outside of the box. It takes a lot more collaboration with other staff, parents, and schedules. I could meet core objectives through worksheets and textbooks, but I wouldn't be able to foster the same level of excitement, engagement, and critical thinking.

While sharing their experience with their students in authentic ways takes considerable time and effort, the teachers unanimously feel that students have more buy-in, more enthusiasm, and deeper learning this way.

In his review of literature on the necessity of international experiential learning for teachers, Cushner (2007) agreed, stating, "If teachers are truly architects of

educational experiences and opportunity they must understand how closely intertwined the relationship between cognition and experience or affect is—they are just inseparable when it comes to culture learning” (p. 35). He goes on to explain that deep understanding of other cultures cannot be developed in cognitive-only approaches to learning; it requires attention to the affective domain, “and this takes time. Quick fixes to complex problems that require significant unlearning and relearning do not happen overnight.”

I now turn to an analysis of the impact the JFMF experience had on curriculum, students, and teachers, all according to the teachers’ perceptions.

Curriculum Impact

As stated, some teachers chose to create entirely new lesson or unit plans, while others chose to integrate their JFMF experience into already existing curricula. Many of the plans were extensive and were implemented over an entire semester or year, so including in-depth descriptions of all activities would be unrealistic here. I offer in this section a detailed look at the follow-on plans of two teacher participants, followed by a brief summary of activities or specific examples of integration to represent the other five respondents.

Sam. Fifth- to eighth-grade students in Sam’s rural charter school were treated to a 3-month interdisciplinary thematic unit that culminated in a community performance. Sam collaborated with the art integration specialist, the physical education teacher, and others to create an in-depth study of Japan’s history and culture, weaving in language arts, math, science, social studies, culture studies, music, technology, and physical education.

The unit opened with a simulation of Perry's arrival at Tokyo Bay, during which students had to negotiate over treasures and develop a peace treaty. They learned how this event impacted Japanese-American relations and global history, and then investigated eras of Japanese dynasties to teach their classmates.

Students particularly enjoyed learning about Samurai culture. In Visual Arts they designed and carved their own Samurai crests, which they used to print headbands for martial arts lessons, collars for Kimonos they sewed, and a display in an artistic installation of inner and outer peace. In language arts, they composed their own creative Samurai adventure stories to share, using Japanese picture books as prompts.

According to Sam, one of the highlights of the unit was learning about the history and aesthetics of the Japanese tea ceremony. With the help of a visiting artist, students were able to make their own stoneware tea bowls and transform their art room into a teahouse, complete with *tatami* mats, painted calligraphy, a garden and washing bowl, ikebana flower arrangements, and a low doorway. A Japanese teacher at a local college led the students in the ceremony, which the students reflected on through poetry.

In social studies, students studied Japanese and American imperialism, read testimonials of atomic bomb survivors, engaged in "healthy" debates over the use of atomic weapons and energy, and wrote letters to government representatives. These activities coincided with investigations in their science class into nuclear technology and the price of progress and were followed by a visit to a nuclear power plant.

In language arts, students wrote Mount Fuji-inspired poetry and haiku and critiqued Japanese and American versions of the film *Godzilla*; and in math class, they

learned about area, perimeter, and scale as they built their own model cities for Godzilla to “explore.” They made their own kimonos, learned karate and basic stick fighting, and studied the stylistic movement of Kyogen performers. Then they brainstormed their own scripts in the style of Kyogen to perform at a culminating community open house.

Literally every activity, every day, was inspired by Sam’s trip to Japan. The all-encompassing curriculum, which tied into Vermont’s learning standards and grade-level expectations, had never before been implemented at the school and will be an available resource for future teachers and classes. According to Wilson (1984) and others, however, teachers who have been abroad teach “more accurately, authoritatively, creatively, enthusiastically, and with more understanding about places they have visited” than do teachers without authentic experience, hence having greater impact on their students (p. 155); so the question remains as to whether any other teacher could inspire or motivate the students the way Sam did (see also Cushner, 2007; Durtka, 2002; Merryfield, 2002).

Denise. Denise’s activities were equally intricate. In her words, her goals were “to teach students about Japan, the transforming relationship between Japan and the United States, and the importance of understanding and accepting the diversity of cultures as we strive for world peace.” Her follow-on plan enhanced the fifth-grade social studies curriculum as a comparative study of geographies, cultures, and economies of Japan and the United States.

During the geography lessons, students created three-dimensional maps of the topography, climate, and natural resources of Japan and the United States. They then

compared the maps and discussed the similarities and differences between the two countries while examining the effects of the physical geography, climate, and natural resources on the economies and lives of their citizens. “Students realized the clothing people wear, jobs they have, recreational activities they participate in, local food they grow and eat, and local tourism are dependent upon the type of physical geography, climate, and natural resources available.” Students were also able to infer aspects of weather, climate, and the types of food available in different regions of the countries.

The next portion of Denise’s follow-on plan gave students the opportunity to learn about Japanese culture. Students were given a Tic-Tac-Toe activities sheet that itemized nine cultural activities from which they had to select three to complete. Options allowed students to create paper dolls depicting traditional and modern Japanese clothing; compare Japanese and American homes and modes of transportation; create travel brochures of popular recreational activities, sports, and tourist attractions; write songs, stories, or poems about the history or culture; create a cookbook of popular Japanese dishes and practice cooking them; learn about famous Japanese artists; compare and contrast Japanese and American educational systems; celebrate major holidays; or learn about a major religion. This portion of the plan culminated with students inviting their friends and family to a celebration of their learning.

The third segment of Denise’s follow-on plan allowed students to study about the Japanese economy. They learned about conversion rates, wages, and jobs, and simulated shopping excursions with yen.

Fourth, her students learned about events of WWII involving Japan and the

United States; and as a result, they were able to make several close-to-home connections. They first learned about the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans, and the dropping of the atomic bombs; and then they turned their focus to the aid given to Japan to rebuild following the destruction of World War II. Students connected to the subject matter by comparing and contrasting what they learned with the burning and rebuilding of Atlanta, Georgia, and the South following the Civil War. They considered how the victims of the South must have felt and what life was like for them, and then inferred the feelings and conditions of the people in and around war-torn Hiroshima and Nagasaki. “Students were able to see similarities in the cases of reconstructing the South and Japan. They recognized the immediate importance of providing basic needs to people, and then rebuilding the infrastructure and industries while developing the foundation for a strong government.”

Their discussion naturally extended to issues of discrimination, including resources gathered from the *hibakusha*, and to “the right or wrong and fair or unfair-ness of the issues.” Regarding her classroom discussions on prejudice and discrimination, Denise wrote,

I did not particularly look forward to teaching this lesson because of the difficulty in helping young people understand these concepts; but it had to be taught, and this was an appropriate way to end our discussions and activities by showing how our two countries have overcome seemingly insurmountable differences to become strong friends and partners. The students left more somberly as we concluded this discussion. I am hopeful they were thinking and taking our discussions to heart.

Ultimately, Denise led her students to understand how former enemies can become strong friends and economic partners.

Robin. Robin spent the whole year studying Japan with her third, fourth, and fifth grade Gifted and Talented students, with the focus on the Edo period. (She built on an intensive unit that she has taught every third year for about 12 years.) Students studied the history of Japan through a simulated learning experience. Because of her experiences in Japan, Robin was able to bring in personal experiences to share with her students, so that they could participate in the same hands-on cultural activities that she experienced, such as the tea ceremony, calligraphy, and cuisine.

Robin used the photos, videos, and tangibles that she brought back as learning tools for her students. For example, in one activity they experienced calligraphy with the same tools the students in Japan use daily in their schools, like the rice paper, ink, brushes, and pads. She had centers set up with the photos of the Japanese students doing the same activities that her students were engaged in.

The students were then able to share their experiences with their parents at an evening festival, for which they made their own *happi* coats. Their parents and siblings visited stations to participate in the activities and enjoy displays of student work. Robin's students also visited local Japanese Gardens and a Japanese restaurant on a field trip. She described her project as "ongoing and unfinished" and is excited to expand on the unit in years to come.

Susan. Susan's follow-on activities also extended beyond her classroom walls. First, she presented to both her local school board and to her staff, emphasizing particularly Japan's mastery of after school clubs and the sense of belonging and community they provide. Second, she conducted an assembly for her entire student body,

which allowed the students to see the commonalities they share with Japanese children even though they live thousands of miles apart. Third, she visited 14 individual K-5 classrooms to present grade-level appropriate literature lessons and origami activities.

Fourth, Susan initiated an after-school Japan Club and supervised six meetings. During these sessions, students participated in Japanese language and customs, a modified tea ceremony, calligraphy, origami, snacks, and crafts. Fifth, she directed her school choir in a concert of several songs with both Japanese and English words. Finally, as a way to share her experiences with family, friends, and colleagues in a more informal setting, she opened her home for a Japanese Open House, complete with food, slides, and artifacts. In total, Susan estimates that 600 students, parents, and friends were impacted by her follow-on activities.

Jared. Jared's follow-on plan was less extensive because he had a difficult time adding onto his already burdened curriculum. He taught a unit on Japan in his world history class, utilizing what he gained from the trip. He also used the experience to go deeper into his semester long comparative religions unit in his intercultural communications class. Jared did not use as much as he would have liked, but he already had plans to increase JFMF's role in the next school year.

Barbara. As a transition support teacher, Barbara did not have a traditional classroom. However, she was able to make presentations to various classes at her school, including U.S. history (the effects of the A-bomb and second generation survivors), child development (schools in Japan), cooperative work education (teens in Japan), comparative religions (religions in Japan), and ESL (Zen stories). She also incorporated

Ikebana and the 1,000 Crane Project into the in school work class. She made a book about jobs in Japan for the school community-based class and incorporated several activities into the National Honor Society and International Club.

David. Finally, David modified his U.S. history curriculum to incorporate several aspects of his JFMF experience. First, he led a special research activity on Japanese society and economy at the turn of the twentieth century, in connection with the gentlemen's agreement and immigration issues of the time. Then he shifted the focus from Germany to Japan to explain the use of militarism and the way Japan and Germany (with Italy) came to join forces and what mechanisms were at work in Germany becoming Nazi and Japan becoming a militaristic expansionist aggressive power. "In this, the question is the difference between the people and the men in power, with a critical look at the notion of democracy."

David made a "significant addition to the Hiroshima-Nagasaki episode," supported by the presentation of the Hiroshima survivor and documents from the Hiroshima memorial. In this portion, he introduced two notions:

One, the notion of peace—that has been the key word of policies, actions and philosophy of the Japanese government and people in the last five decades—and also in controversial reference to 9/11 and the notion of terrorism, connected to the idea that the Native People have been fighting terrorism for the past 500 years.

The main interest David's students showed was in the similarities in the spiritual life of contemporary Japanese and Lakota peoples. One specific example is the practice of purification using water ("as we do in Inipi, where the water turns into steam when poured on the red hot rocks") and the practice of Azil'ya (smudging), "where we used Pefi Hota (sage) or Wacanga (sweet grass), whereas Japanese people use incense." Also

on a higher level of understanding, he drew a parallel between the association of Shintoism and Buddhism in Japan, and “the coexistence (to a lesser extent) here of the Cannupa–Wi Wanyang Wacipi (Sacred Pipe and Sun dance) with some Judeo-Christian and European notions such as god, or simply the idea of religion.” David regularly pointed out that Lakota Spirituality is not a religion, but rather a way of life in the view of Lakota spiritual leaders.

Regarding curriculum impact, Dr. Connie Perdreau, Director of Ohio University’s Office of Education Abroad, stated, “Those who study or teach abroad find it easier to internationalize the curriculum they teach in the United States.... The result is a chance to not only expand their Horizons but those of their students as well” (Smiles, 2001, p. 23). I now turn to the impact teacher participants felt their curricular modifications had on their students.

Student Impact

Wilson (1983) stated that the true test for teachers is whether or not they can transfer and share the knowledge they gain from cross-cultural experiences to students in their classrooms. “Of course, other individuals besides teachers gain in knowledge about other cultures and about themselves through cultural experiences” (p. 81). The students of JFMF participants were impacted by their teachers’ experiences affectively, cognitively, and behaviorally, in overlapping ways. Regarding affective impact, all of the teachers who responded to the second interview protocol (seven of the eight original subjects) commented that their students’ curiosity, interest and excitement were piqued by their personal experiences and artifacts and the authentic learning their resources provided.

Sam's students were "more excited about doing this work" because they had real Japanese students and families to communicate with. Susan's students, long after her follow-on plan was complete, continued to ask questions, "especially about kids their age." Susan is certain that the students "had the world opened up to them a little more," as they continued through the remainder of the year to greet her with "Konnichiwa" and a bow. Many of the teachers commented that the interest and curiosity extended beyond the students to staff and colleagues.

Barbara's students were "intrigued" and "expressed an interest in traveling to Japan themselves," a reaction consistent with the literature on teacher abroad programs, which claims that teachers who have spent time abroad pass on enthusiasm for their experience to their students. For example, Smiles (2001) concluded that faculty "are more likely to encourage students to study abroad if they have done so themselves" (p. 19). Likewise, Wilson (1983) came to the conclusion that students become apprentices to the role of cross-cultural traveler. "They [learn] that such travel would be a valuable and possible experience" (p. 84).

Sam, whose "lily-white, affluent" students reportedly have little exposure to diversity, feels the "excitement and passion for learning about other cultures is powerful for them." She insisted on the need for concrete connections, such as photographs and memorabilia, that made the other culture "come alive." Similarly, Robin explained that because of her own exposure to the culture, she could give more concrete, hands-on activities to enhance her students' learning. "They're so literal that having the actual tools and stories helped them to conceptualize it and made it more concrete."

Teachers know that when students are interested and engaged in authentic learning activities, cognitive learning increases. Sam wrote, “I am amazed by all they are taking in about Japan and know a lot of this is attributed to my first hand experience and passion.” Denise observed, “My personal experience heightens their level of interest. They ask more questions when I bring in personal experience or artifacts from trips. It makes them begin to think for themselves. I get a higher level of questioning from them than otherwise.”

Students need to interact with something as in-depth as a culture in order for them to internalize it, and the teachers believe that their experience allowed for that type of learning. Barbara wrote, “The U.S. history teacher felt that my Japan presentation helped students to make a connection with the Japanese experience during WWII.” Other students made “deep connections” and were “personally excited.”

Sam’s experience with one of her students captures the excitement and deep connections that come because of authentic learning. She wrote:

I have a student who STRUGGLES with seatwork: writing, worksheets, homework...the kid is a disaster in this traditional model of demonstrating knowledge. But last night I saw him starring in a Kyogen play, and he was absolutely shining! Hamming it up with the audience, speaking in his Kyogen accent, embodying the movement of Kyogen actors he studied in PE class, he was showcasing his learning in a way that made sense for him, and in a way in which he could have success. Later, I observed him explaining the history, the time era, and cultural relevance of this theater form with parents and visitors.

Sam believes that the learning sunk in for this student in a way that would not have happened otherwise, and she credits her Japan experience as the motivator behind the creation of such activities.

Having taught the same unit before and after her JFMF experience, Robin

testified to students' increased cognitive capacity with the subject matter. "Having taught this unit pre-JFMF and then post-JFMF, I can actually see the difference the experience made in the whole unit and the connection with my students and parents." Another teacher wrote, "Sharing real world stories along with lessons and activities is so important to the learning outcomes of young children. It has strengthened the lessons by the products that I see the children producing and by their enthusiasm in the unit."

After her experience being in a country where the language was unfamiliar, Robin was also able to connect her elementary age students with contemporary language debates on a level she has not reached before. They discussed the language barrier and how important language is to a culture.

We've had discussions around questions like, should everyone in a country speak one main language or keep their own languages separate? What are the effects on the culture when the language is changed or becomes more primary for children than the adults? During war, what importance is the language to a nation? What happens when you live in a country like Europe or India and there are many languages for countries sometimes smaller than Texas as near to each other as the states in the USA?

Texas is debating many of these issues today. The children are interested in language issues and their discussions opened up communication and thinking about it from other perspectives, "making the children more comfortable with who they are." Robin was pleasantly surprised by the reactions of parents who want their children to participate in debates such as these, though she admits she was initially reluctant to tread on risky ground and was careful to let students reach their own conclusions.

Beyond affective and cognitive impact, teachers' cross-cultural experiences and resulting follow-on plans also impacted their students' behavior. Regarding her students,

Barbara commented, “They are more open with their interaction with me, sharing their personal experiences and problems and celebrations.” Robin’s students gained confidence in their own identities: “I’ve noticed new students taking risks and joining the discussions with personal experiences, which has seemed to help them take pride in their heritage.” One teacher stated, “I’ve seen other students listening to another person’s perspective.” In addition, another had a student who thanked her for the “openness” in her classroom.

Denise’s follow-on activities gave students opportunities to learn to work cooperatively with others who speak, act, look, or learn differently than themselves, thereby internalizing problem solving and reducing discrimination. Barbara’s National Honor Society students taught a peer with severe autism how to make origami cranes, bringing together a “diverse group of students who found enjoyment in this unique art form.” The advanced ceramics class at her school also interacted cooperatively with special education classes in a way they had not previously, making vases for their Ikebana (flower) arrangements.

More and more, we are moving to a globally connected culture, and looking at our relation to other people and other cultures the way the JFMF follow-on plans allowed students to do has extreme relevance. Sam summarized the affective, cognitive, and behavioral impact she feels her follow-on activities had on her students, stating,

My students are definitely more aware and interested in Japan, but this does not preclude them from being aware and interested in other cultures. I think (desperately hope) that they are more open-minded in general, and can apply this unit of study to other academic and life experiences.

Denise’s response was similar. She believes that most of her students have a greater level of acceptance and interest in learning about people of other cultures than previously. She

also believes that many of them understand that prejudice and discrimination are deterrents to peace, and that it is our personal responsibility to address prejudice and discrimination in our daily lives in an effort to improve our quality of life and that of others.

Ultimately, what these teachers found for their students is not unlike Merryfield's (2002) summary of student impact from teacher travel. She found that students developed open-mindedness, learned to anticipate complexity, learned resistance to stereotyping, and developed cross-cultural communication skills through teachers who had spent time abroad.

In her work with the Ohio State University Professional Development School, Merryfield (1995) analyzed reflections, journals, debriefings, formative evaluations, and peer reviews to learn what a group of teacher-education students learned from their teachers' experiences abroad. Merryfield discovered that students developed conceptual understanding in several areas through simulated cross-cultural experiences. For example, students developed perspectives consciousness, felt connected to global history and contemporary global issues, became sensitive to and appreciative of student differences and individual needs, began to critically critique available instructional materials, and learned to deal with the complexity of teaching diverse student populations about the world and its peoples.

Teacher Impact

The initial objective in analyzing the JFMF Teacher Abroad experience was to determine if and how an international cross-cultural professional development

opportunity could impact teachers' perceptions of themselves and their roles as global educators. While curriculum and student impact are certainly the objectives of globalizing curricula, this qualitative case study was intended to determine if teachers with authentic cross-cultural experiences feel they are better equipped to prepare their students for global roles than they were prior to their international experience. Responses yielding this theme are subdivided into three categories: respect, personal growth and learning, and responsibility.

Respect. The first theme that emerged from the teachers' analysis of personal impact was respect. The teachers who participated in the JFMF Teacher Abroad program felt they had earned greater respect from students, parents, and other teachers and likewise developed a new respect for previously marginalized students in their classrooms. Speaking of her prior professional development experience in China, Robin wrote, "When I went to China, [my students] could say that their teacher went to China. That meant a lot to them." She explained that because she could answer students' questions with more confidence and authority after her trip, her students trusted her more and were more eager to ask questions if they knew those questions would be answered. Six months after the JFMF experience, she added, "I learned it was important to the parents that I had experienced China and Japan," noting that she felt her students' parents trusted her as an authority.

In his initial interview, Michael spoke of the respect he attributes to other teachers in his school who bring international experience and perspectives into their classrooms, particularly in comparison to those who do not:

I can tell by their students what teachers aren't experienced. Last year I taught first grade, but this year I'm 2nd grade. I know what students should have been taught last year because I taught first last year. And I'm seeing patterns. One of the teachers is a sorority girl that just graduated from college last year. Students coming from her class are immature and not used to the level of conversation that other kids are capable of that come from other teachers.

This respect extends to teachers being more open to learning from their students' experience and perspectives—particularly students previously marginalized in their classrooms. Michael stated that international experience makes teachers “more open to kids bringing in their own experience and broadening our [teachers'] perspectives.” Robin admitted to learning about the perception of Westerners from one of her Indian students (“I've learned *a lot*”). In addition, Susan extended that openness to new perspectives toward members of her extended community. She said, “I have had the opportunity to meet several Japanese American folks in my community and it is such a joyful experience to talk about my trip with them as they share their remembrances of their lives in Japan.” This sharing of experience resulted in strengthened mutual respect among participants.

Two teachers commented on the development of a new respect for people who struggle to learn the language of our country and for the children of Mexico who were immersed into our school system. They attributed this change in perception to the “times of helplessness” they experienced when unable to communicate in Japanese. Other teachers explained that while they had previously respected these students in their struggles to communicate, that respect was “compounded” by their own inability to speak Japanese. For one teacher, this reality hit when he needed to use the restroom and was unable to come up with a polite way to excuse himself from his host family's dinner

table. For as trivial as that experience may seem, this teacher recognized that many of his students experience that frustration of not being able to communicate needs or perceptions any time they leave their own homes, and in particular, for the 6 hours a day they spend at school.

In one of our spontaneous debriefing sessions in Tainai, many members of the cohort articulated a major paradigm shift with regard to second language speakers in their classrooms. Rather than viewing these students as an added burden or a “threat” to teaching, participants in that conversation conceded to the value of multiple perspectives in class discussions. We determined that language is a way of interpreting reality and that discovering ways to harness those varied interpretations would be difficult but worth the time and energy. Not only that, but also these students exemplify the very skills that global educators desire in *all* of their students—the ability to cross-linguistic and cultural borders. We should not let them reside on the periphery of our classrooms.

Respondents in other studies of short-term cross-cultural programs have likewise self reported more patience with foreign language speakers in the United States, frustrations at America’s monolingualism and the desire to learn another language, and the development of linguistic coping mechanisms, such as pantomiming (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2003; O’Brien, 2006; Zamastil-Vandrova, 2005).

Personal growth and learning. The second theme that emerged from the teachers’ self-analysis was personal growth and learning. The JFMF Teacher Abroad experience allowed teachers to take risks and move beyond their comfort zones, resulting in personal growth and increased self-confidence in their roles as educators. Robin wrote, “The

immersion experience of the JFMF program helped me to take the risk to open my classroom more even if it is in a public school in the Bible Belt of the U. S. A.”

Regarding her collective cross-cultural experience, Sam commented, “Experience is the truest and deepest teacher.... While I certainly have been met with challenge and hardship, I have grown monumentally each time I have taken the risk to explore myself within another country.” Her experiences in India, Japan, and elsewhere have moved her “educationally, spiritually, and reflectively, in ways [she is] still contemplating with awe.”

Barbara grew from the experience in a particularly surprising way that she believes will permanently impact her classroom and her students for the remainder of her career, and that is in her confidence to move beyond her “technology comfort zone” and improve her computer skills. Barbara’s follow-on plan included the use of technology that she was unfamiliar with. Knowing that she would be using technology to implement her plan, she took an on-line class during the summer prior to the trip, which “forced” her to become familiar with tools and strategies that are available for teachers

Probably most notable is my ability to manipulate pictures and use them in instruction—that includes more sophisticated PowerPoint presentations and instructional materials I make for the classroom. I also learned to utilize BoardMaker to make books for a developmentally delayed special education class.... I was able to mix my photos with word symbols and they were able to read it. That was pretty cool.

Barbara repeatedly used the word “forced”: “JFMF *forced* me to learn...” and “Because of my follow-on plan I was *forced* to try...”, acknowledging that had she not been selected to participate in the JFMF Teacher Abroad program, she would have remained in her comfort zone and not allowed herself to adapt to the tools in her changing classroom.

Barbara had been teaching for 34 years prior to the trip, so it would have been very easy for her to continue with the same lesson plans and objectives she had already mastered. Instead, she challenged herself so she can challenge her students. She laughed, “Before [JFMF], I would have been clueless.” Now, however, she feels “technologically literate” in a way that will assist her students in global and interpersonal communication.

Robin, the 21-year teaching veteran, summarized many of the teachers’ comments regarding opportunities for life-long learning: “I’ve learned about World War II, Hiroshima, and the Japanese as a teacher with my students in my mid life. I’m a baby boomer, for goodness sake! I have only begun to learn!”

With learning comes the increased self-efficacy that all seven respondents felt they had gained. Increased confidence is reflected in comments such as:

I have more confidence in the things that I teach. I don’t have to wonder about some of the activities because now I’ve actually experienced them first hand.

Participation in the Fulbright program added another dimension to my teaching experience and brought a new vitality to my job and school.

I gained confidence in the areas that I’ve taught previously because of the experiences in Japan. I immersed [students] as much as possible in the same hands-on cultural experiences that I shared while there, such as a tea ceremony, festival, calligraphy, food, etc.

I feel a sense of fulfillment, creativity, and challenge. If I had to follow a set curriculum, I believe my job would be easier, but I’d be less fulfilled and incredibly bored.

I know I am a better ambassador and more educated educator because of having had the opportunity to experience Japan first hand.

Increased self-confidence is a common theme in the literature on study abroad (see Akande & Slawson, 2000; Black & Duhon, 2006; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; and others). The participants in this study were no exception.

Responsibility. Teachers' confidence was also strengthened when their previous personal beliefs and philosophies about their roles as educators were validated by their Japan experience. This validation gave them courage to be more assertive in their objective and lesson planning and more creative in their presentation of material. While all seven of the respondents to the second interview stated that their understanding of their roles as global educators did not change as a result of the Teacher Abroad program, their perceptions were *reinforced*, and they now feel more "passionate" and "energetic" about their responsibilities.

On one level this reaction could be interpreted that JFMF is "preaching to the choir," so to speak—that only teachers who are already converted to the cause of global empathy and life long learning apply to these programs. However, this case study is examining the experience of only eight of the 200 participants in the October 2007 JFMF cycle. There may have been other participants in other cohorts or other cycles who had a negative experience or who traveled simply because it was free. That concession articulated, the philosophies of the subjects selected from the Niigata cohort were validated and strengthened.

Barbara, for example, had defined her responsibilities as an educator specific to her role in special education and now believed more strongly in the use of technology to improve instruction for and communication with the disabled. Other teachers felt responsible to prepare future leaders, and all but one expounded on the need to disseminate peace and understanding.

With regard to the responsibility teachers feel to prepare leaders, Denise stated

that students need problem solving skills supported by strong character and values “as they make decisions that impact global peace and cooperation among nations.” Sam responded, “It is my responsibility to teach students to effectively communicate, to consider points of view, and to share their voices and empower their thinking. I need to impart confidence in them as future leaders and decision makers.”

By far the most emphasized responsibility was that of education for peace. Subjects articulated this role in numerous ways. One said, “Education is the best way I have found to impact the world, to spread tolerance, peace, and understanding.” Another said, “It is integral that I introduce students to other cultures and other methods of thinking. Our kids need to be flexible, creative, and compassionate.” Still another added, “Celebrating the heritage, uniqueness and vibrancy of other people brings a connection of human spirit.”

Jared was passionate that “fostering a clear understanding of other cultures, their traditions, and religions allows the students to see that there are other ways of life out there and it is okay, even good, that they are different from our own.” He really stressed to his students that most of the problems in the world stem from an unclear understanding of other cultures, their traditions, and religions, and that the road to peace is “paved with understanding.”

Likewise, Robin had a dream that children would come to school without adult prejudices instilled in them and would be able to honor others for who they are. As a result, she tried to facilitate an environment of acceptance and peace in her classroom. “I know—it’s a big dream,” she said, “but it’s the center of what I do when I work with my

students. It is how I structure my year.”

Denise perceived herself as “an information provider who helps students think beyond themselves and their own needs.” Her responsibility extended to helping students realize the importance of understanding, appreciating, and accepting other cultures, recognizing and combating discrimination, and understanding the relevance these issues have to peaceful relations throughout the world. She aimed to help her students see their role and accountability in promoting greater understanding and peace among nations of the world. Denise was very assertive in articulating how her experience in Japan, and in particular the meeting with the atomic bomb survivor, reinforced her perceived role.

I listened as a *hibakusha* shared his experiences from the atomic bomb attack, and I was struck by his gentle nature and his deep regret that Japan forced the issue to the point that the U.S. felt it had to take drastic action to end the war. He said in school they were taught to live and die for the emperor, and to feel hostility toward the U.S.; but when the U.S. sent help to rebuild Japan following the war, he realize the US soldiers were people of goodwill who helped in the reconstruction of Japan in many ways. He now works to promote peaceful relations throughout the world, and says we must learn from the past and never repeat our past mistakes. I believe it is more important than ever to help students understand the past, learn from our mistakes, and seek ways to avoid future conflicts.... Our students need to see the importance of working with other countries cooperatively to help others improve the quality of their lives while promoting peaceful relations. The first step in that monumental task is understanding, appreciating, and accepting diversity. If a survivor of the atomic bomb can apologize for his country’s actions and devote his life to working for peace, can we do less? Education is the key to a more peaceful world, and as teachers we can help students realize their role in building a peaceful future.

Denise’s Southern classroom was fertile ground for implementing a follow-on plan intended to help students learn from past mistakes.

It is interesting that of all the traits deemed necessary for educators in an age of rapid globalization (Bottery, 2006), epistemological provisionality was the one most

gratifying to the teachers in this study. Further, the teachers' self-analyses were insightful in that their perceptions of their responsibilities as educators did not change as a result of the JFMF experience but were reinforced. Comments of this nature include the following.

I gained some new material and subject matter, as well as artifacts and books to explore with students as a result of JFMF, but this philosophy was firmly held within me prior to my trip to Japan.

My philosophy became stronger and more confident. It's more important to me now than ever.

My experience gave me a deeper appreciation for Japan's culture and history than I even had before.

My perception has not changed but my knowledge and experience has increased so I have more to share with students.

It's obvious that the JFMF journey did not change my understanding, but strengthened it.

Direct Impact summary. In sum, the teachers felt the impact of their JFMF experience was reflected in the respect they gained from and for their students, coworkers, parents and community; in the level of empathy they now express for minority and non-English speaking students; in personal growth and learning; in increased confidence in performing regular responsibilities; and in the validation of previously held teaching philosophies.

Returning again to Bottery's (2006) suggested requirements, the teachers self-identified as global educators largely as a result of this validation of belief. In particular, their comments centered on their efforts to comply with four of Bottery's suggested requirements; first, through peace education they strive to make a difference in the quality of society; second, they are building trust between themselves and their stakeholders, including but not limited to their students and community; third, by helping

their students to accept multiple paradigms they are demonstrating their ability to embrace and teach epistemological provisionality; and fourth, by sharing their growth and perceptions with me they are engaging in professional self-reflection.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine how a singular, short-term, cross-cultural professional development opportunity might contribute to the development of global educators, hence furthering the progress of global education. The questions that guided the data gathering are listed below.

1. How do individual teachers infuse a singular international cross-cultural experience into their classroom practice?

2. In what ways can an isolated, short-term experience contribute to the development of a global educator?

3. How do teachers' perceptions of their responsibilities change as a result of a cross-cultural experience?

These three questions yielded the anticipated themes that were discussed in this chapter. However, other themes emerged which were not anticipated. To those themes I now turn.

CHAPTER VI

OUTCOMES: DEEP IMPACT

*Travel is more than the seeing of sights; it is a change that goes on,
deep and permanent, in the ideas of the living. (Miriam Beard)*

Regarding categorical aggregation, Stake (1995) claimed that some of the themes that emerged from case study data were anticipated and others were not. Such is the nature of qualitative research and the “multiple realities” that emerge when subjects interpret experiences according to their own paradigms. As a participant observer in the JFMF experience, I was prepared for varied perceptions with regard to Anticipation and Direct Impact. I knew that teachers would have very personal albeit similar goals for participating in the teacher abroad program. I also knew that all the teachers would create very personal follow-on plans catering to their specific subject matter and/or grade level. However, I was not prepared for the level of interdisciplinary cooperation and planning that took place in the various schools nor the extensive impact beyond the classroom to schools, parents, and community, which I described in Chapter V.

However, more startling than the creativity and effort in lesson planning and extended impact was the way the teacher-subjects reflected on the JFMF experience itself. I expected deep reflection on curriculum, student, and teacher impact (although I did not know what that reflection would be); and I expected a self-appraisal of goals. However, when I asked participants to compare the JFMF program to their previous cross-cultural experience, I was not prepared for the teachers to have reactions and interpretations similar to my own.

Being the only member of the cohort with prior experience in Japan and with the years I had spent living in former Japanese colonies and researching post-colonialism in graduate school, I thought I held a monopoly on certain reactions or interpretations. Because of this, I kept two separate journals throughout the trip—a study journal and a personal journal. In the study journal, I recorded events and conversations that I felt were relevant to the task at hand—notes on interviews, presentations, and debriefing sessions; ideas for further investigation; and descriptions of people and places. In my personal journal, I recorded information that I deemed irrelevant to the study: observations about the country and people, confrontations between group members, and my own thoughts and feelings about what I was experiencing.

Because I had taken such pains to keep myself out of the study, I was surprised six months later in the follow-up interviews when other teachers expressed similar interpretations of events when their exposure to the region so dwarfed my own. The observations and reactions that I had deemed irrelevant to the study were central to the teachers' experience.

As I mentioned in Chapter III, the realities that emerged did not fit within the bounds of the proposed study nor the framework introduced in the Review of Literature and hence took on a life of their own. I struggled to find a theoretical framework through which I could interpret my and the other teachers' experience. Globalization simply was not enough, and the interpretations went beyond the post-colonial framework through which I had previously been taught to view Japan and its neighbors.

I found my voice in “anti-colonialism,” a framework that augments post-

colonialism to allow all voices—dominant and oppressive—credibility. According to Dei and Asgharzadeh (2001), anti-colonialism shifts from the “preoccupation with victimization” that characterizes post-colonialism to a celebration of difference, allowing subjects to narrate their own stories, rather than having their stories articulated by a privileged class. In other words, anti-colonialism is not a replacement for but rather widens the scope of post-colonialism, allowing narratives on both sides to matter and emphasizing that individuals should be allowed to voice their own.

In their follow-up interviews, the teachers consistently referenced their desire to hear their students’ “voices” and “stories.” They spoke of privilege and oppression and of a need to “celebrate difference” in our classrooms rather than be afraid of it or try to fit all children into a single mold. These were the same words that I had used in my personal (“irrelevant”) journal, and they are the same words used by anti-colonialists.

In this chapter, I briefly articulate the perspective I held as a researcher going into the JFMF experience, following which I introduce anti-colonialist discourse. I then move to the unanticipated third category that emerged from the data: Deep Impact. The primary methodology adapted by anti-colonialists is that of life history, which explains the use of the first-person narrative in the presentation of this chapter.

Prior Perspective

I went into the JFMF experience with more historical background and academic preparation than probably the majority of the 200 educators on the trip, and I knew before departure that I was going in slightly on the defensive (see Appendix A for bracketing

interview and Appendix B for a summary of Japanese colonialism). I felt that the coordinators were going to be “sugar-coating” our perspective, yet at the same time I was looking forward to experiencing cognitive dissonance. (My personal anticipation and prior experience were what prompted me to keep separate study and personal journals on the trip.)

My experiences in Asia began directly after I completed my undergraduate degree at 21, when I accepted my first job in South Korea. I lived there for 3½ years working for an English language daily newspaper and for a large broadcasting conglomerate. While I was living in Korea, former “comfort women” began showing up at the Japanese embassy on Thursday mornings to hurl rocks and shout nasty slogans. My Korean being incredibly shaky at the time, I had to ask coworkers to translate for me, and they reluctantly did so. I needed to know what could possibly get a group of 90-year-old women so riled up. So it was that the story of Japanese wartime atrocities unfolded for me: their colonialist assimilation policies, their brutal treatment of prisoners of war, the Rape of Nanking, and their organized system of sexual slavery during World War II.

In sum, Japan’s history of colonialism began as early as the fifteenth century and expanded particularly from the Meiji Restoration in 1867 through World War II. Prior to the Meiji Restoration, most of East Asia had remained hermetically closed to the West. Then, in 1867, Japan began invading its neighbor countries under the noble pretext of protecting them from encroaching European imperialism. During this period of Westernization known as the Meiji Restoration, Japan worked toward aligning itself intellectually, technologically, and militarily with the West, hence distinguishing itself

from and establishing dominance over its “inferior” Asian neighbors. Victory over the Russians in 1905 solidified Japan’s regional superiority, and Japan began pursuing its colonialist aims through the process of assimilation—obliterating the languages, cultures, and religions of subjects to create one superior race, using education as its main vehicle of indoctrination (Dahl, 2008).

The remnants of its colonial past continue to cause myriad social problems within Japan and between Japan and its neighbors, four populations being particularly affected: the Ainu, the indigenous inhabitants of Hokkaido; the people of Okinawa; the Chinese; and the Koreans, both those in Korea and those who remained in Japan after WWII. I learned all of this from the perspective of the formerly colonized, much the way I learned about British colonialism when I lived in India a few years later.

After a 7-year sojourn that spanned over 30 countries, I moved to England where I completed a master’s degree in gender studies at Oxford University. Impressed by the legacy of colonialism in the various countries wherein I had traveled, I focused my learning on the construction of the post-colonial Korean identity, using the “comfort women” I had met years before as my trope. I wanted to know why it took those women 50 years to admit what had happened to them and why Japan refuses, to this day, to offer a formal apology for its wartime atrocities.

While my motives for continuing my affair with Japan may appear antagonistic, I applied to the JFMF program because I believe in the power of authentic learning. I wanted to augment a unit I taught in my World Literature classes every year, and I wanted to be able to do it fairly. My sojourn to Japan with the Japanese Fulbright

Memorial Fund, therefore, tied together many loose ends in my life: the experience allowed me once again to travel to Asia, it allowed me to learn about Japan's relationship with her neighbors from the colonizer's perspective, and it allowed me to spend time with educators who are likewise deeply impassioned about global understanding and empathy.

The Anti-Colonialist Theoretical Framework

As I stated previously, I had much difficulty articulating my and others' whole experience through the proposed lens of globalization. Further, I find little that is "post" in Japan's colonizing of its neighbors, so the post-colonial lens I had been trained in previously with regard to relationships in the region was also inadequate. Perhaps by accident I stumbled upon the anti-colonialist writings of Dei and Kempf (2006), to which I felt an immediate connection.

Walsh (1991) defined colonialism as "the aggregate of policies used by dominant countries to extend control over and establish occupation of sovereign nations" (p. 2). Its purpose is "to penetrate the consciousness of the masses and, in so doing, render them powerless." Hence, the maintenance of dominant and subordinate relations is ensured.

The literature on colonialism is generally concerned with dominant countries and/or races silencing the voices of the physically weak (or those with less gunpowder): British colonialism in India, French colonialism in Africa, the Dutch in Southeast Asia, the United States in Puerto Rico, and slavery in the Southern states. Even during Japanese colonialism, when goals were met through assimilation rather than racial segregation, the struggle for power was about silencing voices and colonizing minds. Post-colonial

discourse, then, is concerned with giving voice back to the marginalized. Further, it tends to bifurcate its audience—the Whites into guilty perpetrators and non-Whites into victims (Ogaz, 2000).

The American version of this discourse is couched in discussions of multiculturalism, with particular attention to Black and Hispanic voices, and speaks little of its own imperial aggression toward other lands or peoples, including the peoples whose continent they claim.

As a Masters student at Oxford University studying the formation of the post-colonial South Korean identity, I struggled with the semantics of the post-colonial framework, as it was and continues to be articulated through a privileged, Western lens. Post-colonial theory demarcates history into Western epochs, “as if non-Western peoples had no history before the coming of the Europeans” (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, p. 300). It also assumes issues of gender, class, and primarily race as points of academic reference.

This focus on gender, class, and race is problematic in discussions of Japanese colonialism in that the Japanese motivation for expanding their empire was nationalistic, and power was enforced through policies of assimilation, rather than segregation, in an attempt to formulate a perfect race that could compete with Western powers. But at the same time I recognize that post-colonial theorists have provided much insight regarding the diversity of available voices and colonial relations, as well as notions of power. The limitation of post-colonialism is that the “colonial” part has been defined solely and exclusively by reference to the fact of European colonialism; nothing more; nothing less”

(Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, p. 307; see also Dudden, 2005).

Rather than functioning contrary to post-colonialism, anti-colonialist discourse broadens its scope. While still working with a notion of colonial, anti-colonialism redefines the term to include *all* forms of dominating and oppressive relationships that emerge from the structures of power and privilege embedded in social relations (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001). These power inequalities are engendered and fed by history, tradition, and culture. Therefore, as Dei and Asgharzadeh explained, “colonial is defined not simply as foreign or alien, but more importantly as dominating and imposing” (p. 308). Power structures are embedded within genders, races, classes, and nations, and not just between them.

Further, anti-colonialist theory does not privilege any one form of difference or dominance, such as gender, race, sexuality, religion, or class. Rather, the discourse sees these as independent categories that interrelate and interconnect with each other. All human interaction is governed by multiple power structures; and the individuals, groups, and communities within these structures have their own specific histories, geographies, and social categories. Shifting from a “preoccupation with victimization” characteristic of post-colonial discourse, anti-colonialism celebrates these differences and allows subjects to define their own geography, history, culture, language, and spirituality, rather than having their identities articulated by a privileged class (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001).

Despite its claims to inclusivity, most marginalized or colonized subjects know that post-colonial theory is conceptualized only by those who can afford to do so.

These victims of colonialism and neo-colonialism cannot afford to articulate their conditions of post-coloniality. The languages that rearticulate post-colonial issues

are not their languages. Those individuals who do these articulations bear no resemblance to the millions of displaced persons' linguistic, cultural, economic, and emotional states of being. These languages that so passionately talk about heterogeneity, fluidity, and decentrism are themselves deeply rooted in privilege and opulence and are mainly understood by a highly specialized audience. (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, p. 5)

In the case of colonialist and contemporary Japan, the marginalized peoples mentioned previously (Koreans, the Ainu, the people of Okinawa, and the Chinese) certainly could not afford to speak their needs and disturbances, as all four have in some way become economically and/or politically dependent upon Japan or its chief Cold War ally, the United States. It is my view that the voices of victimized Koreans and Chinese are beginning to be heard as the two countries are coming to their "economic own," so to speak. This is evidenced in South Korea's recent creation of a tribunal to seek reparations from the United States for civilian casualties during the Korean War (Cho, 2008).

Further, as Japan's population continues to age and Japan begins to rely more heavily on an imported work force, many policies and "givens" will need to be reconsidered with regard to marginalized peoples if Japan is to maintain economic hegemony.

To summarize, anti-colonialist theory simply asks us to recognize that our social lives are affected by relationships of power and are the products of multiple structures and beliefs. It recognizes that oppression in *all* forms is dehumanizing and demands that all voices, regardless of language, culture, or history, be heard.

The primary methodology adapted by anti-colonialists to see that all voices are heard is that of life history, which explains the use of the first-person narrative in the presentation of this chapter. As an anti-colonialist researcher, my narrative helps me to

represent my experience. Narratives “help shape our social reality as much by what they exclude as what they include. They provide the discursive vehicles for transforming the burden of knowing into the act of telling” (McLaren, 1993, p. 206). In this way, narratives can be politically enabling or crippling, depending on the stories we choose to tell and how we tell them. Essentially, the aim of narrative is to give voice to those silenced by the institution, and to allow those voices to speak for themselves.

While I am wildly grateful for my experiences working and traveling abroad, I am somewhat angry that my teachers never introduced those voices to me, nor were they required to. Why was I deprived of the richness of culture and diversity throughout my public education? Can my mind also be colonized, even if I am White and middle class? What about *my* voice? Is it possible for a government to colonize *its own people*?

This sense of having been colonized by a nationalistic curriculum is the lens through which I and the other teachers in this study interpreted our deepest experiences in Japan and which led me to the anti-colonialist framework. It was that sense of being silenced and indoctrinated that provoked me to take eight years out of my life to live, work, study, serve, and play in over thirty foreign countries after college. I realize that my trip to Japan with the Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund was simply a continuation of that narrative.

Deep Impact

The third major theme to emerge during categorical aggregation of interviews and observations was that of deep impact, which I further subdivided into three levels. Level I

is an initial comparison of the JFMF program to previous cross-cultural experiences and somewhat reflects the type of comments I assumed I would gather in response to the comparison question. Levels II and III, labeled The JFMF Agenda and American Colonialism, respectively, went beyond the proposed intentions of the study and require the additional anti-colonialist framework for interpretation. I will discuss these levels in order of depth.

Level I: Comparison of Cross-Cultural Experiences

The first level of interpretation reflects an initial comparison of the JFMF Teacher Abroad Program to participants' previous cross-cultural experiences. This initial reaction or analysis of the trip generally regarded logistics and itinerary. Much was accomplished and much was learned in such a short amount of time, even for those who had extensive travel experience. Teachers described the experience as "abundant" and "borderline overwhelming." The downside to having everything arranged was that participants did not have to "struggle through the muck" on their own and "get to look back with that sense of accomplishment." Overall, teachers viewed the journey as an unprecedented experience for educators.

Robin remarked, "So far in my life, nothing has been as extensive as the JFMF experience. Nothing that I've done so far can compare.... So much was built into the experience in such a short period of time." Barbara stated, "JFMF was a structured professional experience like no other cross-cultural experience I have ever had.... We were exposed to so many facets of the Japanese culture, including government,

education, and the arts. It was all-inclusive.” Susan mentioned that previous cross-cultural experiences offered “minimal opportunities to delve deeply into the specific culture as they were tourism based.” Denise reflected, “The JFMF trip gave me access to high-level officials in government and education, as well as artists, who would not have been accessible to me under normal circumstances.” Most comments focused on the access participants had to people and schools that were not possible on previous personal trips. Sam expounded:

I have never been treated as luxuriously, and with as much respect, as I was through the JFMF trip. I felt an honored, revered professional, and recognize the trust and belief the Japanese government imparted in educators who could serve as true cultural ambassadors. The trip—different, unprecedented in my experience, and well planned—afforded me with unique opportunities to glance briefly at the educational and political world of Japan. I am incredibly grateful for such an opportunity that I will doubtfully have again.

Financially and logistically, teachers “could never have had this experience or these hookups—the Hiroshima survivors, the spa.” To have such a range of activities and experiences in such a short amount of time was “unprecedented.”

For all but two of the participants, this was the first opportunity to stay in a host home and interact so closely with host country citizens “other than hotel or restaurant staff.” All of the participants experienced all levels of education and had access to government and school officials for the first time.

Another major difference noted from previous experiences was that in Japan, participants were traveling with other educators, each with a specific objective. Denise noted, “Having specific goals as I made the trip helped me to really *see* experiences and taught me about specific aspects of Japanese life.” Sam had in the back of her mind,

“How am I going to use this in my classroom?” Looking at the experience for someone else made participants see each experience differently than they would have if looking for only themselves.

As for the importance of traveling with other educators, one said that to experience Japan with such a large and diverse group of educational professionals from the United States was “extraordinary.” Another mentioned, “Making the trip with fellow educators expanded the experience through our common interest in the Japanese culture.” A third said that the cohort gave her the opportunity to hear about schools in other parts of the United States and to share ideas with other educators.

Responses at this level reflect other studies that have been conducted with regard to overseas professional development. Mahan (1994, as cited in O’Brien, 2006) wrote that an overseas professional development experience is one in which “participants are likely to achieve personal and professional outcomes that could not be matched had they chosen to remain at home” for conventional professional development (p. 105).

Conventional professional development is defined by one participant in O’Brien’s study as “surface learning” (p. 105) and by another as “literally, sitting in a room and listening to someone drone on endlessly about something I’m probably never going to use or someone who doesn’t understand the reality of teaching so it becomes just wasted time” (p. 104). Participants in O’Brien’s analysis of a teacher exchange program to East Africa concluded that there simply is no comparison between traditional professional development and authentic cross-cultural experience in terms of the intensity of learning; JFMF participants agreed.

Level II: The JFMF agenda.

I classified the second level of interpreting the JFMF experience as propaganda, or a recognition of the JFMF Agenda. This categorization is in no way intended to be malicious. As I stated previously, I am profoundly grateful for the generosity and hospitality of the Japanese government in sponsoring the JFMF Teacher Abroad program. The label simply reflects differences in the way the Americans and the Japanese interpreted specific events on the itinerary.

Reflections falling at this level recognize that while participants were given ample opportunity to venture out on their own, the sponsoring Japanese government's agenda was part of the structure of the program, which is, in turn, reflective of Japanese culture. A few teachers acknowledged, "They told us what they wanted us to know," which for Jared, who does not like being told what to do or think, was "frustrating." Many teachers acknowledged that the dynamic of the group is part of the Japanese culture: "That in itself is the culture—the group, the organization, having to deal with the group dynamic."

However, teachers who had not prepared themselves to conform to proper Japanese *katas*, or procedures, complained that we were treated like sheep or children, not realizing that the discipline (*seishin*) and self-sacrifice required to conform to a group-ordered society is a valued Japanese character trait. "To the Japanese, social conformity is not a sign of weakness but of strong inner self-control that has helped the individual to overcome his or her more antisocial instincts" (Gannon, 2001, p. 42). American individualism, to the Japanese, is an anti-social instinct.

Members of the cohort also felt that the level of organization almost *forced* us to

have a positive experience. In the baths under the stars in Tainai one evening, a participant commented, “I feel like I’m being wooed.... We’re staying in a spa, we’ve had wonderful food, and I’m not having to work hard for the experience. It will be easy for me to go back with a glowing impression of Japan.” In other words, the participant felt that having the experience handed to us on a golden platter, with no allowances for mistakes or stumbling, would leave us no choice but to have a positive experience.

Sam’s reflection months after her return to the United States was particularly insightful:

Instead of participating in a student-led learning challenge, I was completing a teacher-driven assignment. In Japan, everything was smooth, efficient, and worked well. I followed a large crowd, showed up at the assigned time, and signed my name out when I had to go to the bathroom (being timed while I was gone). While I am profusely grateful for the opportunity to travel to Japan, have so many arrangements taken care of, and witness the breadth of places, people and experiences we did in just 2½ weeks, I can’t say that my experience there was authentic, nor revolutionary in the way I was prompted to examine the Japanese culture or my own. Because I did not have to struggle, falter, or wonder, I was not forced to dive as deeply into my experience.

Many teachers lamented that because we were such a huge group, we did not have much of a chance to “scrape our knees” or to connect beyond a superficial, formal way to Japan or to the Japanese ambassadors we met. For a two and a half week program, for example, Sam and others felt that one night of home stay was “a joke.”

According to Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich (2002), home stays are often where students learn the most during their experiences abroad. The blatant nature of the interaction forces learning, in particular learning about the world and its people (Kissock, 1997). Taylor (1994) wrote, “Only through direct human to human contact do we stop thinking of people as representatives of groups and begin to respect them as unique

individuals” (p. 8). Those in the cohort who wished for a lengthier home stay were the same teachers who wanted the opportunity to “struggle through the muck” and “scrape our knees.” So for the most part, our experience in Japan did not allow us to think of the Japanese we met as individuals, the way Americans tend to view each other. Rather, we were introduced to a collective and representative group, the preference of the Japanese.

I personally pursued three different lines of questioning to various presenters, the responses to which further reflected what the Americans interpreted as the superficiality of our interaction with the country and its people, and hence an agenda in the Japanese government’s sponsorship of the program. The Japanese ambassadors with whom we associated, however, most likely interpreted my questions as violations of *seishin* (self-discipline) and the presenters’ responses as obedience to proper social *katas*. However intended or interpreted, the responses resulted in extensive conversation and debate among the cohort during our free time.

My questions stemmed from biases I held prior to the trip; and although they may seem spiteful, my intent was that I was searching for cognitive dissonance; the questions were intended for clarification purposes only. I had learned much of Japan’s history by living and traveling in its former colonies, and I was hoping to gain an opposing perspective the way I had when I studied colonialism as a graduate student in England after having lived in India. I did not expect to come to a conclusion on who was “right” or who was “wrong;” I simply wanted to hear another side of the story.

I posed the first question to Dr. Kuniko Inoguchi of the House of Representatives on our fifth day in Tokyo. The entire group of 200 educators had been pleased to hear

from a panel of Diet members, and the floor was open for questions. As context for my question, Dr. Inoguchi is a member of the Liberal Democratic Party and has been a member of the Diet since 2005. A former Fulbright scholar to Yale University, she is the first to hold the newly created position of Social Affairs Minister. One of few women in such a position, her first self-proclaimed mandate is to gender and social equality.

Dr. Inoguchi explained in impeccable English that Japanese post-colonial politics and economic policies have not previously been social policies: “Economics has always been the priority.” Japan has no natural resources other than its people, so the people have built themselves by maximizing efficiency and technological innovation.

Dr. Inoguchi spoke of the need for cultural sensitivity, specifically with regard to its aging population and the havoc this is wrecking on the country’s shrinking workforce. Currently, 21% of population is over 65. By 2025, that population will exceed 40%. Further, more and more women are postponing marriage and children. This means that, to maintain its current standard, Japan is going to have to rely on either an imported workforce or more outsourcing. One of Inoguchi’s primary concerns is the lack of social acceptance of the workforce that they are beginning to import, particularly those from South and Southeast Asia. Compounding this context, one of the front-page stories in the English language daily that morning had articulated the plight of the ethnic Koreans in the Utoro district of Kyoto.

Dr. Inoguchi’s background and the tone she took in approaching her subject matter led me to believe that she would be open to discussing the dismal workforce and/or pension rights of minority populations already residing in Japan, so I felt no

hesitancy in posing my question:

Dr. Inoguchi, you explained how a lack of natural resources has historically necessitated prioritizing economic policy over social policy. Now that social policy is becoming a priority, what will you do in your position as Minister of Social Affairs to affect specific post-colonial policies, such as the relocating of the ethnic Koreans in Kyoto?

Put simply, after demonstrating her respectable brilliance, poise, and mastery of the English language for over an hour, Dr. Inoguchi acted as if she did not understand my question. She consulted in whispers with other panel members for a few moments and then stated clearly in the microphone, “I do not understand your question.” I rephrased the question a few times (e.g., “How do you intend to help the ethnic Koreans in Kyoto who are being kicked out of their homes?”) before my inquisition was dropped and the next questioner was summoned by the moderator.

In retrospect, Dr. Inoguchi may have interpreted my question as a violation of *seishin*, or self-control. As I explained previously, Japanese people value personal discipline and self-sacrifice in serving the interest of the group (Gannon, 2001). In this case, that interest was the collective “face” (the prestige and self-respect) of the Japanese people. In contrast, my question had been self-seeking.

The next day I addressed atomic bomb survivor Keijiro Matsushima with my second question, but this time I received a more blatant response. Mr. Matsushima was a member of the three-person panel on peace education and offered an emotionally charged account of what he experienced on August 6, 1945.

Matsushima, who remembers cheering when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, thought nothing of the twin B-29 bombers he saw flying outside his school window. He was in a

high school calculus class, 2 kilometers south of the bomb's hypocenter, with 70 other boys and remembers how beautiful the planes looked shining in the sunlight, "like ice candies." He also remembers being careless about seeing them. So many bombers had flown over the city in the weeks and months previous that they had simply become part of the scenery, so he turned his attention back to his textbook. He described the next moments:

It was at the next moment that an orange red flash jumped in my eyes, and a shock wave of searing heat blew into my face.... At the same time, I had jumped under my desk, unconsciously pressing my ears with both thumbs and my eyes with the other fingers because we had been told to do so in the case of a bombing. Then I heard the huge noise of the blast; I still have no idea if it was the sound of the bomb's explosion or of the collapsing buildings. Perhaps it was both. Real dark, pitch-black world.

Although there were over 70 boys in the room, Matsushima heard nothing. No one screamed; no one cried.

He made his way out of the school and walked home through the damage and fires, past people whose skin had burned off—"burnt people who looked like smoked and broiled pigs.... A procession of charred people." Without exception, their arms were thrust out and their muscles exposed. He told of bodies floating up and down the river according to the movement of the tide and of people pulling maggots from their wounds with chopsticks. "Hiroshima is dying," he thought over and over. Then, with a sly grin and a tone that brought comic relief to the audience, he said, "Hiroshima was dying, yet I didn't believe in surrender. That's education!"

Now, over 60 years later, having suffered various reactions to the radiation, the loss of family and friends, and discrimination from other Japanese as a *hibakusha* (his

wife's family were afraid of him), Matsushima holds no grudge against the American people. He told us that people have a grudge, a hatred, for the weapon, but not to the American people. "Before the A-bomb, we hated Americans. They were the enemy. But once the war was over, we had no reason to hate." He understands that the bomb was a "necessary decision" for Americans and apologized for the Japanese government's stubbornness in continuing the war (!); and then he concluded, "But please don't cheer about it. Let's cooperate to stop the use in the world. Never again. We must cooperate for the human race."

Mr. Matsushima's presentation was profoundly inspirational. There was not a dry eye in the room or a heart that was not committed to sacrificing for peace. Having experienced first hand the horrors of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, I felt a true connection to this man as he spoke of his fear and forgiveness, and I truly felt that he was committed to the cause of humanity. When the floor opened for questioning, I approached the microphone believing that my personal biases about post-war Japan would be cleared. I addressed the panel:

I know that there were a number of Koreans who were living in Hiroshima at the time, Koreans who had been conscripted by the Japanese to come and work in factories and munitions factories, and so a number of the victims were Korean. And I know there is a lot of bitterness to this day on the part of Koreans for the Japanese activities in the war. I'm curious if you have a recollection of the way those Koreans were treated and the relationship between the Japanese and the Koreans in Hiroshima in the immediate aftermath of the bombings.

Tomoko Yanagi, a young high school English teacher on the panel, was the first to respond:

That's a very central issue. In my opinion, the Japanese government should officially apologize to the Koreans who suffered not only by the atomic bomb but

also by what the Japanese people did. There has been a controversy about what the Japanese people really have done to the Korean people. It is very difficult.... We have to know, all the Japanese people have to know, correctly what was in the past in order to build a good relationship between Japan and other Asian countries.

Her response received nods of approval from the audience; then she turned the time over to Mr. Matsushima to discuss the feeling of Hiroshima during the war and immediately after. His response was a little different:

As you know, there were many Koreans in Hiroshima even before the war. Even in my classroom in elementary school, there were some Korean children. They did not have a good time among us, as you know. And they were also bombed in Hiroshima. Well, they must have had a hard time after the war. Not discrimination to Korean people, I don't think. As you know, before the end of the war, Koreans, they were also Japanese people. Japan colonized Korea many years ago. But I don't think Japan was called "conqueror" of Korea. They were treated in a good way as a colony. They were considered to be the same as Japanese people.... I don't think we have ever discriminated Korean people so badly. I don't think so. Korean people received elementary school education; their schools were as nice as ours during the war. I don't have a bad impression about colonization of Korea. I think they were treated in the same way.

American moderator David Satterwhite of the Japan-United States Educational Commission was quick to intervene. "We all need to keep in mind that was an era of colonial powers, Western, and Japan followed...with its colonizing of Asia." He then called for the next question.

Was it just me, or had this man, who had just brought a roomful of educators to its knees, just gone back on every ounce of wisdom and forgiveness he had offered? On the other hand, were my biases so strong that I had misinterpreted his answer?

My questions from that point on were referred to by the people I had become friends with as "Strike One" and "Strike Two," and a number of people whom I had not met likewise approached me to express their bewildered disappointment.

One member of my cohort later pointed out that the two younger speakers on the panel both apologized, in part, for Japanese aggression. The English teacher told us that she felt the Japanese government should apologize for its wartime activities in her response to my question. Previously on the panel, a young woman whose father had recently died from an atomic bomb related illness began her address by apologizing on behalf of him for the way Japan treated other people during the war. She directed that apology to those Japan had colonized, as well as to victims of Pearl Harbor and prisoners of war. This member of my cohort and I surmised that perhaps the attitude is generational—that younger Japanese are more removed from and hence willing to examine the colonialist and war-time legacies than are older Japanese.

Dahl (2008) has pointed out Japan's dual role of victim and perpetrator during the war, stating that the most significant obstacle to a formal apology from the Japanese government is the sense that they are victims themselves. It is natural that Mr. Matsushima would prefer to concentrate on Japan's received wounds rather than on the wounds they inflicted on others. While Japan's survivors are leaders in peace education and efforts to ban nuclear weapons, they have become so at the expense of acknowledging the horrors of their imperialism, "focusing instead upon situations in which their own citizens have been victimized" (p. 250).

Positioning this exchange within the context of anti-colonialist discourse, Itwaru argued that the objective of any imperial order is to see the colonized disauthenticated, "devoid of an indigenous identity, ancestry, and history" (as cited in Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, p. 302). This was precisely Japan's objective as pursued through their

assimilationist policies. Mr. Matsushima stated, “[The Koreans] were considered to be the same as Japanese people.... I don’t have a bad impression about colonization of Korea. I think they were treated in the same way.” The point is, however, the Korean people did not *want* to be treated the same as the Japanese. While they certainly were not offered the same basic human rights as ethnic Japanese, they wanted to be treated like Koreans, able to practice their own identity, history, language, and spirituality. It is their authenticity that Mr. Matsushima seemingly denies.

Unlike my first two questions, I felt that my third question was met with an attempt at understanding. Three days after the Peace Education workshop, my cohort visited Niigata University, where we were pleased to hear a presentation on current trends and issues in Japanese education by Professor Yosuke Yotoriyama. This setting was much more intimate, with no more than 50 people in the room. On one side of the room sat the twenty members of the Niigata cohort and our translator and guide, Meiko and Iishi, and facing us were about a dozen education professors and another dozen or so teacher education students.

Dr. Yotoriyama’s presentation was eye opening in that he exposed for us how intimately the Japanese education system reflects the American system. With all the obvious differences in application (e.g., state vs. national curriculum), many of the objectives of the standards movement were adopted by Japan, and they are now preparing to transition toward legislation similar to No Child Left Behind.

Then Dr. Yotoriyama spoke briefly of textbook censorship and his view that Japan needed to acknowledge its colonial legacy. The sensitivity of his subject matter

was made obvious by his body language and the comments of his department Dean (mentioned in a previous section); so for the most part, the American teachers did not press the issue. However, the temptation was simply too great for me, and when the floor opened for questions I risked my third strike!

I did not refer specifically to colonialism or wartime acknowledgement, so this question was a bit softer than my previous two. I preceded with reference to civil rights and multicultural education in the United States and then asked what efforts were being made to bring minority (e.g., Korean and Ainu) voices and cultures into public school settings and curricula.

Dr. Yotoriyama likewise did not use the words “colonialism” or “censorship” in his explanation, yet his tone was vaguely apologetic. He answered first by acknowledging the lack of multicultural presence in history and cultural education and the need for those voices to be included for the Japanese story to be complete. He stated that most Japanese believe their country is homogenous, and he spoke of the need for an “attitude shift” away from post-war nationalism. While there are no multi-cultural standards per se in Japanese education, certain grassroots organizations are leading the charge against prejudice. These movements are few and far between and are concentrated in areas where those populations are present. He even had to explain what “multiculturalism” is to the education students in the room. Professor Yotoriyama offered several anecdotes with regard to bullying against ethnic minority children and hopes that a new level of understanding will come with the next generation.

Dr. Yotoriyama was not able to offer statistics or solutions regarding multicultural

education the way he had throughout the rest of his presentation, but he was painfully aware of the need and acknowledged that this is one area in which Japan could learn from the United States. Although he periodically stole furtive glances toward his Dean, he remained unintimidated while alluding to topics for which many in higher education have lost their posts.

Of the many presentations we attended in Niigata, Dr. Yotoriyama's by far sparked the most positive reaction. Members of the cohort expressed relief that someone had finally "acknowledged they aren't perfect" without pretending not to understand the question. His honesty was "refreshing" and "a welcome fish in a sea of propaganda" according to participants.

In retrospect, Dr. Yotoriyama's response was more intricate than I realized at the time. Dei and Asgharzaeh write that "race, racism, and xenophobia lie at the heart of all colonialist and imperialist enterprises" and that historically, race has been invoked to justify subordinate and superordinate social positions (2001, p. 309). While the idea of a "divine" or "superior" race kept the Europeans separate from the people of color they oppressed, Japan imposed assimilationist colonial policy because they are arguably of the same race; they look much like the Korean, Ainu, and other groups they were attempting to colonize. Yotoriyama spoke as an anti-colonialist when he acknowledged the need for Koreans to be able to use their Korean names in school without fear of being bullied and to speak their own language and celebrate their own history without repercussion.

Other than the three questions I asked our presenters over the course of the trip, I was intentionally reticent to explain my previous personal and academic history or biases

to other American educators. I did not want to taint their interpretation or experience with my personal biases. Yet many of the subjects alluded to the reactions I received to these questions in their responses 6 months after our return to the States. (Interestingly, one of the participants referred to “the question that girl asked the Diet member,” not realizing “that girl” was me because we had not been introduced substantially to our cohort at the time.) While I entered the JFMF experience with specific bias regarding Japanese post-colonial nationalism, I neither expected nor solicited those responses from the eight study participants, so the emergence of this theme really surprised me. It probably should not have, as it is futile to expect anyone to “unlearn” information about such atrocities.

My background did enter one conversation with Michael while we were in Tokyo. Over raw chicken gizzards and liver one evening, he asked what my “deal” was with the Koreans. I simply stated that I had investigated Japanese colonialism as part of my graduate work, and we left it at that. In addition, while visiting Hiroshima, I explained what I knew about Koreans in wartime Hiroshima and a little about the Comfort Women to some of the teachers with whom I visited that city; however, none of those teachers were in the Niigata cohort.

Level III: American Colonialism

The third level of Deep Impact also came unexpectedly. While I had gone into the JFMF experience with the feeling that the American curriculum is doing a disservice to our students by not preparing them adequately for global economic, social, and spiritual survival, and with a bias against Japanese post-colonial nationalism, I had not merged the two in my mind. The third level of deep impact reflects what I and the other participants

learned when we turned the lens of colonization inward, toward America. I mentioned previously that American post-colonial discourse spoke to civil rights and multi-cultural education only and that we failed to engage our students with critical perspectives from beyond our borders; but I had not examined that failure with respect to *our* colonialist history or current occupations. Similarly, when I inwardly accused the *hibakusha* of silencing the voices of Korean victims, I did not consider that he may have been colonized by a nationalist curriculum just as I and the other American teachers feel we have been. He also was denied the richness of diversity and stories throughout his own education.

Not until six months later, trying to interpret the experience, did I discover the anti-colonialist theoretical perspective, discussed previously, which allowed for this connection. The post-colonial discourse I was previously familiar with was not broad enough for context. Post-colonial discourse focuses heavily on race and the victimization of the colonized, whereas ours is an issue which encompasses nationalism and which must consider the damage the colonizers inflict upon their own as well as those they are subjugating.

The third theme, American Colonialism, emerged in three stages: first, with the recognition by the members of the Niigata cohort of the isolationist perspective of the American curriculum; second, in the voices of the Native American member and an African American member of the cohort; and finally, from the cliché but very real Epiphany of Self that many of the members experienced, and which summarizes the penultimate value and necessity of study abroad for educators.

An isolationist curriculum. For most in the group, recognition of the American isolationist perspective came well before the JFMF experience. For a few, the recognition occurred in Japan. Regardless of where the recognition occurred, all of the teachers expressed a level of frustration, or even anger, at having been a silenced recipient of that perspective.

Sam summed up the frustration one evening after our visit to an elementary school, saying, “It feels so disrespectful to me to not be able to communicate with these kids at lunch today, like I’m the asshole that couldn’t be bothered to learn the language.” Her anger was not so much that she could not speak to the students in their own language (she does speak Spanish and some French), but that she did not *have* to, whereas students the world over are required to speak English. High school students in Japan have to demonstrate a certain level of mastery of English on the College Entrance Examination to be considered, yet fewer than one in ten American students engage in foreign language study (NASULGC, 2004).

Denise articulated her recognition of isolationism in one of her JFMF application essays, where she wrote that she hoped through the implementation of her plan that her students would “understand that we must learn to live peacefully with others in our world through unconditional acceptance and true concern for their welfare; that our country is not isolated, but shares similar sufferings and concerns with other countries of the world.” Likewise, Jared wrote that he learned history from biased teachers and does not want to do the same disservice to his students. He feels that by personally traveling to other cultures, he can improve his own and his students’ understanding of history more

than he could by reading textbooks.

Again on the topic of history, Michael noted that he tries to teach “history, not American history.” Sam commented on the importance of students examining a variety of points of view, “not just from the one presented in an American-published textbook.” She wrote

By looking at, for example, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki through the point of view of a victim, by arguing for or against the use of the bomb, by connecting this science to our daily lives and communities, students begin to see the intricate web that surrounds us and understand that global issues are rarely black and white.

Robin explained in her second interview when and how she came to the recognition of America’s isolationism. She described herself as a small town Texas girl in the 50s, 60s, and 70s, and an adult in the 80s in that small Texas town. In the 90s, to get an ESL endorsement added onto her certificate, she had to take some language and cultural courses in college.

In one class, a Vietnamese man spoke about his survival in Vietnam during the war. He spoke to us graphically about his survival and his family in Vietnam. I realized then how previously, I had only looked at the world from my limited perspective, which included the American media’s point of view only. I had friends and family called up to serve back then and remembered their conditions upon their return or non-return from the war. From his speech, I understood that there are other points of view and the seed of [doubt or] “Who is the enemy?” was planted. It began my curiosity about people in places not thought of before.

Later, Robin moved to a larger town and taught in a more diverse school with 16 languages. There, she was introduced to cultures she had not known before. Referring to a morning assembly we had attended at Nakajo Elementary, Robin continued,

Looking across the gym at the 700 Japanese children and being astonished at the non-diversity, I realized how blessed we are with all the diversity we have and that we should embrace it and use it instead of trying to conform it to fit in a box.

David, the Native American member of our cohort, blatantly understood what it meant to be pushed into a box, and he worked tirelessly to see that his students did not experience the same roadblocks to identity that he continued to encounter.

After years of apathy and confrontation, for example, David's community was finally supportive and passionate about the traditional prayer song he offered every morning at his high school. "The students want it. And the people, they say it's good." For many years, there was no prayer song, and David felt that too many of the students were losing touch with their identities as Lakota Sioux. In addition, many White teachers on the reservation did not understand the point of the song and were resentful.

There has been resentment a couple of times where somebody said, why do we do that? We should have a Christian prayer. If we allow that we should allow time for Christian prayer too. Democracy or whatever. But that's not a religion; it's a way of life. It belongs to the people.

Now, in a high school of 400 students, when David brings the prayer song, everybody stands and remains silent. The whole high school settles down, including the students who do not know the ways or who do not fully understand the culture.

David referred to Japanese culture as a point of comparison to the prayer song and the "box" that Native Americans are forced into on the reservation and in American life. He compared how both industrialization in Japan and colonization in America brought changes to a traditional way of life, yet the Japanese and Native American cultures had to adjust, or struggle to remain the same, while incorporating new actual realities into the core of their cultural representations. He offered the example of Indian youth enlisting in the Armed Forces as a modern way of achieving warrior status, while in Japan that achievement has transferred to the corporate world where status is actualized.

David clearly recognized the isolationism embedded in the American perspective, because it was his voice and his way of life that had been silenced for so long. In a follow-up interview, he continued to illustrate the chasm between the life he has experienced as a Native American and the lives of Americans off the reservations:

The Lakota had been told to live like the White man, and they believed they were doing so.... And the White man's life wasn't real good, to say the least. Then World War II veterans came home with the news that the White man was definitely not living like the Lakota on our reservations. And they're still not.

Further, when David returned from Japan, his substitute had had a hard time keeping up in a subject matter that was a total novelty for her. She was a White woman from the East coast, and with her husband had ended up in the school, she as a substitute and her husband hired as a PE teacher. They left right after David returned. "Seems like it was too much for them, the cultural shock, I mean."

The experiences and perspectives David brought to our cohort led the rest of us to ask, *"If we are not prepared to bridge a chasm within our own nation, with a people we label American, and hear their voices and see from their perspective, how can we expect to bridge the divide across an ocean?"*

Voices from the cohort. This question leads to the second level of understanding with regard to American Colonialism, wherein participants not only commented on their recognition of American isolationism but also further recognized how the isolationism they had been indoctrinated with affected the way they responded to and interacted with two specific members of the group, David and Aurelia.

David was by far the most unique and memorable member of the group as far as background and viewpoint. He was well received and respected by the other American

teachers and the Japanese hosts and students as he repeatedly shared aspects of Lakota culture (e.g., prayers, dedications, and language). The American teachers tended to hold him in awe, simply because of the way he carried himself. As a whole, they respected him but stood back. David commented to me a few times, and again reiterated in his second interview, that I was his bridge to the rest of the group: “My dear Raquel,” he wrote, “for some reason that you and I may not understand, but very likely feels right, YOU have been my link toward the rest of the group, and I opened to you more than to anyone else.” (This, by the way, is one of the greatest compliments I have ever received).

The students reacted to David quite differently than the other American teachers did. They loved his hat and his earring, his beautiful beaded jewelry, and the photos he carried of his horses. He was “a real Indian!” not like those they had previously been exposed to on the big screen. At every school we visited, David gathered a student following like the Pied Piper gathered children.

In his second interview, reflecting on the way he interacted with these two distinct groups, David wrote:

I found myself facing two cultural shocks. First, of course, was the Japanese people, culture, way of life. This was an expected encounter, and it was well guided by the way the program had been set...and the Japanese people we met and interacted with who were for the majority individuals who had practice in this kind of...cross-cultural active encounter. But the other fold of this whole experience was for me to find myself as part of a large group of people with whom I shared little common traits but the citizenship. Culturally (this includes history, language, values, models of proper behavior, or personal and professional references), I found myself more disoriented in the American group (where everyone else, roughly, took for granted that I was an American teacher) than in the Japanese human environment (where I was perceived like who I really was, that is a foreign visitor). In summary, I met with two different worlds that were not similar to the world I came from; but me being immersed in a large mainstream American group (it was the first time ever I was interacting with

mainstream Americans on a large scale for a significant amount of time)...was a harder experience in that this group related to me in a way that was different from the way I was (or rather I was not exactly) relating to it.

In many ways, David's comments reflect the way many of the American teachers admitted to taking advantage of the fact that he is *American*. I explained earlier the preference of Japanese people to be acknowledged as a part of a group as opposed to as an individual. For the most part, the members of our cohort recognized that we were in Japan to listen and learn, to represent America and not ourselves, and hence conformed to this expectation (this is the *kata* I violated by posing my questions); yet at the same time, the entire cohort agreed that we learned as much from our interactions with David as we had from interacting with the Japanese and that we gained a new respect for the Lakota struggle and culture. Many of our planned and spontaneous discussions were reiterations of things David had said or done as an individual that affected us.

One of the most profound of the experiences we had with David occurred as we traveled by bus from the spa to the train that would take us back to Tokyo from Niigata. Our driver stopped at a lake in a farming area outside Niigata, where we got out to walk and explore. Whether what happened next was planned or spontaneous I do not know; but either way, even the memory is sacred. David gathered us all into a large circle, arms-length apart from one another and placed our guide next to himself. He instructed us all to close our eyes and explained that he was going to offer a prayer of thanksgiving and a blessing upon the health and happiness of our beautiful Japanese mother. Although none of us understood a word he said, the prayer he sang for the next 5 minutes reduced us all to tears.

One day prior to this, we had said goodbye to our translator; and again, David spontaneously offered a prayer of thanksgiving and a blessing upon her future work. He emphasized the importance of translation as a bridge between perspectives and identified the work of translators as one of the highest callings in pursuit of peace. The gratitude he extended in this display was compounded for those of us who knew of David's prior work as a translator for the United Nations.

Because of his life experience and the confidence with which he presented himself, the group unanimously selected David to speak for us or to represent us on many occasions, such as when we met with the president of Niigata University and when we made our final presentation to the other 180 educators on our final day in Tokyo. David's voice was immensely important to all of us throughout the duration of our trip, and more often than not, the cohort relied on him to speak for our collective identity. Many members of the cohort lamented that we had to travel half way across the world to hear the voice of one whose story we have historically silenced.

Aurelia, on the other hand, was not allowed to contribute her individualism to the group and her voice was repeatedly shut down whenever she attempted to do so. She was not one of the eight randomly selected to participate in this case study; nevertheless, her story is an important factor in interpreting the JFMF experience. Aurelia is a talented young African American art teacher from New Jersey who was initially appointed by JFMF organizers to be our cohort spokesperson. Contention arose and she was "overthrown," however, because of her incessant reference to herself as a "Black inner-city youth." This "hammering of her identity" particularly angered the other African

American woman in the group, who asked on more than one occasion, “Does she not know that on this trip we are all *Americans*?”—a reference to our collective identity.

Our point in traveling to Japan was to learn from the Japanese and to listen to them; so when Aurelia framed all of her questions to our hosts with a lengthy biography that the rest of us had memorized, those “questions” not only came across as completely self-centered, but they were also incredibly painful for our translators who did not see the relevance of her individualism.

Before we even left Tokyo for Niigata, everyone in the cohort was frustrated by her efforts at dominance and self-centeredness. The tension only mounted as time wore on, and everyone, including our guide and translator, expressed frustration behind her back. My initial response to the tension was to defend Aurelia. She was, after all, one of the youngest in the group and had little or no experience abroad (or so it seemed—none of us really got to know her). I defended her as naïve and inexperienced and suggested that we all work together to resolve the tension.

Since I was the one defending her, the cohort “voted” to have me confront her. They particularly asked that I explain that we were in Japan to listen, not to dominate, and to get directly to the point of a question without reciting a 5-minute biography. I was very reluctant to confront Aurelia, because, like the Japanese, I am not a big fan of contention. However, I could see the weight her questions were bearing on our translator and the confusion and impatience on the part of the hosts she was addressing. Therefore, I agreed to talk to her.

Unfortunately, our conversation did not go as I had intended. My timing was

horrendous, and the confrontation caught me completely by surprise. My grandfather had passed away while I was in Japan, but at the urging of my parents, I had decided to finish out the trip. I was in a lot of angst, feeling guilty for not attending my grandfather's funeral and trying to grieve for a man I deeply loved half a world away. I was struggling to grieve and remain focused on the JFMF objectives; and as a result, our "talk" turned into an explosion during which I deeply offended Aurelia. She refused to interact with anyone in the group for the remainder of the trip. She would not participate in any of the group activities when we returned to Tokyo or any of the exchanges when we returned home.

Looking back, I realize how damaging our behavior was to the overall objective of our time in Japan: We were there to promote cultural understanding and to build empathy, yet we completely silenced a person who obviously needed a venue to voice her narrative. Further, we oppressed her voice and identity for asserting her own version of Americanness—my version of American individuality having been my insistence at posing the three troubling questions to our presenters. In my case, the Americans were angered and bewildered at the silencing; yet when Aurelia's voice was silenced, we were relieved. More than a few in the group thanked me later for "shutting her up."

On one hand, I regret the role I played in that silencing because I know that Aurelia had a lot to teach me that I could have used in my personal life and in my classroom. Had my grandfather's death not emotionally drained me, I may have had the energy for constructive dialogue.

Yet overwhelmingly and on the other hand, I know that I cannot hold myself

responsible for her anti-social behaviors and inability to function as a member of a collective. The Niigata cohort represented a diverse and tolerant group of educators; the fact that Aurelia so offended *us* reveals that her behavior truly was inappropriate. Educators understand the imperative of rules in group preservation. Our treatment of Aurelia was due to her refusal to play by those rules. Further, as I have described the situation to colleagues and others who were not members of the JFMF cohort, the response by many has been that she unnecessarily “played the race card”—an unpleasant and sensitive accusation in any setting, but one which suggests that Aurelia has yet to process her own racial and identity issues.

Epiphany of self. This leads to the third level of recognition that took place with regard to American colonialism, which was the need for us, as Americans participating in the JFMF experience, to step outside of ourselves to confront our realities. I call this the Epiphany of Self, and it serves two purposes. First, the Epiphany allows us to understand our own paradigms, values, and beliefs more fully by taking them out of context—hence, defining ourselves for ourselves. One teacher commented that time away always brings her back to her “spiritual core.” Robin mentioned that she is able to refine her values by placing herself in uncomfortable situations. When Sam was critiquing the authenticity of her experience, she wrote that her experience in Japan was not authentic or revolutionary in the way she was prompted to examine Japanese culture *or her own*, implying that previous experiences out of context had prompted her to self-examine more than the current circumstances had.

Second, the Epiphany of Self allows us to define ourselves for others, or what

anti-colonialist discourse refers to as constructing our own narrative. McLaren (1993) explains that each identity (individual, group, or national) is a result of a social narrative, or a succession of politically, historically, and ethically meaningful events, some of which we sanction and some that we discount for various ideological or political reasons. He further states that our identities are never complete but are always in the process of negotiation. The narratives we write shape our social realities and too often are written by someone other than ourselves, often by those in power.

David believes that encountering different realities “leads you to look at yourself and redefine yourself, be it only to tell the ‘other’ who you are, which is really to tell them who you think/understand/feel/hope you are.” In other words, the encounter allows individuals to construct their own narratives.

One teacher in the Niigata cohort commented, “So much of my identity at home is what other people want it to be. I feel like in Japan, I was able to let people see me for who I really am, or how I wanted them to see me.” Another teacher told me in confidence, “For these few weeks, I forgot I used to be a victim of abuse.”

By stepping out of our comfort zones and meeting each other on equal yet unfamiliar ground, the American educators in the Niigata cohort—other than Aurelia—were able to present to each other the identities we feel we are at our cores. We relied on personally constructed narratives rather than social constructions. Two of the teachers took this Epiphany of Self one step further, expressing the hope that they could help their students feel more comfortable with who they are; and Barbara, Susan, and Robin all mentioned that the way they reacted to or treated their students upon their return

(particularly their marginalized students) helped those students become more confident and assertive of their own identities in the classroom. Robin wrote that discussions in her classroom made the children “more comfortable with who they are” and “take pride in their heritage.”

As one whose individual and group identity has historically been constructed by individuals or institutions in power, David wrote,

That they are Americans, my students would not deny. But they are primarily Lakota, and the American nation is a composite in which one would disappear as a specific people (melting pot, huh) if one cannot make the difference between one’s own true and essential identity and the more general designation of being an *American*.

This is ultimately what the anti-colonialist framework is about. Whether the power structures in our society are forged by race, gender, class, religion, or intellectual or physical ability, and whether those social structures exist within or among nations or in our minds, domination in all its forms silences voices that need to be heard on both sides for the growth and healing of both.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the unanticipated theme that emerged during categorical aggregation, that of deep impact. This theme emerged in three stages: first, in teachers’ comparisons of the JFMF experience to their prior cross-cultural experiences, particularly with regard to logistics and itinerary; second, in a recognition of the Japanese government agenda or motive in sponsoring the teacher abroad program; and third, a recognition of deep and residual American colonialist practices and aims.

This third stage in particular required the adoption of the anti-colonialist theoretical framework for meaningful interpretation. This stage emerged in phases: first, teachers recognized the isolationist perspective of the American curriculum; second, they commented on other voices from the cohort, in particular the resounding voice of a Lakota Sioux and the silenced voice of an African American; and third, teachers experienced the very real epiphany of self, which allowed each of us to more fully understand our own paradigms by taking them out of context. Hence, it helped us realize that while being privy to the voices and perspectives of other nations, cultures, and creeds can certainly help us in our global social, political, and economic dealings with other people, part of that understanding is that we gain a clearer picture of ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. By critiquing what Japan has imposed on others and itself with its colonial legacy, I and the other teachers in my cohort were more clearly able to see what *we* are imposing on ourselves and others—the richness we are missing by not opening up to the perspectives of others, both within and without our borders.

CHAPTER VII

NATURALISTIC GENERALIZATIONS (CONCLUSIONS)

A man sees in the world what he carries in his heart. (Goethe)

In response to the many faces of globalization affecting American classrooms today, the intent of this study was to examine the effects of a short-term, cross-cultural experience on the development of global educators. In particular, I sought to examine how K-12 teachers perceived their own roles in the classroom prior to and after an international professional development experience. Was the experience just an opportunity for free travel, in exchange for disseminating obligatory lesson plans? On the other hand, was 3 weeks in a foreign country enough to persuade these teachers to reassess or rearticulate their goals as educators of young people in an age of rapid globalization?

The impetus for pursuing this study was many sided. First and foremost, as a young college graduate in the early 90s, backpacking across Asia and Europe, I became increasingly frustrated at what I had never been exposed to—the art, the religion, the politics, the histories, and the voices beyond the borders of the United States—while still pulling A's all through high school and college. However, what frustrated me more, when I became a teacher myself 20 years later, was that I was not required to teach my own students those things.

Second, globalization, for good or ill, is having deep and profound effects on the culture, politics, economics, demographics, and environment of the United States. While

globalization is not affecting every corner of the globe equally, or yet, the fact is that these factors influence what happens in our classrooms here. With this in mind, I pursued this study in an attempt to uncover how we can better prepare our students to succeed, both socially and economically. Third, while I had visited Japan prior to the JFME experience, most of what I knew about the country I had learned while living in its former colonies. I wanted to learn about Japan from the inside.

Because of this effort, I can confidently assert that a short international sojourn can positively affect teachers' perceptions of themselves. It can also persuade them to reconsider and recommit themselves to their responsibilities as global educators, regardless of the extent of their previous cross-cultural experience. I know that because I saw the pattern repeated with each person interviewed, and myself, without exception.

To reach this conclusion, I employed a qualitative case study design to analyze the experience of eight participants of a 3-week international professional development program, sponsored by the government of Japan. I wanted to know if the experience helped the teachers feel more qualified to prepare their students for a life framed by globalization and if their personal perceptions of their responsibilities changed in light of the experience. I examined participants' application essays and follow-on activities, conducted interviews, and kept detailed journals as a participant observer. Initial interviews were conducted in Japan; second and subsequent interviews were conducted five to six months later as participants had the opportunity to return to their classrooms in the United States and implement their learning.

In my analysis of the application materials, interviews, observations, and follow-

on plans, three major categories emerged: anticipation, direct impact, and deep impact. Anticipation explores why the teachers applied to the JFMF Teacher Abroad program and what they expected to gain from the experience. Direct impact examines how teachers incorporated their experience into their already burdened curricula and how they feel that incorporation impacted their students, schools, parents, community, and sense of self. Anticipation and direct impact synthesize the types of responses I anticipated when I formulated the study questions, and these themes are portrayed through the assumption that multiple forms of globalization are impacting the work we as teachers are attempting to accomplish in our classrooms.

The third theme, deep impact, synthesizes the unanticipated themes that emerged during categorical aggregation and examines the multiple realities of the JFMF experience as articulated by the eight participants and myself. This final category emphasizes the importance of decolonizing our classrooms as we move into the global age. Opening ourselves and our students to others' narratives, from wherever or whomever those narratives may come, is necessary for students not only to gain a more accurate vision of history but also to narrate their own lives more cogently. I summarize and offer recommendations on these categories separately.

Anticipation

Although some members of the Niigata cohort were traveling abroad for the first time, all eight teachers selected to participate in this study had some level of prior cross-cultural experience that they attempted to integrate into their classroom practice. Some

offered their experiences in the form of fun tangibles—music, photographs, or memorabilia—with no expectation of lasting impact. Others integrated their prior experience through a general attitude of acceptance towards others. Third and seemingly most effective were those who integrated a global perspective into their content and delivery through Natural Infusion, inspired either through their institutional mission or their own prior cross-cultural experiences.

These three levels of integration resemble the continuum articulated by the Wisconsin State curriculum guide, which categorizes teachers and students as tourists, travelers, or global citizens and their classrooms as touring classrooms, traveling classrooms, or global classrooms (Durtka et al., 2002). Tourists visit a destination for a short time; focus on differences, food, and festivals; and then return to their regular curricula. Travelers enjoy exploring the history, geography, economics, politics, and art of other cultures and incorporate new customs and languages into their routines. In addition, global citizens cross cultural, linguistic, and political borders; practice democracy and citizenship; engage in service learning; participate in inquiry and action; and experience multiple perspectives. Our students need global classrooms and the opportunity to develop the traits of global citizens.

Because all eight participants in this study had had prior international experience, I was curious as to what they expected to learn or gain from the JFMF experience that they could not or did not already apply in their classrooms. While some teachers expressed selfish motives for applying—that the experience was an opportunity to celebrate life, to fulfill a life-long dream, or to travel for free—those self-oriented

motives were kept in the background and in all but one case were articulated in passing only after the student-centered motives were expressed. For some, like me, the motive was to set an example of moving beyond the confines of socio-economic status. For others, the example was of life-long learning or of taking risks; and still for others the example was of being an ambassador for peace. In one way or another, all eight subjects pursued the program because they knew it would benefit their students.

These motives position these teachers in reach of Bottery's (2006) recommended criteria for global educators, discussed in the review of literature. While educators have traditionally been held to standards related to subject area expertise, public service, and professional judgment, Bottery suggested that, in response to globalization, educators develop six more traits in order to maintain their relevance. Educators should increase ecological and political awareness, strive to make a difference in the quality of society, embrace accountability, build trust with their stakeholders, embrace epistemological provisionality, and engage in professional self-reflection. Each of the teachers in this study demonstrated varying degrees of movement toward each of these goals.

Direct Impact

One major question in approaching this qualitative case study was whether or not a single international cross cultural experience could significantly progress the goals of global education or if this short exposure to Japan would remain an isolated experience, tucked on a shelf and pulled out for a specific unit each year. Could teachers' core perceptions of themselves and their responsibilities change as a result of a 3-week

sojourn with other educators?

The answer to this question is a resounding “yes.” Even if teachers are experiencing only one culture, opportunities such as the JFMF Teacher Abroad program, where educators travel together with specific objectives, have the potential to open minds and teaching practices. While certain participant preconceptions must be considered, the experience clearly had value in working toward (but not arriving at) greater global understanding. According to Sam, “It’s not the answer, but it’s a start.”

The teachers in the Niigata cohort agreed that having the experience “handed to us on a golden platter” did not allow for the personal analysis of self and country to the extent that “hashing it out on our own” would have done. However, teachers (and eventually their students) were impacted affectively, cognitively, and behaviorally by the experience. Affective impact encompasses the heightened interest and curiosity students and teachers had in learning about Japan in particular, but in learning about other cultures in general. This increased enthusiasm resulted in more creative and authentic lesson planning on the part of teachers and the increased cognitive processing ability and critical thinking on the part of the students. The cognitive impact of the program, in turn, gave both students and teachers the confidence to modify their behaviors. One behavioral modification was that of increased risk taking in the classroom, both in what teachers were willing to include in their curriculum and to discuss in class, and in what students were willing to reveal about themselves. Another behavioral modification was the overt acceptance of differences and a greater understanding of the role that such acceptance plays in global peace.

Although the teachers selected to participate in this study already incorporated to some extent the dissemination of global understanding in their philosophies of teaching, their confidence in themselves as global educators was strengthened by the validation offered through the JFMF experience. All seven respondents to the second interview emphasized that their understanding of their roles as educators did not change as a result of the Teacher Abroad program. Rather, their perceptions were reinforced, and now they feel more passionate and energetic about their responsibilities.

Because lengthy stays in foreign countries are generally not financially or logistically feasible options for most practicing educators, short sojourns such as the JFMF Teacher Abroad program can serve as appetizers for other programs or ideally become one experience among many. Teachers cited the most important aspect of the experience as the opportunity to travel with other educators with a specific objective.

On this line, an interesting avenue for further study would be the effects of gap year programs on educators. A gap year is essentially a year taken out of a career or school routine to work or travel abroad, either alone or with an organization. The gap year is a relatively new phenomenon in the United States, though the concept has been practiced for centuries and has held credence among European educators since World War II. In the European view, Americans have a tendency to race through school and into careers as if life were a timed Olympic event, while Europeans and others have viewed the year out as a natural extension of education and personal growth. (In the early 90s, when I left school to circumnavigate the globe, I was seen as irresponsible and selfish, and I seldom met other Americans doing that kind of activity. Conversely, I found Asia

and the Middle East teeming with young Europeans and Israelis out experiencing their gap years.) Only recently in the United States have gap year organizations begun offering assistance to young people to travel, serve, or study in foreign countries.

The literature on pre- and inservice teacher study abroad is growing, but what of those like me who venture abroad to work or trek either on their own or with gap year organizations, and not with programs for credit? Certainly, those who make a go of it on their own are forced into sticky situations that require intense critical thinking, flexibility and language skills—all of which are useful later in a classroom. The contribution of gap year experiences on teachers, their curricula, and their students is an area that is wide open to investigation.

Deep Impact

As a participant-observer, I was prepared to encounter “multiple realities” with regard to anticipation and direct impact. I knew teachers would have personal though similar goals for participating in the program; and I assumed they would engage in some level of student, curriculum, and/or self-appraisal. However, I was not as prepared for the multiple levels of interpretation I discovered in response to my asking participants to compare the JFMF experience with their prior cross-cultural experience; nor did their responses fit within the bounds of the proposed study or framework. Theories of globalization focus on what has and is happening in realms of politics, economics, demographics, and the like. They also present challenges to education as a result of these changes. However, these theories are not enough to encompass a proper response.

Further, the post-colonialist lens through which I had previously been trained to view the geographical region of Japan and its neighbors did not speak to America's imperial aggression toward other lands or peoples—or our own. Further, it does not allow oppressed peoples to tell their own stories, but rather speaks *for* them. As Dei and Kempf (2006) proclaim, there is nothing “post” about colonialism as long as peoples are not allowed to voice their own narratives. For this reason, I adopted an anti-colonialist stance, which broadens the scope of other colonialist theories to examine multiple relations of power from all sides. This stance is necessary in analyzing the Deep Impact of the JFMF program.

When I asked participants to compare their JFMF experience with their prior cross-cultural experience, they responded on three levels. The first level was a basic comparison of logistics and itinerary between the JFMF program and their prior international experience. Noted at this level were the sheer abundance of opportunities offered in such a short amount of time, the privileged access to high-level government and education officials, and the chance to travel with other educators with a singular objective. Teachers lamented that they did not have to “struggle through the muck” on their own or “get to look back with that sense of accomplishment;” however, they all appreciated the JFMF program as an unprecedented opportunity they could not have logistically or financially created on their own.

The second level of deep impact was the recognition of a Japanese government agenda in sponsoring the program. While we were given much time to wander and explore on our own, the sponsoring government's agenda was part of the structure of the

program, which was, in turn, a manifestation of Japanese culture. Essentially, we were participating in a teacher-driven assignment, rather than in student-centered learning. One participant commented, “I’m not having to work hard for the experience. It will be easy for me to go back with a glowing impression of Japan,” meaning that the experience took little effort on our part as participants and that the program was so “routinized” that nothing could possibly go wrong.

The responses I received to my three questions—posed to the Diet member, the *hibakusha*, and the university professor—also revealed a sensitivity on the part of the sponsors to issues they would rather have avoided. Again, the questions, which stemmed from my prior awareness of Japanese colonial issues, were intended for clarification purposes only and were not meant to be malicious. I believe, however, that two of the questions were interpreted as a violation of *seishin*, or self-control, and a threat to “face.” The Japanese, who avoid confrontation in order to preserve face, would rather concentrate on their own victimhood as opposed to the wounds they inflicted on others during their colonization and wartime efforts. Interpreting the responses to my three questions through an anti-colonialist lens, it seems that Dr. Inoguchi (of the Diet) and Mr. Matsushima (the *hibakusha*) sought to disauthenticate the identity, ancestry, and history of those the Japanese have traditionally antagonized, while Dr. Yotoriyama (of Niigata University) sought to give them voice.

Considering that the three questions and their respective responses were interpreted so differently by the Japanese hosts and the American visitors, an avenue for further investigation would be to examine the effect of study abroad programs on the

hosts who sponsor them. Would it not be interesting now to question the JFMF program organizers, the presenters, the educators, and the host families as to their interpretation of the objectives and outcomes of the JFMF Teacher Abroad program? Being the first American to associate with two members of my host family, I would be interested as to their opinion of America, Americans, and American education both before and after my brief visit. After all, two of the JFMF Teacher Program objectives are to increase understanding between the people of the United States *and* Japan and to enrich American *and* Japanese curricula. Numerous studies examine the effects of study abroad on participants; none that I came across examined the effects on the hosts.

Finally, the third level of Deep Impact manifested itself as a recognition on the part of the American teachers of an agenda in our (America's) own dispensing of curricula. This theme emerged in three stages: first, with the recognition of many members of the cohort of the isolationist perspective embodied in the current American elementary and secondary curriculum; second, in our group's reaction to and treatment of two specific members of the cohort, David, a Lakota Sioux, and Aurelia, an African American; and third, through the personal epiphany of self that many members of the cohort reported having experienced.

The unanticipated message exposed through this theme was the imperative to decolonize our classrooms if we do not expect globalization to destroy us, "globalizer" and "globalized" alike. The threat of globalization as a mass colonization project was articulated by David in his second interview:

Globalization is dangerous, because it obviously favors the large powerful groups, cultures, languages, ways of life. Thus, globalization threatens us [Native

Americans] and so many indigenous peoples throughout the world more than conquest, genocide, colonial greed, assimilation attempts, etc. ever did before. It is therefore crucial—a matter of cultural, ethnic, historic and linguistic survival—that, through education, we use the threat itself to prevent the disastrous predictable effects that it definitely will have if we remain passive.

I approached the JFMF Teacher Abroad program looking for a Japanese agenda and with a certain bias against their colonialist legacy. Scrutinizing that agenda forced me to look inward at my own role as an educator; and had I not had such profound experiences with other members of my group (i.e., David and Aurelia), I doubt the message of colonialism would have hit as hard, both in the way we deal with the voices of other peoples and cultures and particularly in the way we deal with our own.

This introspection is not simply a case of looking at external forces, as Dei and Kempf (2006) explained, but of analyzing internal power relations (e.g., Who has the power to determine what should be taught? Who dispenses that information and how?) and recognizing that both the colonizer and the colonized are affected and disaffected by these encounters. Teachers need to scrutinize how our knowledge is produced and validated, and how that knowledge is disseminated in our texts, our classroom relations, and our social interactions.

We have to understand and promote understanding of the way certain voices have become dominant, and how certain voices have become devalued, or subordinated. What are the processes and consequences of that subordination? We must look at how certain knowledge or certain ideas have become dominant as well as how they are being used and not questioned. It is very important to bring forth the subordinated voice to subvert and challenge what is taken for granted, what is seen as normal, what is accepted as the conventional norm. (Dei & Kempf, 2006, p. 71)

Students need to understand who speaks for whom and how and why. They need to know what voices are absent and why they are absent, and they need opportunities to bring

those narratives into the conversation. Ultimately, teachers and students need to bring their *own* narratives to the table, because we, also, are part of the story. David continued:

By meeting the otherness, and as we recognize and acknowledge their difference, we assert for them as much as for ourselves our own specificity. As an educator, this is what I do. And really, what else could be in education for us nowadays? If education is not this, for me, then it is only the last weapon in the hand of a colonial government to finish to acculturate the Lakota; and if that is [the case], I am not an educator; I want to become a counterterrorist fighter, like Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull and others.... But really, no matter what, I believe that quite a few of us here on the reservation are already that and have been for a while already.

David recognizes, and through the JFMF experience other teachers realized, that we do not live in a bubble. Those around us shape *our* world, just as we shape theirs. We do not live in a vacuum, and we cannot take each other for granted.

Conclusion

As educators, what is the proper response to the increasing flow of people, cultures, values, and ideas across our borders as a result of advancements in communication and technology? Foremost, we need to prepare our students to deal with multiple perspectives and paradigms in a respectful and communicative manner. We need to listen, and we need to teach our students to listen. Andy Green wrote,

Education must remain in the public arena where tolerance, mutual respect and understanding and the ability to cooperate are cultivated. Just as it offers opportunities for individual development and advancement, it must also strive to promote civic identity and civic competence and to make possible a democratic and cohesive society.

Our classrooms must be decolonized spaces where *every* narrative is valued so that we do not perpetuate the same isolationist disservice on yet another generation of global citizens. Confronting the narratives of others ultimately allows students and teachers to

confront and voice their own, as I have now done. If for no other reason than this, we need more opportunities for international and intercultural exchange in our schools.

REFERENCES

- Akande, Y., & Slawson, C. (2000). Exploring the long-term impact of study abroad: A case study of 50 years of study abroad alumni. *International Educator, 9*, 12-17.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (1983). *A global perspective for teacher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). (1986). *Without a nickel: The challenge of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Council on Education (ACE). (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. [International policy paper]. Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, L. F. (1982). Why should American education be globalized? It's a nonsensical question. *Theory into Practice, 21*, 155-161.
- Black, H. T., & Duhon, D. L. (2006, January/February). Assessing the impact of business study abroad programs on cultural awareness and personal development. *Journal of Education of Business, 140-144*. Retrieved April 6, 2007, from EBSCO.
- Blackmore, J. (2000). Globalization A useful concept for feminists rethinking theory and strategies in education? In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 133-156). New York: Routledge.
- Bollag, B. (2004). Get out of the country, please. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(13), A42.
- Bottery, M. (2006). Education and globalization: Redefining the role of the educational professional. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 95-113.
- Bremer, D. (2006). Wanted: Global workers. *International Educator, 15*, 40-45.
- Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Chang, I. (1999). *The rape of Nanking: The forgotten holocaust of World War II*. New York: Penguin.
- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2003). What's a month worth? Student perceptions of what they learned abroad. *International Educator, 12*(4), 26-31.

- Cho, S. H. (2008). South Korea says U.S. killed hundreds of civilians. *New York Times*. Retrieved August 8, 2008, from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Chung, C. S. (1995). Korean women drafted for military sexual slavery by Japan. In K. Howard (Ed.) *True stories of the Korean comfort women* (pp. 11-30). New York: Cassell.
- Citron, J. L., & Kline, R. (2001). From experience to experiential education: Taking study abroad outside the comfort zone. *International Educator*, 10, 18-26.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cushner, K. (2007). The role of experience in the making of internationally-minded teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 27-39.
- Dahl, E. S. (2008). Is Japan facing its past? The case of Japan and its neighbors. In M. Gibney, R. E. Howard-Hassmann, J. M. Coicaud, & N. Steiner (Eds.) *The age of apology: Facing up to the past* (pp. 241-255). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dei, G. J. S., & Asgharzadeh, A. (2001). The power of social theory: The anti-colonial discursive framework. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 35(3), 297-323.
- Dei, G. S., & Kempf, A. (2006). Australia and France on fire: An anti-colonial critique. *International Education*, 36, 63-82.
- Diene, D. (2006). *Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and all forms of discrimination: Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from <http://www.debito.org/UNdienerreport012406.html>
- Dudden, A. (2005). *Japan's colonization of Korea: Discourse and power*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Durtka, S., Dye, A., Freund, J., Harris, J., Kline, J., LeBreck, C., et al. (2002). *Planning curriculum in international education* (Report No. Bull-3033). Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED480600)
- Employers Weigh in on Value of Education Abroad. (2007). *International Educator*, 16(3), 8.
- Evans, P. Y. (2004). A life changing experience: The impact of the educational trip to China by St. Louis area teachers during the summer of 2000. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 3154259)

- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Friedman, T. L. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Anchor.
- Friedman, T. L. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century* (2nd ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Furlong, T., & Hardin, S. (2000). *International education study abroad programs: A level I review*. Tallahassee: Florida State Board of Community Colleges. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED440715)
- Future of international education, The. (2004). *Recruitment and Retention in Higher Education*, 18, 3-4.
- Gannon, M. J. (2001). *Understanding global cultures: Metaphorical journeys through 23 nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gibney, F. (1999). Editors introduction. *The Nanjing massacre: A Japanese journalist confronts Japan's national shame*. New York: Sharpe.
- Giordano, G. (2003). *Twentieth-century textbook wars: A history of advocacy and opposition*. New York: Lang.
- Green, A. (1997). *Education, globalization and the nation state*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Green, M. F., & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Guerrero, E. (2005). Making the most of short-term immersion. *International Educator*, 14, 42-45.
- Guilherme, M. (2002). *Critical citizens for an intercultural world: Foreign language education as cultural politics*. Tonowanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Hadis, B. F. (2005). Gauging the impact of study abroad: How to overcome the limitations of a single-cell design. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30, 3-19.
- Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. (2000). Education and globalization: Learning to live together. In J. Hallak & M. Poisson (Eds.), *Globalization and living together: The challenges for educational content in Asia* (pp. 10-16). Geneva, Switzerland: International Bureau of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED446014)

- Hansen, H. M. (2002, Spring). Defining international education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 5-12.
- Hanvey, R. G. (1982). An attainable global perspective. *Theory into Practice*, 11(3), 162-167.
- Hayward, F. M., & Siaya, L. M. (2001). *Public experience, attitudes and knowledge: A report on two national surveys about international education* (Item no. 309181). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hulstrand, J. (2006). Education abroad on the fast track. *International Educator*, 15, 46-55.
- Hunter, W. D. (2004). Got global competency? *International Educator*, 13, 6-12.
- Institute of International Education. (2004). *Open doors online: Report on international educational exchange*. Retrieved June 18, 2005, from <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>
- Institute of International Education. (2006). *Japan Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Program (JFMF)*. Retrieved June 16, 2006, from <http://www.iie.org/>
- Jenkins, K. (2001). Studying abroad takes on new urgency following terrorist attacks. *Black Issues in Higher Education* 18, 34.
- Kamat, S., Mir, A., & Mathew, B. (2006). Producing hi-tech: Globalization, the state, and migrant subjects. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.). *Education, globalization, and social change* (pp. 341-354). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kambayashi, T. (2007, October 23). Japan revises history texts. *The Christian Science Monitor*, 4.
- Katsuichi, H. (1999). *The Nanjing massacre: A Japanese journalist confronts Japan's national shame*. New York: Sharpe.
- Kissock, C. (1997). Student teaching overseas. In M. M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow, & S. Pickert, S. (Eds.) *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators* (pp. 123-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal* 38(3), 441-453.
- Korean tower relocated to inside Hiroshima Peace Park. (1999, June 21). *Asian Political News*. Retrieved October 5, 2008, from <http://findarticles.com>

- Koreans in Uji to buy half of disputed land. (2007, October 29). *The Japan Times*. Retrieved October 4, 2008, from <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/>
- Lai, P. S., & Byram, M. (2006). The politics of bilingualism: A reproduction analysis of the policy of mother tongue education in Hong Kong after 1997. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalization, and social change* (pp. 490-504). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J., & Halsey, A. H. (Eds.). (2006). *Education, globalization, and social change*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, T. L., & Niesenbaum, R. A. (2005, June 3). The benefits of short-term study abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, B20.
- Lutterman-Aguilar, A., & Gingerich, D. (2002, Winter). Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: Educating for global citizenship. In *Frontiers: Special Issue. The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* (pp. 41-82). Carlisle, PA: Dickinson College.
- Marcum, J. A., & Roochnik, D. (2001). What direction for study abroad? 2 views. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(36), B7. Retrieved June 21, 2005, from <http://chronicle.com>
- Marginson, S. (2006). National and global competition in higher education. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalization, and social change* (pp. 893-908). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLaren, P. (1993). Border disputes: Multicultural narrative, identity formation, and critical pedagogy in postmodern America. In D. McLaughlin & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Naming silent lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change* (pp. 201-236). New York: Routledge.
- McCarthy, C., & Dimitriadis, G. (2006). Governmentality and the sociology of education: Media, educational policy, and the politics of resentment. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalization, and social change* (pp. 198-211). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Merryfield, M. M. (1995). Institutionalizing cross-cultural experiences and international expertise in teacher education: The development and potential of a global education PDS network. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46, 19-27.
- Merryfield, M. M. (2002, October). The difference a global educator can make. *Educational Leadership*, 18-21.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. (2008). *Abductions of Japanese citizens by North Korea* [pamphlet]. Retrieved October 4, 2008, from <http://www.mofa.go.jp>
- Myers, M. (2000). Qualitative research and the generalizability question: Standing firm with Proteus. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(1/2). Retrieved October 25, 2008, from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-1/myers.html>
- National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). (2004, October). *A call to leadership: The presidential role in internationalizing the university*. Retrieved June 8, 2005, from http://www.nasulgc.org/CIP/Task%20Force/Call_to_leadership.pdf
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (1990). *Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Governors' Association (NGA). (1989). *America in transition: The international frontier. Report of the Task Force on International Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Newman, P. A. (1989). Fulbright Group Projects Abroad program: A case study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 9012894).
- O'Brien, K. B. (2006). The convergence of the global and the local: What teachers bring to their classrooms after a Fulbright experience in Kenya and Tanzania. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 3216959).
- Ogaz, C. P. (2000). *Towards a post-colonial education: Subjectivity, pedagogy, and cultural critique*. (Doctoral dissertation, U.C. Santa Cruz, 2000). Retrieved June 12, 2008, from ProQuest. (UMI No. 3003209)
- Orchowski, P. (2004). A broad horizon: Distant lands drawing more students—and teachers. *Community College Week*, 17(7), 8-9.
- Perrucci, R., & Wysong, E. (2006). Educating for Privilege. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.). *Education, globalization, and social change* (pp. 885-892). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Pickert, S. (1992). *Preparing for a global community: Achieving an international perspective in higher education*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Pickert, S. (2001). *Changing views about international activities in American teacher education programs*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED460092)
- Schneider, A. I. (2003). *Internationalizing teacher education: What can be done? A Research report on the undergraduate training of secondary school teachers*. Washington, DC: Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 480869)
- Sherif, A. (2007). Lost men and war criminals: Public intellectuals at Yasukuni Shrine. In S. M. Jager & R. Mitter (Eds.), *Ruptured histories: War, memory, and the post-cold war in Asia* (pp. 78-98). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sjoberg, K. (2008). Positioning oneself in the Japanese nation state: The Hokkaido Ainu case. In D. B. Willis & S. Murphy-Shigematsu (Eds.), *Transcultural Japan: At the borderlands of race, gender, and identity* (pp. 197-216). New York: Routledge.
- Smiles, R. V. (2001). A world-class education: Rewards abound for those who dare to teach or study abroad. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 18, 18-27.
- Smith, A. F. (2002, October). How global is the curriculum? *Educational Leadership*, 38-41.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tanaka, Y. (2002). *Japan's comfort women: Sexual slavery and prostitution during World War II and the US Occupation*. New York: Routledge.
- Tatara, M. (1998). *The second generation of hibakusha, atomic bomb survivors: A psychologist's view*. In Y. Danieli (Ed.), *International handbook of multigenerational legacies of trauma* (pp. 141-146). Retrieved October 4, 2008, from <http://books.google.com>
- Taylor, E. W. (1994). Intercultural competency: A transformative learning process. *Adult Learning Quarterly*, 44(3), 154-174.
- Tinkler, B. E. (2004). *Establishing a conceptual model of community-based research through contrasting case studies*. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from <http://comm-org.wisc.edu/papers2004/tinkler/3.htm#3>

- Tucker, J. L., & Cistone, P. J. (1991). Global perspectives for teachers: An urgent priority. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42, 3-10. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from <http://jte.sagepub.com>
- Ueunten, W. (2008). Okinawan diasporic identities: Between being a buffer and a bridge. In D. B. Willis & S. Murphy-Shigematsu (Eds.), *Transcultural Japan: At the borderlands of race, gender, and identity* (pp. 159-178). New York: Routledge.
- Van Hoof, H. B., & Verbeeten, M. J. (2005). Wine is for drinking, water is for washing: Student opinions about international exchange programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9, 42-61.
- Waks, L. J. (2006). How globalization can cause fundamental curriculum change: An American perspective. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalization and social change* (pp. 835-849). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, C. E. (1991). *Pedagogy and the struggle for voice: Issues of language, power, and schooling for Puerto Ricans*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Weiner, M. (1997). The representation of absence and the absence of representation: Korean victims of the atomic bomb. In M. Weiner (Ed.), *Japanese minorities: The illusion of homogeneity* (pp. 79-107). New York: Routledge.
- Wilson, A. H. (1983). A case study of two teachers with cross-cultural experience: They know more. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8, 78-85.
- Wilson, A. H. (1984). Teachers as short-term international sojourners: Opening windows on the world. *Social Studies*, 75(4), 153-157.
- Wilson, A. H. (1993). *The meaning of international experience for schools*. New York: Praeger.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and method*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yoshimi, Y. (2000). *Comfort women: Sexual slavery in the Japanese military during World War II* (S. O'Brien, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1995).
- Zamastil-Vandrova, K. (2005). Good faith or hard data? Justifying short-term programs. *International Educator*, 14(1), 44-49.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Bracketing Interview

BRACKETING INTERVIEW

This bracketing interview was conducted by Jonathan Hall, a fellow graduate student, prior to my departure for Japan. In it, I articulate my biases regarding and previous experience with Japan, as well as my goals as an educator.

Why did you decide to do this study?

First of all, I'm very passionate about study abroad, and I'm very passionate about internationalization, and I don't think there's enough preparation going on in our schools. I was . . . I don't even know where to begin talking about this . . . I was not globally prepared at all when I graduated from high school. Let me just give some examples here.

When I graduated from high school, I didn't know there was a difference between Thailand and Taiwan. I had never heard of the Dalai Lama. I probably thought America was the only country that had ever had a revolution. I just didn't know these things at all. And I was a 4.0 student. And I was a 4.0 student in college, too. And I never, well, I'm still an idiot. I didn't know there was a place called Tibet until I went there. You know what I mean? I grew up in the Cold War. Our textbooks were very isolationist. They led us to believe, for example, that the Americans won the American Revolution. You know? We didn't. The French won it. So I grew up with this very, very isolated vision. I had tunnel vision. I still have it to some extent. Anyway, it's embarrassing. And I embarrassed myself on more than one occasion in an international setting because of my ignorance and because according to the American standard I was this 4.0, intelligent, whatever, when according to the rest of the world I was a blazing idiot. I still am. I should put that in the present tense.

I want to change that. I think that the time for isolationism is over. Maybe we needed to be isolationist when we were hedging for our position in the world. But our isolationism and our ethnocentricity is now shooting us in the foot. We're not on top anymore. We're going to continue to fall behind. We're going to continue to lag behind until we know how to communicate with people from other countries—from other cultures—until we can communicate across borders racially, linguistically, religiously, philosophically. We just need to get along. My whole goal is empathy.

There are reasons for globalizing education, like world poverty and medicine and politics and environmentalism, and all that kind of stuff. My personal goal is just empathy. We just need to understand each other so that we can communicate and compete and not humiliate ourselves on the world stage.

There are a number of different ways that we can internationalize curriculum, and mine is particularly what can teachers do? How can a teacher's cross-cultural experience affect a classroom? We can boost up our world history requirements. We can construct world

language requirements. We can boost up our world literature requirements. We can require students to study religion. But aside from all of that, how can a teacher's personal global experience and a teacher's global mindedness affect her students?

You mentioned that you embarrassed yourself in an international setting. What international experience do you bring into this study?

Very little growing up. My first time to leave the country, . . .well, cross culturally, I had cross-cultural experiences within the United States. My father worked a lot with Native Americans, so I had a lot of exposure to Native American culture growing up, specifically Denai culture, Navajo culture, and language. But my first time leaving the country was as an undergraduate. I went to Mexico for a semester to study Spanish authors and help build a school. That was my first time abroad. And then after college I moved to South Korea. I lived there for a few years. I basically spent six or so years in Asia. I lived in Korea for three years and then traveled for three years. I hit most countries in Asia. I didn't hit North Korea and I didn't hit Sri Lanka, but I pretty much hit everything else. Oh, and I didn't go to Laos. But I hit pretty much everything in between. I hit a little bit of the Middle East, and then I spent a couple years in Europe. I did a graduate degree in Europe, then bummed around Western and Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean. So all in all I spent over eight years abroad. Just traveling and working and living abroad, studying, and whatever. I only came home a few times. For Christmas one year. Once for a wedding. So I've lived abroad, I've worked abroad, I've done humanitarian service, I've studied at a foreign university. I've sort of done a little bit of everything.

How have those experiences affected your teaching? How has that helped you be a better teacher?

I know it helps me be a better teacher. One of the classes that I teach is World Literature. And when I'm talking about places that I've been and places that I've experienced, languages that I'm familiar with, I teach with much more. . . .I don't want to say "authority" because I'm not an authority, but I am much more assertive when I teach those units. I can add more to the curriculum. I can speak from personal experience and it's not the same as stuff coming from a textbook. I can speak about a place and I know what I'm talking about. Whereas other places, I've gleaned it from a textbook. We do a unit on South Africa and I'm a basket case. I pull my students that are from South Africa and I say, "Will you teach this unit for me?" Because I can teach out of a textbook, I can recite dates and places and quotations and whatever; but it's different talking about Vietnam and Cambodia when I've been through the tunnels of Cu Chi, when I've seen the skulls from the Killing Fields. I can talk about Siddhartha and the Ganges because I've swum in the Ganges. I can talk about India passionately, whereas, the other places I'm must more stoic, and I'm just, "Here's this country. Isn't it great?"

Can you think of pros and cons to having more personal experience?

Oh, absolutely. I'm obviously biased toward teaching about places I've been. And so if a student is really interested in learning about some place that I haven't been, yes, we can investigate it, but I'm more reluctant to do so because I know I don't know what I'm talking about. So yes, there are definite cons. But I'm also very directed in my curriculum about telling my students, "When you go here. . ." or "Where are you going?" or "Where am I getting my post card from?"

Can you think of any cons to being so passionate about the places you've been?

It's hard not to let my biases show to my students. It's hard to be objective. But beyond that, no, because it makes my students want to go there, or somewhere. Those are my postcards [indicating the west wall of my classroom, which is covered with postcards from former students who have traveled, worked, or studied overseas]. Those are all from former students.

Is that the goal?

My goal is a wall of postcards. That's what I want.

Why?

Because I want my students to go out and experience the world in a way that I didn't, well, in a way that I have now. I want them to get out. I want them to know that there's more to life than what's here. This is a great place. It's a wonderful place to be. But you can see what is here much more clearly if you can see it from the outside. But also, these students aren't rich. We're on the wrong side of the tracks here. This isn't that rich high school up on the hill just north of us. A lot of my students live in trailer parks. A chunk of them qualify for free or reduced lunch. A lot of their parents didn't go to college. But I also went to school here. My family struggled financially when I was growing up. And my students know I went to school here, and they see that I've done it. They know that I won't accept socio-economic status as an excuse not to travel or see the world. I did it without money and without help. So can they. They know that I expect them to.

What are the top benefits you can think of for study abroad, for internationalizing schools? What do you see for your students?

What did it do for me? Gave me self confidence. An ability to rely on my own wit. Critical thinking. Absolutely critical thinking. Let me relate an experience from a former

student who went to do a study abroad in England a couple of years ago. Her first day in England, she was supposed to be picked up at the airport. She got to the airport, and nobody was there, because the people who were supposed to pick her up thought she wasn't coming until the next day. Plus her luggage didn't arrive. I was cheering when she told me this. I was like, "Yeah!" Because she had to figure it out. She had never left the country before, and she was in an English speaking country so it wasn't so bad, but she had to figure out for herself where she was going, how she was going to get there, how she was going to deal with her luggage, this type of stuff. She had to rely on herself. She was forced to work through it on her own, without a cell phone.

You know, when you're out in the middle of nowhere in the Chinese countryside where nobody speaks English, and you don't speak Chinese, and the bus breaks down out in the middle of nowhere, where are you going to find a place to sleep? And where are you going to find a place to eat? Learning how to negotiate your surroundings without a cell phone, and without your mom, and with money not being able to talk. Having to rely on your own wit. There's critical thinking out of the box. Self confidence. Language ability. The ability to communicate and relate to other people. Just human experience. Human contact.

It's amazing, too, how much you learn to communicate without language. How much you realize that we all have the same basic human needs, and you don't need words to communicate those.

And I'm so much more flexible. I'm not a reactor. You know, in India, if the schedule says your train's leaving at 7:00, you leave your guest house at 7:30, get to the station around 8, and then wait a few hours until the train arrives. You just learn to go with the flow. You learn that sometimes things just aren't going to go as planned. I recognize when I can have control and when I just have to let things happen. I can sit in traffic on I-15 and it doesn't phase me because I know it's out of my control. It's not going to do me any good to get all worked up about it. Meanwhile, everyone around me is honking and brandishing weapons.

I do better in business because of my experience. I do better in my teaching because of it. I relate better to my minority students because of it. Parents. I'm more sensitive to global issues. I'm more sensitive to the news. I participate more in my community, whether that's voting or going to community festivals or working at the literacy center. It makes me more active in my own community. It makes me more aware of what's going on. When I bought my house, I was watching the market in Asia. When I saw the market in Asia stabilize, I locked in my loan at under 6%. Two weeks later, rates went up to 7.5. If you're aware of what's going on, you get a better interest rate on your house!

Back to your goal of empathy. How does this goal of empathy, and all of the benefits you just listed, relate to your job?

When I say “empathy,” I mean that in all factors: political empathy, social empathy. It encompasses environmentalism. It encompasses politics. It encompasses medicine. It encompasses all fields. What is my responsibility as an American if I decide to become a doctor or an attorney or a housewife or a nurse or a welder? What is my global responsibility? So that’s what I mean by empathy. If I’m going into politics, obviously empathy is going to be an issue when I’m dealing with foreign policy or social welfare policy. In education, how does empathy come into education? Is that your question?

How does your goal to help students develop empathy relate to, compare with, your assigned job to teach students to read and write?

One of my responsibilities as an educator is to prepare my students for citizenship. Another is to prepare them for the job market, and for higher education, right? So citizenship anymore can’t mean, “I’m a citizen of American Fork, Utah.” No, we’re global citizens. Even if you never leave the country, you affect and are affected by it. It feeds into whatever career they choose, like I said, medicine or politics. Or even if they’re housewives shopping at the grocery store. International events affect the price of everything, their food, their clothes. Are their clothes sewn in sweatshops by kids that should be in school? I want my students to be able to articulate their responsibility to people of other nations and cultures and creeds.

In your opinion, can a short-term, isolated experience contribute to the development of a global educator?

This is where my biases come in. I don’t think so. Well, I think it can contribute, if it’s a start or part of a larger whole. But I don’t know if a brief experience in one country is enough. It’s enough to start letting people see that people think differently than we do and people have different experiences than we do. It’s a start. But I don’t know if it’s enough to really get people to commit to the need for global education. I think, I don’t know, I think that there are probably a million people out there like me who recognize the importance. But I have a feeling that there’s also going to be people on this trip who are going abroad for the first time, and they’re doing it because it sounded cool, and they’re going to be all excited, and they’re going to come back and do this cutesy little slide show for their classes, and then that’s going to be it. I think for some it’s enough to get the fire started. But I think for others it’s going to be nothing more than just a paid vacation. So I don’t know. That’s why I’m doing this study!!

How do individual teachers infuse an international experience into their classroom curriculum?

You’re asking my questions now! Infuse? I do it every day. I do it with stories and

anecdotes. I do it with video. I do it with books we read. I do it every day. I can't even begin to tell you how I do it. Something comes up every day where I talk about an experience. I'm sure it's harder in subjects like math. In English it's easy.

That question is geared toward this specific Japan experience. It's geared to what the teachers are doing with this experience. Are you doing some lame slide show? Or are you really infusing critical thinking and perspectives, because it does go beyond feeding them seaweed and wasabi peas. That's superficial. To me, it's, "Am I forcing my students to see something from a different perspective?"

Here's an example. Right now in some of my classes, we're reading *Hiroshima*, which is the atomic bomb from the perspective of six survivors in Hiroshima. And the students are all completely blown away, because they all knew about the atomic bomb. They all know that hundreds of thousands of people were injured and killed, but they didn't know . . . there was never a name attached to it. There was never a personal experience. It was a big number with commas in a textbook. And now they're reading about these individuals and what they were doing when it happened and how it happened, and how they had to dig their families out, and how all their families died, and how their skin fell off and their hair fell out and their eyes melted and they picked maggots out of their flesh with chopsticks. They're reading these stories and now all of a sudden it's becoming personal, because they're realizing that maybe that decision shouldn't have just been made during a 15 minute coffee break, which essentially it was. It wasn't even a decision, in fact. It was a foregone conclusion. Nobody debated it. So now they're questioning the morality of it. You know, they've all read about the atomic bomb in textbooks, every year because the curriculum is so repetitive in history, but they've never considered it from the other side. They never considered before what a Japanese person thought about it. It's just never crossed their minds before that they could do that. So critical thinking goes beyond, "Here's some seaweed; why don't you chomp on it for a while?" It's "Can you see something from another perspective? Can you empathize? Can you consider that maybe we weren't right?"

We read *Things Fall Apart*, a Nigerian novel. The first half of the novel, you get to know the Ibo culture and the Ibo language, and the political system and the religious and family structures, and there's this really intense respect developed for the Ibo culture. And then all of a sudden the white, Christian missionaries come in in the early 1900's and they're very, very brutal. They try to impose the White man's law, and the White man's God's law, and the Ibo culture literally falls apart. And the White, Christian missionaries in that book are the bad guys. And the students empathize with the Ibo. They see it from the Nigerian perspective. And they get angry, and then they all of a sudden go, "But I'm going on a [Mormon/LDS] mission after I graduate! What am I supposed to do?" So it makes them consider that. I've had quite a few former students who are now out serving LDS missions write to me and say, "Remember that book that I hated? Thanks for making me read it, because it's really making me consider things and think through things before I barge into someone's house and tell them that their traditions are wrong."

It's making me a better missionary because I've seen what 'persuasion' is like from the other side." Part of empathy is being able to see something from somebody else's perspective and understand it, and I think that my students for the most part can do that, once we get going.

How does your experience affect your perception of your role as an educator?

I became an educator because of my experiences in the Towers on 9/11, which I feel was a result of so much misunderstanding and a lack of empathy on the part of American culture. I mean, people around the world hate us, and we think we're so cool! You know what I mean? So I feel like I have a responsibility to my friends who were killed to build on empathy. I have a responsibility to my friends and I also have a responsibility to my students to prepare them, like I said, for global citizenship, and for a world that is not the same as the world that we went to school in. When we went to school we were preparing to compete with the guy in the chair next to us, and to serve the guy in the chair next to us. These students are competing against students from all over the world. Nearly 40% of graduate engineering students in the United States are from India. And they take it all back to India with them. So I have a responsibility to prepare them for work and college, and they've got to have a global perspective anymore to do that. It's a different world from the one we grew up in.

How is this JFMF experience going to be different from your previous cross-cultural experience?

This is one where there's intense academic preparation and pre-orientation activity. And there's a specific objective. On a lot of my previous travel, my objective has been, "Oh, I think I'll go surfing in Vietnam."

Of all the experiences you've had abroad, which one has impacted you the most?

I don't know if I can answer that question. They've all been valuable in one way or another. I'll tell you one of my favorites, though. When I was living in England, studying at Oxford, my roommate was a law student from Pakistan. She and I got into the habit of holding scripture study together. Some nights we'd read from the Q'uran; other nights we'd read from the Bible. Sometimes we'd just talk about different aspects of our spirituality. I learned so much about myself that year; I articulated beliefs for the first time and really came to an appreciation for my own religious heritage. At the end of that year, she came to me and said, "You made me a better Muslim." My response to her was, "You made me a better Christian." Neither of us ever had any intention of converting the other; we just pursued the conversation out of genuine interest. I love that woman. I've lost touch with her since, but those conversations I had with her are still with me.

Profoundly.

And I've had similar experiences with roommates and friends of other faiths. I'm a practicing Mormon, and I feel that I'm a better Mormon because a Buddhist monk taught me how to pray, and a Jewish roommate taught me to observe the Word of Wisdom (the Mormon dietary code) because she was so faithful to Kosher. I'm a better Mormon because I've spent so much time intimately studying other faiths—not trying to prove them wrong or to debate, but to take what I can from them to make me a better person.

Which do you think is more valuable? Just relaxing in a culture and just becoming a part of it like you've done in the past, or being in a program where you're going to see it from their eyes, the Greatest Hits version?

I think there are pros and cons to all of them. Like I said, I've lived and worked abroad, I've studied abroad, I've traveled just for fun abroad, I've done humanitarian work, and now I'm going on a program with objectives that someone else has defined. I think there's value to all of it. This particular experience, I am largely going to be seeing it through their eyes because they're really going to be sugar coating it. They want us to see the positive, so it is going to be biased, I think.

So you're bias is that they're going to be biased?

For sure! Because I already know a lot about the Japanese education system; it's very similar to Korea's. So I'm going to be playing devil's advocate the whole time—in my head, of course. I'm not going to tell my hosts if I disagree with them!

Do you think other people are going to have that bias?

I'm going in, I don't want to say this, but I am, I'm going in on the defensive, because I did my Master's Degree on Japanese colonialism, so I'm familiar with 19th and particularly 20th Century Asian history, particularly Japan and Korea. I spent more time in Korea, and I learned it from the Korean side, but I've heard from Filipinos and Koreans and Chinese, you know, what the Japanese were like as occupiers. And I interviewed former Comfort Women for my Master's thesis. And I know all about the Rape of Nanking, and things that don't even appear in the Japanese textbooks. I know things about Japanese history that Japanese students don't even know—that people in Japan have been given death threats and lost their university posts for publishing, like the Comfort Women and some of the Japanese atrocities. Now that's not to say that Japan is the only country that has had atrocities like that, because certainly America is not innocent. But I'm painfully aware of the concerted effort on the part of the Japanese government to cover things like that up. And I'm very suspicious of their national curriculum, not because I know a lot about it specifically, but because I know that Korea

also has a national curriculum and I've seen how negative the repercussions can be. I've seen how negative that has been in Korean culture. So I can only guess that it's equally damaging in Japanese culture. And I know that there are merits to a national curriculum. There are pros. They score very high on their standardized tests. But I know there's not a lot of critical thinking going on, and I know there's a lot of censorship going on. And that really bothers me.

How will your bias, this bias, affect you as a researcher?

I think it's going to be good for me, actually, to see it from a Japanese perspective, because, like I said, I've learned it from an American perspective and a Korean perspective. I lived in India and then studied colonialism from a British perspective. My advisor was a colonialist at Nuffield College, my advisor at Oxford. And that was learning colonialism from a former colonizer. We all know about the British Empire. That being said, it was a very different form of colonialism. British colonialism and European colonialism emphasized the demarcation between Black and White, or White and Colored. The separation was very important: the colonizer was the White guy, the colonized was the Black guy, and they didn't mix. The whole idea was separation. It wasn't until they started reproducing together that they had problems. So the philosophy was, "You can keep your culture, you can do whatever, but we're in charge. We'll let a few of you in to be our puppets, but do what you want." But the Japanese, they had a philosophy of assimilation. They look like the Koreans; they look like the Chinese. You can't always tell them apart. So their method of colonizing was assimilation. Make them dress like us. Make them speak our language. Make them worship our gods. To completely blur the line between colonizer and colonized. They tried to completely stamp out the Korean culture and language and religion, their way of life. So again, I think this will be good for me. I learned about colonialism from a Brit, and I spent a lot of time in India. So I got to see both sides. I've seen the Korean side; now I'll see the Japanese side. I'm expecting some cognitive dissonance here—a lot of it. I hope I'm taken completely by surprise. It will be more interesting.

Appendix B

Brief Summary of Japanese Colonialism

BRIEF SUMMARY OF JAPANESE COLONIALISM

Japan's colonial past continues to cause myriad social problems within Japan and between Japan and its neighbors, four populations being particularly affected: the Ainu, the indigenous inhabitants of Hokkaido; the people of Okinawa; the Chinese; and the Koreans, both those in Korea and those who remained in Japan after World War II. In this appendix I briefly summarize Japan's history with these four populations, including relevant policies and legislation regarding them as minority peoples. These histories are by no means inclusive. They are intended, rather, to offer a snapshot of post-colonial relations.

The Ainu

According to Sjoberg (2008), the Ainu first came in contact with people of Wajin descent (the Japanese majority) as early as the eighth century. In the fifteenth century, the Japanese moved onto the island of Hokkaido, forcing the indigenous Ainu into labor, depriving them of their resources, and prohibiting them from speaking their own language and practicing their traditional lifestyle rituals, such as hunting and fishing (Diene, 2006; Sjoberg). Full-scale exploitation of the island began at the onset of the Meiji Restoration in 1867 when the Japanese adopted its official policy of assimilation. The policy stated that the Ainu were to be incorporated into the Japanese nation state on equal terms with the Wajin; however, the procedure was "a final blow" against the Ainu way of life (Sjoberg, p. 200).

In 1980, a report issued by the Japanese government to the International Covenant

on Civil and Political Rights denied the existence of the Hokkaido Ainu; and in 1986, Prime Minister Nakasone stated that Japan's success in the global economy was due to its homogenous population (Sjoberg, 2008). However, in 1991, when various economic and socio-cultural projects and centers had made it difficult to continue denying their existence, the government finally conferred cultural and religious minority status to the Hokkaido Ainu.

According to the last census, 24,000 Ainu currently reside in Japan, though the United Nations Commission on Human Rights places the number between 30,000 and 50,000, asserting that many Ainu conceal their identity to avoid discrimination. Twenty-eight percent of the Ainu interviewed for a 1999 survey indicated that they or someone they knew had experienced discrimination at school, regarding marriage, or in the workplace (Diene, 2006).

This discrimination against the Ainu is imbedded in the Former Natives Protection Law of 1899, part of the assimilation policy which attempted to turn the Ainu away from their traditional salmon culture and into farmers. The law allotted to the Ainu six times less land than was given to the Japanese encroachers; and today, the Ainu maintain only ten percent of their ancestral land. The forced change of lifestyle erased much of their ethnic culture and forces the Ainu to be dependent on the local Japanese government for permission to fish. Further, "the Japanese have built a number of prejudices to justify the historical oppression of the Ainu, spreading the idea that they were not intelligent, had a barbaric culture, and had a different appearance"(Diene, 2006). Such prejudices remain justification for discrimination and make many Ainu ashamed of

their origins.

A law for the promotion of Ainu identity, enacted in 1996, aims to promote research and dissemination on Ainu language and culture; however, in the view of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the law does little to promote their basic human rights (Diene, 2006). The Ainu are virtually absent from the political sphere (there has been only one Ainu parliamentarian in the past) and “they are among the few indigenous peoples in the world who have no land recognized as their indigenous land.”

The Ainu believe that alleviation of their discrimination could come through education. Many Japanese know nothing about Ainu history, or even that the Ainu exist, or they think the Ainu are foreigners. “The Ainu need their true history and culture to be taught as part of the culture and history of Japan, which is not homogenous” (Diene, 2006, ¶48).

The people of Okinawa

Japan annexed the Ryukyu Kingdom in 1879 and immediately implemented similar colonial and assimilative policies in their use of the island as buffer against the encroaching West (Ueunten, 2008). The people of Okinawa have suffered continuously from discriminatory policy since the annexation, including their use as buffer again in the bloody Battle of Okinawa a century later. During that battle, known as the “typhoon of steel,” Okinawa lost 150,000 lives and most of its material culture as the Japanese military fought desperately to hold off the American forces in order to buy time for the rest of Japan. Further, Japanese soldiers killed many Okinawans under suspicion they were spying for Americans. Ironically, the Japanese military did not trust Okinawans

“even though it expected them to fight to defend the Emperor and the Imperial homeland” (Ueunten, p. 163).

Okinawa’s role as host to the 2000 G-8 Summit gave the island a position of importance in Japan’s internationalism; however, Okinawans are rarely consulted on political decisions affecting the island, and some Japanese still do not see Okinawa as part of Japan (Kambayashi, 2007). Many Okinawan surnames are seen as “unusual” or “foreign-sounding” to Japanese mainlanders (Ueunten, 2008, p. 172).

Further, the people of Okinawa are a constant presence in Japan’s textbook wars. Japan’s wartime history is a source of deep contention among countries in the region, and national textbook committees are fond of downplaying or omitting controversial material (Dahl, 2008; Katsuichi, 1999). The people of Okinawa accuse Japan of “soft-peddling” its brutal behavior toward them, particularly during World War II. For example, on the eve of the American invasion of Okinawa in 1945, the Imperial Army warned islanders that American soldiers would treat them badly if taken captive. They gave civilians two grenades and told them to commit suicide rather than surrender. They were to throw one grenade at the Americans and use the other to blow themselves up. Four hundred two Okinawans complied. The history of this coerced suicide during the bloodiest battle of the Pacific War has until recently been included in nationally approved high school history textbooks. However, recent nationalist revisions indicate that “some Okinawans committed suicide or were forced to commit mass suicide, but not ‘by whom’” (Kambayashi, 2007, p. 4). In an attempt to recover the reputation of the Imperial Army, “The government is trying to crush Okinawans’ testimonies under their foot,” says one

survivor.

According to the UN Commission on Human Rights, the most serious official discriminatory practice against the people of Okinawa is the continued presence of U.S. military bases on the island (Diene, 2006), a presence which serves to remind Okinawans of their status as buffer. While Okinawa comprises only 0.6 percent of the total land mass of Japan, the bases cover about one fifth of the main island of Okinawa. Some of the bases replaced existing Japanese military facilities, and “others were built on land that was procured by forcibly evicting Okinawans who had lived there” (Ueunten, 2008, p. 164). Since 1972, 75% of U.S. bases in Japan have been located in Okinawa, all within crashing or striking distance of residential areas and directly and adversely affecting indigenous culture and customs.

The Japanese government claims the bases are there to protect “public interest;” however, the UN Commission found that Okinawans suffer daily from consequences of their presence: “permanent noise linked to the military airport, plane and helicopter crashes, accidents due to bullets or ‘whiz-bangs,’ oil pollution, fires due to air maneuvers, and criminal acts by American military officers” (Diene, 2006, ¶51). The noise levels reportedly interrupt schools so that kids are unable to concentrate and lessons are regularly interrupted. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights further reported 338 plane crashes on the island between 1972 and 2005: “In particular, in a case of a helicopter crash on a university campus, the aid workers and police were driven out, the prefecture could not participate in the investigations and the victims received no compensation” (¶52).

The most threatening consequence of the U.S. military presence on Okinawa is the violence directed at women and young schoolgirls by American military officers. The 1995 rape of a 12-year-old girl by three American servicemen is “only one in an unbroken string of violent incidents stretching from the early days of the battle of Okinawa to the present” (Ueunten, 2008, p. 164; see also Diene, 2006). While the Japanese government has promised to take appropriate measures in these cases, Okinawans remain unpacified.

The Chinese

During the Meiji Restoration, Japan also attempted to expand its empire into China, seizing Manchuria in 1931 and installing China’s last emperor, Pu Yi, as a puppet ruler. Anti-Japanese sentiment swept the country, and in 1932 a Shanghai mob attacked five Japanese Buddhist monks, killing one. In what became known as the Shanghai Incident, Japan exacted revenge by bombing the city, killing tens of thousands of civilians. The slaughter received worldwide criticism, as did the Rape of Nanking, or the Nanking Massacre, which occurred five years later.

In the first large-scale work published on the Nanking massacre, Chang explained,

In the 1930s, Japanese military leaders had boasted—and seriously believed—that Japan could conquer all of mainland China within three months. But when battle in a single Chinese city [Shanghai] alone dragged from summer to fall, and then from fall to winter, it shattered Japanese fantasies of an easy victory. (1997, p. 33)

When Shanghai finally fell, the Japanese Imperial Forces were humiliated by their near defeat and lusted for revenge. They marched to Nanking in December of 1937 and in six

weeks systematically raped, tortured, and murdered a disputed 300,000 Chinese soldiers and civilians during house to house searches of the city and towns en route.

The Imperial crimes are documented in heinous detail in both Chang's (1997) *The Rape of Nanking* and Honda Katsuichi's (1999) *The Nanjing Massacre*. Both reports rely heavily on interviews with survivors and former soldiers, as well as government documents and period papers. Chang's book has received criticism because of her poor Japanese translations and claims that she used doctored photographs (Dahl, 2008). Gibney (1999) asserted her account is inaccurate and incomplete, that she is not careful enough with her numbers, and that her stereotypes are too simplistic. To her credit, however, Chang brought wide attention to the incident and is recognized for uncovering the diary of John Rabe, the German Nazi businessman who saved thousands of Chinese lives. Chang committed suicide amid the criticism of her work, though conspiracy theories mounted in Internet chat rooms that she was murdered for her pursuit of justice (Dahl). For the most part, Chang presents a chillingly detailed—albeit biased—account of the massacre her grandparents escaped.

The other author, Honda Katsuichi, was the first Japanese credited with breaking the taboo against discussing the massacre. A journalist for the *Asahi Shinbun*, he wrote a series of articles based on interviews with survivors and later compiled those articles into books. A veteran reporter, Katsuichi is meticulous with his numbers and details. He has received numerous death threats for his efforts, but remains widely read in Japan (Dahl, 2008).

Some details of the massacres had emerged during the Tokyo War Crimes Trials

immediately after the war; however, many Japanese civilians regarded the proceedings as a “kangaroo court” set up by the victors (Gibney, 1999, p. xxv). The incident was not reported in the mass media, hence most adults at the time did not know about them. In 1972, when Japan and China normalized relations, the countries issued a joint declaration in which Japan “painfully acknowledged and deeply regretted the damage it had inflicted upon the Chinese people” (Katsuichi, 1999, p. 294). However, Japanese right wing politicians opposed resumption of the relations and set out through various media to disprove the massacres.

In the early 1980’s, when Katsuichi began gathering confessions and apologies from former soldiers and officials and printing them in the *Asahi Newspaper*, right-wing apologists quickly dismissed the accounts as isolated incidents and organized a movement to produce a new history textbook with a sanitized version of Japan’s “advance into” (as opposed to its “invasion of”) China (Gibney, 1999). In 1985, another textbook controversy erupted among Japan and its neighboring nations with the release of the *New Japanese History* series, edited by the National Congress to Protect Japan. The ultranationalist policy group wrote the series to restore nationalism and pride in Japan’s military history (Dahl, 2008).

Chang (1997) referred to these textbook and government controversies as the “Second Rape,” or the silencing of the victims, blaming both the Japanese culture of intimidation and U.S.-Japan Cold War Relations. (In the face of Chinese communism, U.S. policy makers had determined that America needed an ally from its former enemy.)

In the 1990s, some steps were taken to acknowledge Japan’s wartime atrocities in

nationally approved textbooks. For example, some school districts, backed by the Teachers Union, feminist and labor organizations, and the liberal media have refused to use the *New Japanese History* textbook series (Dahl, 2008).

Ethnic Koreans

After 50 years of encroachment, and with the support of the Western powers at the Hague, Japan declared Korea a protectorate in 1905 and officially colonized the peninsula in 1910, the legality of which is still hotly debated (Dudden, 2005). With the annexation, the Japanese implemented the same assimilationist policies they had pressed upon the people of Okinawa 30 years earlier. These policies became particularly dehumanizing during World War II, when the Japanese forced many Koreans to fight for the Emperor. Unarguably the most dehumanizing policy was the Imperial Army's systematic abduction and brutal sexual enslavement of 100,000 young Asian women euphemistically referred to as the "comfort women" (Tanaka, 2002; Yoshimi, 1995/2000).

After the Shanghai Incident of 1932 and the Rape of Nanking in 1937-38, Japan became particularly concerned for its own reputation in the international (i.e., Western) arena. To alleviate the incidence of random rape of local women (and, therefore, the outcry from the Western nations)—as well as to boost troop morale, relieve the psychological pressure of battle, and reward soldiers for their courage—the Imperial Army kidnapped or lured over 100,000 young women, many as young as 12, to staff an intricate system of military brothels (Chung, 1995; Tanaka, 2002). The vast majority of those women were taken from the colony of Korea. Many of them were promised food

and pay to work in factories in Japan, so their families offered them willingly. Instead, the women and girls were shipped as “war supplies,” often arriving at their bases before essential equipment or ammunition, and forced to “serve” as many as 30 soldiers a day.

After the war, the women were killed or abandoned, and many committed suicide, while those who returned to Korea returned to a lifetime of discrimination if they revealed the crime committed on them (Chung, 1995; Yoshima, 2000). While some Japanese texts have, in the past, passively mentioned a military brothel system, school textbooks approved as of 2007 do not include any reference to the Comfort Women (Diene, 2006).

Many Korean women and men really were recruited to work in Japanese factories and construction, and they likewise were victimized. The Koreans, who were perceived as a source of low-grade manpower, were paid a third less than the Japanese workers; further, the standard of living provided “took for granted a decadent cultural heritage” (Weiner, 1997, p. 85). When the United States bombed Hiroshima in 1945, 10% of the victims were ethnic Koreans who were working in factories there. The Japanese government at the time would not allow official funerals for any victim that was not Japanese, and they did not allow for a memorial acknowledging the Korean victims until 1971. The memorial was originally placed across the river from Hiroshima Peace Park; only after much international protest was it moved into a remote corner of the grounds in 1999 (“Korean tower,” 1999).

Another large group of Koreans was brought to Japan during the war to build a military airport in the Utoro district of Kyoto. When the war ended, the project was

abandoned, and “the Koreans who were working there, far from receiving war reparations, were forgotten and left in that land without work, resources, protection or legal status” (Diene, 2006, ¶ 54). For over 60 years public authorities never ventured into the 21,000 square meter area, so its basic infrastructure was built entirely by the inhabitants, a considerable number of whom still lack running water.

In 1987, the land was sold without notice to a real estate agent, who filed a suit two years later demanding the Koreans’ eviction. The Supreme Court upheld the expulsion order for two decades, failing to recognize the rights of the people who were brought to Japan to serve the Emperor and subsequently abandoned. The expulsion threat heightened in October 2007 while the JFMF group was in Japan, and Korean residents who had known no other home for over 60 years were told to leave the land. Then, just days before the JFMF group was to leave Japan, *The Japan Times* reported that residents would be able to purchase half of the land from the Osaka real estate company, with the help of the South Korean government and citizens (“Koreans in Uji,” 2007).

Anti-Korean sentiment throughout Japan is particularly evident in education, where to avoid discrimination only 14% of Korean elementary students in Japan use their Korean names. In secondary school, the figure is 9% (Diene, 2006). Much harassment, verbal abuse, and physical violence takes place regularly and has increased since 2002 when the North Korean government admitted to abducting over a dozen Japanese nationals for language training (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2008).

Since 1945, Koreans in Japan have created a number of schools to preserve their identity, language, history, and culture; but these schools lack recognition by the

Japanese authorities, so graduating students are not eligible to take the university entrance examination. The Korean schools do not receive financial support from the government, which puts a heavy burden on the parents who receive no tax exemption on their donations to the schools. Conversely, donations to other foreign and international schools are tax exempt (Diene, 2006). Further, Koreans have no access to pension rights, even though those who work pay income tax; currently, an estimated 50,000 Koreans are more than 70 years old but are obliged to work to survive.

Refusal to Apologize

In 1995, socialist Prime Minister Murayama attempted to apologize to Japan's neighbors for wartime aggression to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Unfortunately, however, he was unable to convince the conservative Diet of the need for a state apology and instead had to apologize as an individual as opposed to as an official government representative. Soon, the more conservative Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) returned to power and the window of opportunity for an official apology closed (Dahl, 2008). While more and more Japanese civilians and officials are willing to acknowledge current and past atrocities, these personal apologies are often met with violence or threats of violence from other Japanese (Chang, 1999; Dahl, 2008; Katsuichi, 1999).

Dahl (2008) examined the cultural, geopolitical, and psychological dynamics of an official apology, giving particular credence to the geopolitical conditions at the end of the Cold War. Japan at that time readily apologized to the United States, Great Britain, and Australia. "Asia, however, was another matter" (p. 246). Further, Japan claimed their

issues with China were resolved in 1972 when diplomatic ties were reestablished.

Gibney (1999) compares this refusal to apologize to the mentality of modern Germany:

By contrast, modern Germany has done its collective best to face up to the Nazi crimes of the past and to atone for them, whenever possible. Over the years, German visitors to Japan—former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt notable among them—have been astonished at the apparent historical amnesia of most Japanese about the wartime misdeeds of their troops. (p. ix)

One of the most significant obstacles to an official apology, according to Dahl (2008), is the sentiment of many Japanese that they themselves are the victims. Undoubtedly, the Japanese suffered tremendous losses at Hiroshima and Nagasaki as the first victims of the nuclear age, and as a result, they have become leaders in the campaigns for peace education and the abolishing of nuclear weapons; but they have done so at the expense of learning about their own history of imperialism.

Dahl explains that it is “preferable to concentrate on one’s own wounds rather than the wounds one has inflicted on the other.” National histories, as in the Japanese case, can contribute to this myopia “by glossing over negative actions taken in the name of their state and focusing instead upon situations in which their own citizens have been victimized” (Dahl, 2008, p. 250). Such an ethnocentric distortion of history results in generations of Japanese who cannot learn from their country’s mistakes.

Dahl also points out the issue of direct responsibility. As the original victims and perpetrators of the wartime atrocities pass on, younger Japanese have wondered why it is on their shoulders to apologize for incidents prior to their being born. Katsuichi, credited with exposing much of the Nanking massacre, was a child during the war. He writes, “of

course I didn't know anything about it, and I don't bear any responsibility" (p. xxv). As a journalist, he admitted to bearing responsibility for learning the story that went unreported for so long; but he says, "Expressing remorse to China is the task of the Japanese government."

Appendix C
Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT

The Effects of a Short-Term Teacher Abroad Program on Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves and their Responsibilities as Global Educators

Introduction/Purpose

Professor J. Nicholls Eastmond in the Department of Instructional Technology at Utah State University is conducting a research study to find out more about how teachers experience a singular, short-term, cross-cultural professional development opportunity and how that experience contributes to the goals of global education—in particular, to the development of global educators. You have been asked to take part because you are an elementary or secondary educator embarking on a cross-cultural educational experience and are committed to integrating your experience into your classroom practice through a self-designed follow-on plan. There will be approximately eight (8) participants in this research.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this research study, you will also be asked to submit copies of your JFMF application materials and essays, as well as your follow-on plan, and any relevant lesson plans and assessment materials. You will also be asked to participate in a minimum of two individual interviews. The first brief interview will be conducted in person while on location in Japan, and the second will be conducted electronically after you have had the opportunity to implement your follow-on plan. Subsequent interviews or electronic correspondence may be pursued for purposes of clarification. Data from the interviews will be included in a doctoral dissertation and workshop presentations, and may also be included in manuscripts submitted for publication in professional journals.

Video/Audio Release

Your interviews may be audio recorded to facilitate in the transcription process. Video and still images taken in Japan will be kept indefinitely and may be used in professional workshops and publications.

Risks

Participation in this research study may involve the minimal risk of loss of confidentiality. However, steps will be taken to ensure your privacy. For example, you will be given a pseudonym, and other identifiers, such as place of employment, will be masked. If you choose to submit student work samples, their names should also be removed.

Benefits

There may or may not be any direct benefit to you from these procedures. The investigator, however, may learn more about the impact of a short-term cross-cultural

experience on teachers' perceptions of themselves and their development as global educators. The analysis could lead to further inquiry into the adoption of best practice in preparing students adequately for life in our increasingly complicated and connected world.

Voluntary nature of participation and right to withdraw without consequence

Participation in research is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without consequence or loss of benefits until June 2008 when analysis begins.

Confidentiality

Research records will be kept confidential, consistent with federal and state regulations. Only the principal investigator and student researcher will have access to the data, which will be password protected. Hard copies of transcripts and other documentation will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked room. Personal, identifiable information will be kept for five years for the purpose of a follow-up study.

IRB Approval Statement

The IRB (Institutional Review Board for the protection of human participants at USU) has reviewed and approved this research study. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights, you may contact the IRB at (435) 797-1821.

Copy of Consent

You have been given two copies of this Informed Consent. Please sign both copies and retain one copy for your files.

Investigator Statement

I certify that the research study has been explained to the individual by me and that the individual understands the nature and purpose, the possible risks and benefits associated with taking part in this research study. Any questions that have been raised have been answered.

J. Nicholls Eastmond
Principal Investigator
(435) 797-2642

Raquel Cook
Student Researcher
(801) 372-3203

Participant's signature

Date

Appendix D

Rationale for Photographing and Recording Participants

The Effects of a Short-Term Teacher Abroad Program on Teachers' Perceptions
of Themselves and their Responsibilities as Global Educators

RATIONALE FOR PHOTOGRAPHING AND RECORDING
OF PARTICIPANTS

This study is qualitative and therefore relies on the analysis of narrative data. Oral interviews will be recorded with a digital voice recorder to ease transcription and coding. Video and still photographs will potentially be used in workshop settings and professional development presentations as part of the researcher's JFMF follow-on plan and professional goals (global education and teacher training—see below).

RATIONALE FOR KEEPING INFORMATION INDEFINITELY

The JFMF Teacher Abroad program is one of many personal and professional cross-cultural activities that I have participated in. Professionally, I am active in movements to globalize secondary curricula, publishing and presenting in professional and local journals and professional development training and workshops. The images and data from these experiences will be viewed by education professionals in these settings. Images may be replicated in PowerPoint presentations or workshop handouts.

Appendix E

Address to the Japanese People

ADDRESS TO THE JAPANESE PEOPLE

“David”

31 October 2007

Anpetu waste eciciyapelo. Ohayo gosaimas.

We are a group of educators from America. Our country is very large and we come from the four directions: from the West, from the North, from the East, from the South. Some of us come from big cities, some of us from smaller towns, some of us from isolated areas with a scarce population. Although we all are Americans, each of us has a different cultural background. I myself come from the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, home of the Oglala Lakota tribe.

Three weeks ago we started on this journey across your country, among your people, and it has been a wonderful experience. We saw beautiful sites and gorgeous landscapes. We heard chants in your shrines and your temples, we heard students singing together in the schools, and we heard everyday voices converse in your language like a mysterious melody. We smelled the scent of fresh flowers and the brisk, pure air coming down from the mountains in the peaceful morning. We tasted the gifts of the sea, the fruits of the land, and the delicacies of the Japanese culinary art. Our lives were touched by the kindness, the respect, the generosity and the wisdom of the Japanese people. And so, today, we stand in front of you with an open heart, with humility, with respect, and with a great thankfulness.

To the teachers and administrators, I want to say: Like you, we care, we guide, we help, we are role models. To the students, I want to say: Like our students, you dream, you try, you prepare yourselves, you are our future.

Today, we were given a new day to live. It will be a good day, because we will share it together. Thank you for welcoming us in your schools, in your classrooms, in your homes... and in your lives.

Lila wopila tanka heca. Doomo arigato Gosaimas.

CURRICULUM VITAE

RAQUEL COOK

EDUCATION

Utah State University	Curriculum and Instruction	Ed.D.	2009
	<i>The Effects of a Short-Term Teacher Abroad Program on Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves and their Responsibilities as Global Educators</i>		
Oxford University	Modern Languages Women's Studies	M.St.	1998
	<i>Bodies and Battlegrounds: Hwang-Hyang Nyo and the Construction of the Post-Colonial Korean Identity</i>		
Brigham Young University	English Language and Literature	B.A.	1992

ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL COURSEWORK

Utah Valley University	Secondary Education Licensure	2004
Utah State Office of Education	Utah 3R's Project Professional Development Certificate	2008
Brigham Young University	Education for Peace Professional Development Certificate	2006

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LICENSES

Utah State Board of Education	Level 2 Professional Educator License Secondary Education, Language Arts endorsement	Expires 2012
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)		2005 – present
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)		2008 – present

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

Utah Valley University	Assistant Professor Department of Education	2008 – present
------------------------	--	----------------

Alpine School District	Classroom teacher (10, 12 th grade) Department of Language Arts	2004 – 2008
Utah Valley State College	Adjunct Lecturer Department of English	1998 – 1999

SCHOLARLY WORK

- Cook, R. (2006). Beyond Tolerance: Teaching English in a Post-9/11 classroom. *English Journal*, 96(2), 19-22.
- Cook, R. (2007). *Global literacy: How my students are expanding their horizons*. Paper presented at the Brigham Young University CITES Secondary Literacy Conference. Lehi, Utah.
- Cook, R. (2008). *Working together for Utah's Children*. Paper presented at the Utah School Nurses Association Annual Conference. Provo, Utah.

RECOGNITIONS

Paul and Kate Farmer <i>English Journal</i> Writing Award	2007
Japanese Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Scholar	2007
Teacher of the Year, American Fork High School	2006

SYNERGISTIC ACTIVITIES

Industrial Bank of Japan Special Projects	1999 – 2002
Joong-Ang Daily Newspaper English Language Advisor, Cultural Events Division	1993 – 1995
Korean Broadcasting Company Morning Talk Show Host	1993 – 1994
Korean National Police College English Language and American History Instructor	1992 – 1993
International Travel	1995 – 1997 1993