

Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand
by © Farrah Chantal Collette

A Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Education: Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning Studies

Department of Education

Memorial University of Newfoundland

June 2019

St. John's Newfoundland and Labrador

Abstract

The following Master's thesis discusses research on cultural identity negotiation of Third Culture Kids (TCKs) attending an international school in Bangkok, Thailand. Postcolonial theory, primarily Said's (1978; 1994) theory of Orientalism, and Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) theories of symbolic capital, symbolic power, and fields of cultural production are central to this study. The ethnographic approach of this research focuses on eight TCK participants, who have at least one non-Western primary culture of home, and who negotiate dominant local and globalized cultures of the school into their identity. Highlights on primary and secondary cultural identities, and the varying symbolic capital that discourses of different cultures offer are provided through the focus on the relationship between marginalized and hegemonic cultures present in the international school setting. The research aims to further an understanding of more socially just cultural and educational frames of curricular education in international schools.

Keywords: Third Culture Kids (TCKs), Cultural Identity Negotiation, Orientalism, Symbolic Capital, Symbolic Power, Western Cultural Hegemony

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Karla, June, Aida, Salem, Ronnie, Alyssa, Petrie, and Lisa: without your willingness to participate, this study would not have been possible. Your stories are encouraging, and how you balance the many worlds to which you belong is truly inspirational.

Thank you, Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman, who not only helped my craft of this final product, but who also gave me a model of what true academic mentorship through meaningful feedback looks like. I would like to be able to help my own students find the same motivation and encouragement that you have provided me through this process.

Tyson, my dear husband, and partner-in-crime: thank you for being a constant baseline to my endurance, you remind me that my passion for this research is worthwhile, needed, and important in my field. It is such a joy to do meaningful work with you side-by-side. Thank you for being a true example of selfless humility and of endless talent.

Thank you to my grandparents, Ron and Kay Morehouse. Grampy: you lived a life of service, and I can only hope that I can follow the example you have so graciously left all who had the opportunity to know you. Nanny: thank you for being my life coach and my mentor, and for showing me how to insist on perseverance. Thank you for filling my heart with your love and pride for what I do.

Mother, you taught me to think deeply, and that being confined to norms doesn't have to be my reality. You inspire so many people with the power of your story. You are talented and powerful.

To my trailblazer of a sister, you have taught me how to take risks, how to be resilient, and how to rise from the ashes. Thank you for being a model for how to maintain hope and how to fight for the belief that from life's challenges there is growth. Thank you for teaching me that the belief in empowerment is more than just a pipe dream.

Lastly, to my students: I do this for you. You teach me every day that it's all worth it. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 TCK Terminology and Considerations	1
1.2 Researcher Personal Narrative.....	8
1.2.1 Formative Relationships and Experiences	9
1.2.2 Belonging: Personal Primary and Secondary Discourse	12
1.2.3 Reciprocal Empowerment Teaching in Baltimore.....	19
1.2.4 Teaching in Cameroon and Thailand.....	22
1.3 Chapter Summary	26
Chapter 2: Literature Review	27
2.1 Theoretical Framework.....	29
2.1.1 Cultural and Linguistic Capital.....	34
2.1.2 Primary and Secondary Discourses	38
2.1.3 Dominant Discourse.....	42
2.1.4 Marginalized Discourse	45
2.2 Literacy	47
2.3 Third Culture Kids (TCKs)	68
2.4 Educational Practice.....	77
2.4.1 Counterproductive Culturally Utopian Ideals.....	82
2.4.2 Cultural Identity Empowerment	84
2.5 Review of Other Related Studies.....	87
2.5.1 Ethnography of ESLs/ELLs and Students of Immigrant Status	87
2.5.2 Ethnographies of Asian international school students	88
2.5.3 Ethnography of Dual-Language International School	95
2.5.4 Ethnography of Third Culture Kids	99
2.6 Chapter Summary	103
Chapter 3: Research Methodology	107
3.1 Ethnographic Approach Rationale.....	108
3.2 Methodology Overview	109
3.2.1 Description of Research Site and Selection	110
3.2.2 Description of Research Participants and Selection	115
3.2.3 Methodological Issues	119
3.2.4 Data Collection Procedure: Stage One	122
3.2.5 Data Collection Procedure: Stage Two.....	126
3.2.6 Data Collection Procedure: Stage Three.....	132
3.2.7 Description of Data Analysis	136
3.2.8 Credibility of Knowledge Claims	140
3.2.9 Transferability and Dependability	141
3.3 Chapter Summary	142

Chapter 4: Findings	146
4.1 Participants.....	146
4.2 Coding.....	148
4.3 TCKs and the Role of Community	150
4.3.1 Community Belonging and Interaction with Peers.....	164
4.3.2 Community and Teacher-Student Rapport	172
4.3.3 Teacher-Student Rapport Through Humour	178
4.4 Acceptance and Understanding of Culturally Negotiated Identity	187
4.5 Cultural Stereotyping Deters from Cultural Understanding	204
4.6 Cultural Hybridity	212
4.7 Language and Translation and the Power of Bilinguality	225
4.8 Navigating Culture through Norms and Traditions	243
4.9 Chapter Summary	252
Chapter 5: Final Suggestions and Call for Future Research	259
5.1 Cultural Framework and Curriculum of International Schools	260
5.1.2 Significance of Hidden Curriculum	280
5.1.3 English Language and Anglophone Phonology.....	294
5.1.4 Descriptive Semantics for TCKs	300
5.1.5 Terminology of TCK	302
5.2 Professional Development in Intercultural Competency	304
5.3 Chapter Summary	306
Chapter 6: Conclusion	308
6.1 Research Summary	308
6.2 Validity of Claims.....	310
6.3 Limitations	321
6.4 Findings Summary.....	325
6.5 Recommendations.....	329
6.6 Final Reflections	334
References	337
Appendices	348
Appendix A: Informed Consent Form in English.....	348
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form in Thai.....	358
Appendix C: Participant Recruitment Email	369
Appendix D: Parent Recruitment Email in English.....	372
Appendix E: Parent Recruitment Email in Thai	375
Appendix F: Classroom Teacher Permission Request Script	378
Appendix G: Instructional Time Observation Introduction Script	381
Appendix H: Interview Topics Domains and Questions	382
Appendix I: Individual Audio/Video Journal Participant Directions	385
Appendix J: School Vision, Mission, and Commitments	387

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this research is to explore the cultural identity negotiation process that students, whose primary culture is non-Western, experience when attending an international school whose official curriculum differs from that of the host country. The study expands understanding of how participants negotiate their exposure to both primary and secondary cultures that shape their identity. For the nature of this research, I focus on observed cultural negotiations that Third Culture Kids (TCKs) experience in the international school community, and specifically focus on one school, whose pseudonym is Morehouse International School, and that is located in Bangkok, Thailand.

Classroom environments construct a complex system in which social practices and cultural scripts on how to learn and behave are negotiated on a daily basis. Ever-growing intercultural contexts are reflected in schools and classrooms and often serve as systemic microsystems of globalization. Student primary cultural identities are continuously impacted by exposure to secondary cultures in school. In culturally diverse school environments, a student's home culture sometimes differs from dominant cultures at school, and the classroom is a meeting point of these differing cultures where multicultural students in these environments are often referred to as *third culture kids* (TCKs). The next section of this chapter defines the term, *third culture kid*, and discusses its relevance to this research.

1.1 TCK Terminology and Considerations

This section defines the *third culture kid (TCK)*, and provides a discussion on how the cultural identity of the TCK is an important consideration for individuals who work, or are interested in, international schools. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) define the international school as “any school that has students from various countries, and whose primary curriculum is different from the one used by the national schools of the host country” (p. 209). The term, third culture kid, is multifaceted and its definition continues to semantically change as to what it means to be third cultured in our increasingly globalized society also changes. For clarity within this research, the term, TCK, as described in the next paragraphs, aims to provide a definition, so that I can, later in the research, describe more nuanced experiences of the TCK participants. According to Useem (1993), the term *Third Culture Kid (TCK)* originally referred to children who moved to another country or society with their parents, and who learn to combine the original culture of home with that of the newly encountered culture. Since original coinage of TCK, the term has expanded to include individuals who, during their youth, experience cultures different from that of their primary culture of the home (whether they move to a new country with their parents, or for example, attend an international school with a differing culture than that of home). The research of Ruth Useem and John Useem, originally conducted in the 1960s, found TCKs to neither fully belong to “their culture of origin nor fully a part of the host country in which they liv[e] but [they become] part of a merging and melding of the two into a ‘thirdness’” (Schaetti, 2015, p. 1). TCK research was further developed in the 1980s and 1990s by Pollock and Van Reken (2009), and it is their theoretic

work of the TCK that I use to base understanding in this study. A more general term for TCKs is deemed a *cross-culture kid* (CCK), who crosses cultures daily, for example, a child within a biracial family or; a child of immigrant parents, or a more traditional TCK (Schaetti, 2015).

Pollock and Van Reken (2009) “use the TCK experience as a lens for viewing common themes children express when raised among many cultural worlds for any reason” and also suggest the term “*cross-cultural kid*” where applicable (p. 30). A third culture kid (TCK), a more traditional term, is defined as “children who move to another culture with parents due to a parent’s career choice” and a cross-cultural kid (CCK) is defined as “a person who is living or has lived in – or meaningfully interacted with – two or more cultural environments for a significant period of time during childhood” (Pollock and Van Reken, 2009, p. 31). Participants for this research come from a wide range of third and cross cultural experiences, and whose experiences can be further defined by Pollock and Van Reken’s (2009) Cross-Cultural Kid Model. According to this model of TCK and CCK identities, cultural identities can be subcategorized into: “*Children from bi/multicultural homes*”, “*children from bi/multiracial homes*”, “*children of immigrants*”, “*Educational CCKs*”, “*Children of borderlanders*”, “*Children of minorities*”, and “*Domestic TCKs*” (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009. p. 31-32). For the sake of consistency, this research will use the term third culture kid (TCK) to include both the *Traditional TCK*, who are youth raised in an environment “outside of the passport culture or overseas”, as well as for the more nuanced TCK terms mentioned above, such as the *Educational CCK*, who are

youth “who may remain in their home or passport country but are sent to a school (e.g. an international school) with a different cultural base and student mix than the traditional home culture” (Pollock and Van Reken, 2009, p. 32). Third culture kids are youth whose primary culture (often associated with their mother tongue) differs from a secondary culture they experience at school (often associated with the *lingua franca* of the school). The third culture may be viewed as an interstitial, hybrid culture. Sometimes, however, this third culture can be problematic towards how one perceives their personal identity and position within their cultures. Sometimes, TCKs may feel that “neither culture feels like home”, establishing a sense of “unhomeliness, a concept referred to as double consciousness” (Bressler, 2007, p. 241). Questions of cultural belonging for TCKs of this research often occur in one of the three following scenarios. First, cultural displacement for a TCK may be connected to moving geographical locations, in which case the individual does not belong to the dominant culture of the host country or school. For example, a student who is a national citizen of Thailand, who moves with his or her family to another country abroad (a scenario common to youth with a diplomat parent) and attends a Western international school may experience cultural displacement as a *traditional TCK*. Second, cultural displacement can be experienced when the student belongs to the dominant culture of the country, but not to the dominant culture of the school. For example, a Thai national may be considered an *Educational CCK* or a *Domestic TCK* if they attend a Western cultured international school while living in Thailand. Third, cultural displacement can be experienced when the student’s primary culture does not

belong to the culture of the host country nor to the culture of the school. For example, a student with at least one non-Western (and non-Thai) primary culture who is raised or has lived for an extended period of time in Thailand, and who attends a Western international school may be considered one of more of the following: a *child from a bi/multicultural home*, a *child from a bi/multiracial home*, a *child of immigrants*, an *Educational CCK*, a *child of borderlanders*, or a *child of minorities*. All scenarios mentioned can fall within the umbrella term of being a third culture kid.

It should be acknowledged that there are many factors that define the umbrella term of the TCK and CCK, and that terminology used to describe the cultural identity negotiation process continue to be redefined. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) reflect on the dynamic nature of the TCK term and state that “[u]ndoubtedly there are, and will continue to be, more categories than those named here” (p. 32). Because there are many subsets of terms for multiple categories of TCKs/CCKs, as mentioned above, and because there are many ‘grey lines’ between whether participants for this study would best be defined as which specific form(s) of a TCK or CCK, I have chosen to use one unanimous term, TCK, to be inclusive of all participant identities who specifically negotiate their identity between non-Western culture primary cultures with dominant and globalized Western secondary cultures at school. I have reflected extensively on which term is best to use for this study, and I conclude that because the study goes into extensive detail on each participant experience, one common term (TCK)

would provide more coherency within the report and better link the common themes between each participant's experience.

The concept of a TCK (also referred to as Global Nomads, coined by Norma McCaig) is "the experience of those who live between two cultures" (Schaetti, 2015, p. 1). Therefore, the term Third Culture Kid often refers to youth whose cultural identities are comprised of a negotiated 'in between' culture of two or more cultures. A third cultured person has a primary culture (sometimes associated with their mother tongue or place of national citizenship) and later acquired exposure to a secondary culture (this is perhaps a culture experienced by living in a new country, or is a culture school), which influences how and to what extent the person identifies with each culture. As previously mentioned, the 'third culture' refers to the hybrid culture the person experiences due to their ties in their primary, first culture and their new, secondary culture.

Classroom environments often mirror hegemonic cultural practices because education is thought to prepare students for success in the future. Hegemonic culture, to be defined further in the next section, often controls for the norm of this success, therefore, education is tailored towards preparing students for success in dominant cultural frameworks. When considering the negotiation between primary and secondary cultures, one might bring into question issues of culture and power to interpret the difficulty students belonging to more marginal primary cultures experience when attempting to amalgamate primary culture with more hegemonic culture presented at school. Educators, whose primary cultures belong to sociocultural hegemony may not realize the difficulty their students face

when adapting primary cultural identity with secondary cultural identity. The awareness of the impact curricula has on cultural identity is essential to culturally diverse students' needs in intercultural classroom environments where third culture kids interact with many cultural codes.

The aforementioned conflicts with culture and identity surface a number of important questions within education, such as: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the relationship of the multiple cultures students negotiate into their identity? How might hegemonic educational practices influence cultural identity negotiation? How can TCKs maintain a strong sense of their family culture (primary culture) through the exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school?

I think research in this area will contribute meaningfully to contexts with student populations of diverse cultural backgrounds, who often culturally differ from the cultural backgrounds of educators and school. My intention for this research is to enable better understanding of how TCKs negotiate their cultures of home with their cultures of school. I would also like to promote more intercultural understanding in classroom contexts, because I think this will enhance both cultural identity saliency and trust amongst students and educators. As students of diverse cultural backgrounds continue to be essential members of educational learning communities, insight on how to scaffold their experience with the multiple, and sometimes conflicting, cultures they acquire is important to their wellbeing and development. Establishing cultural sensitivity and intentional forethought in classroom curriculum and pedagogy will be of benefit to learning

environments, while possibly improving the quality of life for TCKs within school communities. In order to provide research on third culture identity negotiation, it is important that I reflect on my own background, as an international school educator, and to consider the individuals and cultures that comprise my own subjective position within this research. Therefore, in the next section, I provide my personal researcher narrative, where I discuss my background and elaborate on my own subjectivity towards the focus of this research. Participants who have shared their experiences for this research did so candidly, and it is my hope that by vulnerably revealing my own experiences and reasons behind this research, I can do my part to open the door for better understanding. Understanding starts from a place of vulnerability and a willingness to share our stories, and this is what I try to do in the following section.

1.2 Personal Researcher Narrative

There is an intricate connection between places and identity. Who I am as a researcher is comprised of the influential relationship between these spaces and how the personal plays a significant role in the backdrop to my interests and passions as a professional and as a researcher. As my research centers around the exploration of diverse cultural identities of learners in international schools, it only makes sense that considerations of cultural identity are based in my collective interaction within culture, location, and social environments. My role as a researcher migrates from key personal and professional spaces that occupy my experience. In the following, I will discuss a few key experiences: first, my

memories from formative years, then, pivotal life lessons acquired while living in Tanzania, after, moving to reciprocal empowerment experienced while teaching in Baltimore, and, lastly, professional ambitions ignited while teaching in Cameroon and Thailand.

1.2.1 Formative Relationships and Experiences

As is true for many, my grandparents played a significant role in my upbringing, which was quite significant since they helped raise my sister and me throughout our childhood (we were raised by a single-parent). Both of my grandparents lived through World War II: my grandfather having fought overseas with the Royal Canadian Air Force, and my grandmother having worked on her family farm in New Brunswick (her family often supplemented the lack of resources suffered by many people in her village during the war). Experiencing the hardships caused by war, both of my grandparents lived their subsequent lives empathetically considering the lives and wellbeing of others. Many individuals help others because it makes them feel good to do so, however, my grandparents' consideration of the lives of others was not for this reason, rather because their past experiences taught them that to provide what one could for others was the vocation of those who bore witness to devastating hardships themselves. Those who lived through WWII seem to have a certain perspective on life, almost a simple gratefulness, that many of us in our current society have, to some extent, lost. Although modeling gratitude through very different ways, my grandparents were both an example of empathy and compassion. They felt it important to teach me how to consider the 'other' side of people's lives because it was their belief

that to gain insight on other people's experiences is how we can best learn how to love. Their definition of love had nothing to do with a feeling, rather, it centered around the idea of setting oneself aside in order to more truly know another.

My grandfather was often the strong-and-silent type - he could be a man of few words, but when he did speak you knew it was going to be something you would want to write down because of its sage wisdom. He was constant, steady, and never wavering in his mission to serve those around him. He did not discriminate who was deserving of love, and offered kindness, without question, to all the people he met. He served and cared for others because he believed that this was the root of our humanity. Period.

My grandmother was the strong-and-vocal type - she balanced the silent nature of my grandfather, and her advice was just as wise. She defied gender norms for her time, and set goals that aligned with her passion of vocation rather than with that of societal norms. On her family farm, she drove her family's horse teams in the woods to harvest lumber, she rode her favourite horse, Peter, bareback through the snowy, dense Canadian forests, and she attended university and paved her own way in the working world. At the cabin that she and my grandfather built, she hunted with my grandfather, and alone, to feed her family for the winter. My uncle-in-law has recently nicknamed her 'GRambo' because of a story I once told him about her taking my sister and me out to their hunting cabin: after having sliced open her hand with a paring knife as she was preparing supper, she proceeded to sew her own laceration closed with a needle and thread from her sewing kit. Besides having a tough will-to-live kind of personality, my

grandmother has been an encouragement to me. Recently I had the opportunity to visit with her while traveling back to Canada, and after asking about my graduate research and work as an educator she added, ‘I hope you and your sister live for a very, very long time, Farrah. We need hearts like yours in a hurting world like ours’. My sister was a platoon commander in Afghanistan and now is a therapist who has dedicated her life to work with people in the area of post-traumatic *growth* and resilience. My grandmother showed me what real and selfless love feels like, and how important it is to offer this raw, unrequited love to others. She has set an example of the balance between strength in self and compassion for others, and this has subtly guided my vocation as an educator, as I feel compelled to build compassionate relationships with my students, and also to research ways that educators can best enhance students’ own strength of self.

My grandparents were two sides to the same coin, and together they were a *mélange* of humble wisdom and tenacious, brawny compassion. The multifaceted force of their leadership is a legacy I aspire to honour. In all I do I want to continue to learn and grow and throughout my experiences. I hope not to shy away from the complex and uncomfortable, because it is here that real meaning and purpose is ignited. I think it fitting that this research embraces the abstract nature of how individuals negotiate cultural identity, because the ability to do this requires culturally compassionate understanding of others and the firm belief in oneself. My grandparents demonstrated this for me, and their example has given me the ability to recognize the same capability in the participants who volunteered for this study. My grandparents also showed me what it looks like to

be a life-time learner, and although this is a common catch phrase in education today, they really understood what it meant. I think it is for this reason that I have the desire to learn all that I can while I have the capacity to do so, and believe that the best way to grow is by planting yourself in a deep and wide cultural soil to push your boundaries of comfort and familiarity.

My grandparents set an example that compassion is essential to the human experience, which is one of my goals as an educator-researcher. Their own tenacity for life, for adventure, for not being defined by hegemonic norms, and for living a life of servitude has influenced my desire to research the experience of others negotiating their own cultural boundaries. Because of their example, I, too, wanted to experience life by pushing my cultural boundaries and comfort levels. My cultural boundaries were most expanded through the experience I acquired while living in Tanzania, and revealed to me how little I knew about the world and ignited the desire to have more understanding of others and their cultural norms.

1.2.2 Belonging: Personal Primary and Secondary Discourse

In this section, I describe the connection between my personal, primary discourse and my secondary, cultural discourse gained through my exposure to Tanzanian culture. It is important to consider significant aspects to my personal experiences growing up. My cultural identity is, among other things, comprised of a symbiotic relationship between both cultural connection and cultural displacement. This is especially true through distinctly differing secondary cultural discourses that were incorporated into my original, primary cultural

discourse. As mentioned previously, this is often referred to as one's *third culture*, and someone might be a *third culture kid* (TCK), or a *third culture adult* (TCA) (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009). I would be considered a third culture adult, since much of the secondary cultural discourses I've incorporated into my primary identity occurred mainly during my adult life. The balance between cultural connection and cultural displacement is tricky, and at times confusing, because you are trying to negotiate various cultural discourses into your way of being, however, it is okay to allow the complicated relationship of both connection and displacement happen to simultaneously – connection and displacement are not necessarily at odds with one another. I see the displaced cultural connections that have influenced my personal identity to contribute to my professional identity, and who I am as an educator.

As a child, I was primarily raised in Nova Scotia, Canada. My grandparents, as described above, were central to my upbringing. While living in Nova Scotia, English and French bilingualism was a part of my schooling and community, and language focus was an aspect of my home culture. In my early childhood years, my family moved to Ontario and back to Nova Scotia on two separate occasions. These years were quite transitional, and my family was rather nomadic. For a short period of time, my sister, mother, and I were homeless and this time was a challenge, and to differing degrees, traumatic, for each one of us, individually. Some might be embarrassed by this kind of experience, however, I see my experience with physical homelessness as a child to be extremely

formative to my outlook on life and to this research that addresses questions of cultural homelessness.

After this period of our lives, my mother obtained another degree, changed careers, bought her own home, and fell in love once again with her childhood sweetheart. Her example of how to overcome pain, believe that life challenges are not ‘the end’, and to seek love and life-long growth after trauma is significant. My super-hero sister became a decorated war hero and was awarded the Canadian Medal of Military Valour, one of Canada’s highest military distinctions, for her service in the Canadian military on tour in Afghanistan. I had the opportunity to attend her medal ceremony in which the governor general of Canada presented her with the Canadian Medal of Military Valour in 2011. My sister later obtained a graduate degree in Social Work and continues to serve the Canadian Army in this capacity. Her PhD research focuses on post-traumatic growth, and she is currently blazing pathways in her field to promote understanding of trauma resilience. The way that I observed, and experienced myself, examples of growth and resilience is a significant contributor to why displacement of any kind has the potential to provide opportunities for growth as building blocks for better understanding the value of where one negotiates their belonging. It is my growth mindset, combined with my interest in social justice, that initiated my desire to research culturally responsive and just learning environments for TCK youth.

Homelessness juxtaposed with a desire for a place to belong was my reality, literally. Interestingly, I now research how others negotiate their own kinds of belonging and continue to be inspired by other people who find ways to

facilitate where they belong through their own challenging experiences. I, myself, watched my family overcome challenges, such as homelessness and poverty, and I learned that depending on others is okay, and that the pain caused by loss and trauma can turn into resilience. I have witnessed, and experienced first hand, that overcoming challenges, that getting through, that coming out the other side, is not just a catchy phrase, but a possible reality. In their own way, participants of this research also have had to ‘get through’ their own negotiation of cultural homelessness and the pursuit of belonging. I see clear connections to my own experience of socioeconomic displacement and my desire to capture the stories of young people who have had to fight for their own sense of sociocultural belonging. Although different than economic or geographic displacement, as I experienced in my own youth, cultural displacement experienced by TCK youth also requires a perspective that one can overcome challenges created by needing to question where one belongs. The association I make between displacement and growth is what makes me hold the perspective that humans have the capacity to use challenging experiences for their own betterment, and for the betterment of others. Displacement creates opportunities to learn and practice empathy for oneself and for other people.

In my early adult life, I experienced cultural displacement as I lived in different countries and negotiated new cultural norms into my identity. Although I would not call experience with cultural displacement traumatic, I think my ability to culturally transition and to adapt to new cultures has been influenced by perspectives on growth and resilience. Below, I describe some of my more

significant experiences negotiating secondary cultural discourses into my identity. While completing my Bachelors, I had studied cultural anthropology in Tanzania for approximately six months. Although a short time frame, this experience altered my cultural identity as Western hegemonic discourses were disrupted and I observed, experienced, and participated in other ways of being. I had the opportunity to study under Dr. Jon Arensen, a professor of Anthropology at Houghton College, my undergraduate alma mater. We called Dr. Arensen *Bwana Jon*, which technically meant ‘Sir Jon’, but holds a connotation more semantically tied to ‘beloved mentor’. Dr. Arensen influenced the lives of most students who studied under him: both he and his wife had a contagious sense of adventure, cultural intelligence, and desire to ‘make a difference’ in the lives they touched. Although Dr. Arensen is likely too humble to admit it, countless young adult lives were changed because of the dedication to his work and his teaching.

One of our academic assignments was to learn from a host family in the rural mountains of northern Tanzania. The inhabitants of this particular village had to walk at least two hours to the nearest post office and remained off the electrical grid (and probably still do). Our objective in visiting this village was to observe cultural practices of rural Tanzanians, and to participate in the lives of our gracious hosts; this often entailed things like learning how to plant gardens, assisting with the preparation of food, or, my personal favourite, listening to elders tell traditional African folklore stories. Before arriving to this village, Dr. Arensen advised us to give up our own need for control, and suggested we consider how Western culture’s value of planning, schedules, and being on time

will not work within an event-oriented culture. Although paraphrasing, I remember him saying, ‘once you can manage to give up yourself, and your need to control the events around you, you will find the freedom to actually learn’ - I have carried this sage advice with me ever since and find myself often in situations where it applies. Instead of trying to fit other cultures into my own way of being, this advice has given me the perspective of trying to fit my own self into the culture I experience (which is often easier said than done). As a teacher, this mindset has lead me to my research as I want to understand how students find ways to fit themselves into the cultures that are a part of their lives.

While in Tanzania, my host family insisted I call them *Baba* (Father) and *Mama* (Mother), as I was seen as a daughter-like-guest. As my childhood was filled with outdoor wilderness, working on farms, piling wood, going out on fishing boats, and hunting in the woods. I jumped at the opportunity to ‘get my hands dirty’ ... then I got a few blisters on my hands, and that was the end of that! My host family was so concerned that I was ‘working too hard’ and repeatedly told me ‘*pumzika, pumzika*’ (rest, rest). I “rested” for a little while, and then would try to get up early the next morning to get out in the garden to work, before *Baba* and *Mama* could catch me getting blisters again (they did catch me, and they made me stop working, something that is still hard for me to do). Thankfully, *Baba* finally suggested we go for a hike to pass the time, and I jumped on this opportunity to go exploring. I should mention that *Baba* was about 70-years-old, hiked in rubber boots with his umbrella as a multifunctional cane – and, he still managed to be faster up the mountainside than I could climb (although I blame

that on the fact I had to wear a floor length *kanga* while hiking up the wet, muddy terrain, the truth is that *Baba* was super-human). Dr. Arensen's advice often came to mind as the hike often had a general goal, but no exact map or timing was ever set in advance. *Baba* lead the way and I continually asked for directions as it seemed we were sauntering lost, until hours later the hike suddenly would end with us arriving precisely back where we started. I learned that the more I gave up my need to control my environment, the more I could trust *Baba's* plan and the more I actually learned from my surrounding because there was freedom for it to unfold. Those muddied hikes became somewhat of a metaphor for me being open to other cultural perspectives with the potential to lead the way if I can manage to let go and be open to where I might end up.

I watched as my host father wove large African style baskets to sell to a resort nestled over the hillside in the next town. Every morning and evening after returning from work or our hikes, he would get started on the baskets. The smallest ones (about the size of a mixing bowl) took him days to make, and I cannot imagine how long it took him to weave to the largest basket, about three or four feet in diameter. I would watch him carry the baskets on his back, stacked inside one another like Russian dolls. It was only on the night before I left that I found out he had been working on the smallest basket to give to me as a parting gift. Honoured, I listened as he told me the basket was a small reminder to show how grateful he was to have me live with his family, and he told me that he has many biological daughters whom he loves, and that he would be glad if I should also think of myself as one of his daughters, too. The last words he said to me

before I left were quietly spoken in Swahili: ‘I love you like you are my own daughter’. Not having a relationship with my own biological father, this moment touched me deeply. I realized that, even with extreme cultural differences, connection is a powerful and lasting gift - one of my hopes is that my research of cultural identity could be a basis to spark cultural connections within students themselves or within their relationships with others. When I lived in Tanzania for this short time, I could not wait to go overseas again after obtaining my teaching certification. I had the opportunity to meet North American teachers, an expat family who lived in the northern part of Tanzania, near Kilimanjaro, and they welcomed me to their home and to visit their school. While there, they had suggested that I work in a public school system closer to home first, in order to gain more experiential knowledge first before moving overseas. I followed their advice, and decided to work in North America before dedicating myself to international school placements, overseas. I am thankful for this experience, because it was during this time, teaching in Baltimore, that I learned what being a teacher meant to me, personally.

1.2.3 Reciprocal Empowerment Teaching in Baltimore

After my experience in Tanzania, I taught English Language Arts at a high school in Baltimore, Maryland. When I first started teaching, I had rather grand notions of teaching underprivileged students at an inner city school as I thought I would be the one to ‘save them’; however, I quickly learned that they did not need saving, but rather needed someone to listen to them and help empower their strengths. The idea of power, who has it, what forms of knowing are considered

real knowledge, and who gets to decide are all things that entered into my personal reflection. I came to discover that empowering relationships between teachers and students are more meaningful when power is shared and a certain, healthy level of co-dependency is established. Sharing the power in a classroom can be an uncomfortable thing to do, as it requires giving up a control on the part of the teacher, but in my experience, the bond that is created allows for a greater sense of trust. When working with at-risk students, their trust is essential to the base on which empowerment can take place.

One particular example of a reciprocal power relationship that serves as an anecdote of letting go of control and building trust occurred in a Grade 10 English Language Arts class that I taught. One of my students – I will call him Malcolm – had recently been adopted with his younger brother into a foster family. At first, he was excited but as time went on he told me questionable stories from home, such as that he needed to use his own money to buy beds for himself and his younger brother; often being threatened to be kicked out of his house; and, not being able to play basketball because his foster parent refused to purchase shoes for him to wear. Upon hearing this, I spoke with the Varsity Basketball coach, and we agreed to split the cost for the newest and best basketball shoes (they had a microchip in the sole of the shoe to track movements and plays of the court - something quite unprecedented at the time). Apparently, this model of basketball shoe was what all of the boys on the team dreamed of owning. Upon gifting them to Malcolm, tears streamed down his face as he told us he has never owned anything like that before. We even kept them locked in a cabinet at school as he

was afraid he would ‘get jumped’ in his neighborhood on the way home.

Although this situation had nothing to do with the content of my English class, suddenly Malcolm was getting straight A’s and would often express that he was trying harder because he knew there was an adult there who cared about him. Malcolm continued to play Varsity Basketball in high school, graduating after I moved to a new teaching position, and he later attended college.

One day a new student was transferred into my class from a full self-contained behavioural management school (a type of school where all teachers are trained, and legally allowed, to physically restrain students). The student had moved to our school county before his paperwork was fully processed and was accidentally placed in classes without the support of student service personnel. Once the school finally received all the appropriate documents, administration became aware that he had been receiving daily mental health services with both a psychologist and a social worker, we relocated him into classes with full behavioural care from our specialists. Before this happened, however, his behaviour suddenly exploded in my classroom and it was clear he intended to physically assault me. Malcolm stood up, walked over to my desk, and leaned against the front of it. He crossed his tattoo filled arms and spoke in a calm, cool, collected voice, telling the student, “You can’t talk to our teacher like that”, and when the student got closer, Malcolm followed up with, “I think you need to leave... now”. What happened at that time was something I will never forget: the entire class spoke out, some also standing from their chairs, disallowing the situation to escalate further. There I was, speechless, as a class (some of which

themselves had just returned from juvenile detention centers, were often suspended, etc.) of young people desired to protect me from a situation that would have turned violent. They helped subdue the situation long enough for me to contact our two police officers, stationed full-time at our school, to come and assist the child.

From that point on, I didn't see at-risk students as needing a saviour, and it was extremely humbling for me to be the one needing saving in that particular moment. At-risk does not mean 'weak' or 'unable', and empowerment requires a reciprocity of power and a sharing of roles - something extremely tedious and complex. Even within this experience, the student who became violent was also at risk - a reminder that working with at risk populations is never easy and cannot be effective if done with a saviour complex. I can see how my research interests are influenced by experiences like this because I now have a desire to hear students' stories, to help them tell them to others, and to learn from their challenges which they have endured. My research interests in power dynamics and social justice issues are fueled by the ways in which I came to know students like Malcolm, and how much strength and ability they have to offer to our society. My experience teaching in Baltimore showed me the importance of power-sharing dynamics in the classroom.

1.2.4 Teaching in Cameroon and Thailand

In this section, I discuss my experiences teaching at international schools overseas, specifically, my time in Cameroon and my experience in Thailand; these are two teaching locations that impact my secondary cultural identity

negotiation. While teaching at an international school in Cameroon, community became a key aspect to both my personal and professional life. I taught in an environment where depending on one another for each other's strengths and knowledge was crucial to the functioning of our community. My experience there once again overthrew what I thought being a teacher was supposed to be. Until that point, I had this idea that I should be the protector and gate-keeper of knowledge for my students, however, that's not the case. It's about sharing power roles and acknowledging multiple dynamic cultural identities working together to fabricate what it means to know.

In Cameroon, I had the opportunity to work with staff whose common vocational aspirations focused on public service and preparing students for careers within this field as well. Many of my former students from this school now work as teachers, doctors, linguists, and employees of Non-Government or Non-Profit Organizations. Many parents of students attending the school were, themselves, employed by public service Non-Profit Organizations stationed in Cameroon and other surrounding West African countries. It isn't a surprise that the feel of the campus had an ethos of emancipatory care. One of my fondest memories from working at this school was the morning coffee break. The school campus contained both the school as well as Linguistics and Cultural Anthropology center, and the coffee break was for both teachers, and employees and volunteers working for or training at the center.

The reason I was so fond of this coffee break time was because for thirty minutes everyday I had the opportunity to talk with a variety of individuals doing

extremely interesting work around the globe; no matter what the focus of the project, all of these people were extremely compassionate and were achieving meaningful and sustainable international community development work. At first their work was just impressive, but then I realized that I, too, wanted to offer something to our humanity like I saw these individuals to do. As I spoke with the veteran teachers at this school, they reminded me that through working at international schools were one way that, I could do meaningful work on an international scale.

When the opportunity to teach in at Morehouse International School in Bangkok, later, presented itself, I jumped on it with little hesitation. In Thailand, I had the opportunity to teach International Baccalaureate (IB) English courses to a group of caring and well-rounded students. Differing from my experience teaching primarily foreign expat students while in Cameroon, the student body at Morehouse International School is mainly comprised of Thai nationals who seek to attend university, either abroad in a Western cultured country or in Thailand. I noticed that many students' home cultures differ from that which we operate in at school, and because of this, they negotiate their identity in relation to the two or more cultures they are exposed to and shaped by. The more I became aware of the cultural obstacles this creates for students, the more I considered how I might be get involved and provide a platform from which this issue can be explored and better understood. It is, now, my hope that if students and educators can better understand the nuances of cultural identity, they can more easily find strategies that promote a healthy synthesis of home and school cultures. My professional

experienced teaching in Cameroon and Thailand have influenced my secondary cultural identity negotiation as well as my goals as a researcher.

The intent of the personal researcher narrative is also to reveal how my own subjectivity as a researcher influences and is the foundation for the upcoming chapters that discuss the methodological approach, the findings, and the call for future research. Through connection with our spaces, ourselves, and each other, we can find the grace needed to develop meaningful learning communities in order to empower our individual identities as we work, interconnected, to empower our learning community and what it means to know and to be. Places, and the people in them, impact who we are; how we grow on a personal level contributes to who we are on a professional level. Regardless of geographical location, I have been diversely influenced by the people that I've shared personal and professional spaces with, and these experiences work together in a unique but complicated way to gain insight and deeper knowledge about myself and the communities in which I live.

Influenced by my grandparents' leadership in public service, I have chosen a career in which I hope to serve others with wisdom and strength. My time in Tanzania allowed me to experience differing cultural ways of being and to consider the impact this would have on my own life through a growing ability to give up control and foster human connection. Teaching at-risk students in Baltimore taught me that at-risk does not mean incapable, and that empowerment is more valuable when it is reciprocal. The exposure to humanitarian workers in Cameroon furthered my goals of working in international public service within

the field of education, which is confirmed as I continue to work within the international school system. My personal and professional personas are at a meeting point, where my past experiences intersect and influence why I have chosen to research educational issues of cultural identity negotiation. It is my hope that I can provide resources for heightened understanding of the spaces in which students and educators work together. Schools have the potential to empower the multifaceted qualities we, as educators and students, have to strengthen our personal communities and empower human interconnectivity. As I reflect on how personal me and professional me are one and the same, I am truly grateful that as an educator, my profession *of the brain* is also a *vocation of the heart*.

1.3 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, chapter 1, I introduced the term TCK, which, in the context of this study, is defined as youth whose primary culture differs from the secondary, Western culture they experience at school, and the third culture may be viewed as an interstitial hybrid between home and school cultures. Additionally, I described my own experiences as a researcher that influence the interest in and passion for further exploring cultural identity negotiation. I discussed how my own experience of homelessness has inspired me to research how others navigate their cultural ‘homes’, and how my intercultural experiences have enhanced my passion to better understand the experience of TCK youth. In the next chapter, chapter 2, I provide the literature review used as a foundation for this research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I provide a review of past research and theoretical frames and other research related to this study. First, I establish the theoretical framework through Said's (1994) theory of Orientalism, and I extend Said's (1994) power dynamics of the Occident and Orient to Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) theories of the cultural field of production, symbolic capital, and symbolic power. I will, then, specifically discuss Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) theory of cultural and linguistic capital, and further 'unpack' these theories within the frame of Gee's (1989) discourse theory regarding primary, secondary, dominant, and marginalized discourses. Like a theoretical lattice, I will then extend the previously mentioned theories to discuss their role within literacy instruction. I will further define and expand upon the Third Culture Kid (TCK), which was initially introduced in chapter 1, the introduction, and will discuss the significance of curricula delivered to the TCK in the international school. Afterwards, I expound upon significant educational practice considerations for international school educators of TCK students.

The last section of this chapter, titled Review of Other Related Studies, delivers my review of other related research studies and justifies why I believe my own research to be significant, and how it adds to past research conducted in the area of international school education. I review past research that focuses ESL/ELL learners and students of immigrant status, ethnographic research of Asian international school students, of a dual-language international school, and of TCK students. Pedagogical significance of culturally conscious and responsive

teaching practices is central to the study of cultural identity negotiation pertaining to TCKs (Green, 1971; Séror, Chen, and Gunderson, 2005). Many cultural studies in education focus on English as a Secondary Language (ESL) learning environments, and pertain to students of immigrant populations who attend school in Western culture countries (Emonds & van Tubergen, 2015; Giampapa, 2010; Páez, 2009). Séror, Chen, and Gunderson (2005) suggest that such studies on culturally marginalized students also focus on younger, elementary aged students rather than older, secondary aged students. Much of the research in this field that is conducted in Asia has been done in China, Korea, Japan, and Hong Kong.

Throughout the research process for this study, I have identified on study conducted in Thailand that focus on international school, but the study places focus on the experience of the Western teacher as opposed to solely focusing on the student experience, and the study's participants who are students are of a different age group range than this research. Therefore, there is little research done on secondary aged TCKs, who are not considered ESL *learners*, and whose families are not *immigrant* families (as opposed to *expatriate*). Furthering an understanding of the TCK experience in Thailand is, therefore, relevant to both TCKs and educators of TCKs at international schools located in Thailand. This exploration of the non-Western TCK experience has the potential to empower more successful cultural negotiation for other non-Western TCKs who experience cultural belonging obstacles while attending Westernized international schools (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009). I begin the literature review with a discussion of

the theoretical framework used for this research, where I elaborate on theories of Said (1994) and of Bourdieu (1993; 2003).

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This section discusses the postcolonial theories of Edward Said (1994) and symbolic capital and symbolic power theories of Pierre Bourdieu (1993; 2003), as theories used to frame and interpret meaning within the context of this study.

Theoretical frameworks used include Said's (1994) postcolonial theory of Orientalism and Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) theories of the field of cultural production and symbolic capital, power, and dominance. I will, first, discuss the concept of symbolic capital as it is relative to Orientalism. Social capital gained in a symbolic, linguistic market is influenced by the value mainstream culture places on itself as the Occident, while simultaneously devaluing the cultures of the Orient (Said, 1994). Continuity of cultural imperialism is permitted when a marginalized cultural identity is seen as the Other. Said (1994) states that "[t]he relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (p. 5). Bressler (2007), referencing Said (1994), states that "the basic thought behind colonization and imperialism [is that] 'they're not like us,' and for that reason deserve to be ruled. The colonized became the Other, the 'not me'" (Bressler, 2007, p. 240). Otherness is what "nineteenth-century Europeans tried [to use] to justify their territorial conquests by propagating a manufactured belief now known as Orientalism: the creation of non-European stereotypes that suggested so-called Orientals were indolent, thoughtless, sexually immoral, unreliable, and demented"

(Bressler, 2007, p. 240). In Asian contexts, educational justification for learning English establishes subtle, yet powerful linguistic and cultural imperialistic classroom experiences for TCKs with marginalized primary cultures.

Whereas postmodernism allows for multiple realities to exist as defined by their subsequent hegemonic cultural groups, postcolonialism rejects the acceptance of a prescribed hegemony that silences non-hegemonic voices (for postmodernism finds truth relative to multiple realities according to the hegemonic group of each reality). Postcolonial theorist, Jacques Derrida (1978), rejects the objective existence of a text, and “denies that a text is an autotelic artifact” (Bressler, 2007, p. 233). An autotelic artifact is defined as “a text that exists in its own right as an autonomous object that can be analyzed” (Bressler, 2007, p. 334). An autotelic artifact, according the New Critical theorists, holds the assumption that a text autonomously exists on its own, not dependent upon things like culture, society, or history (Bressler, 2007). Western culture is founded upon a “fundamental error: the searching for a transcendental signified, an external point of reference upon which one may build a concept or philosophy” (Bressler, 2007, p. 365). Derrida (1978) rejects the notion of a transcendental signified as a center of meaning for all people because the center of truth for all people would assume a center around Western dominant discourse as a form of hegemony.

According to Said (1978), “the authority of academics, institutions, and governments can accrue to [a text], surrounding it with still greater prestige than its practical successes warrant. Most importantly, such texts can *create* not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe” (p. 94). There is an

important connection between Said's (1978) concept of Orientalism and Derrida's (1978) concept of a transcendental signified. If one were to accept a transcendental signified, it could only be accepted according to the hegemonic Occident and, therefore, silence discourses belonging to the Orient. Said (1978) indicates that "[t]he relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power and domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (p. 5).

Within a postcolonial theoretical frame, the concept of cultural displacement for third-cultured kids is concerned with "what happens when two cultures clash and when one of them, with its accessory ideology, empowers and deems itself superior over the other" (Bressler, 2007, p. 236). There is an "unfair 'discourse stacking' that our society engages in" (Delpit, 1995, p. 165). Because of this stacking, due to Western hegemony, an individual whose identity encounters two or more cultures must negotiate differing hegemonic cultural codes that are often at odds with one another. Cultural scripts on how to think, behave, and communicate can become jumbled and the result is often a feeling of displacement. When discussing hegemonic assumptions of monolingual power positions regarding language use and cultural identity, Canagarajah (2013) discusses that

[w]e believe that for communication to be efficient and successful we should employ a common language with shared norms. These norms typically come from the native speaker's use of the language. We also believe that languages have their own unique systems and should be kept free of mixing with other languages for meaningful communication. I consider these assumptions as constituting a monolingual orientation to communication. (p. 1)

The notion that the native language speaker is in a position to decide what constitutes a common language and shared norms connects to Said's (1994) Occident and Orient positions within Orientalism, as the Occident position holds the native language speaker's power to decide norms, and those who do not follow these norms are placed in an Orient position. As Said (1978) indicates, hegemony is complex: not only within one cultural reality are there forces of power dynamics, but when a person encounters multiple cultural hegemonies there is an even more complex way in which competing hegemonies interact with other systematic competing hegemonies.

Growing globalization, however, has shifted the boundary line between the Occident and the Orient. Canagarajah (2013) comments on this, as he writes that:

[t]ransnational contact in diverse cultural, economic, and social domains has increased the interaction between languages and language groups. Migration has involved people taking their heritage languages to new locales and developing repertoires that were not traditionally part of their community. (p. 2)

These diverse cultural domains establish increasingly intercultural, intertextual fields and those who interact within these fields are faced with the challenge of how to gain access to social power while also maintaining the power they have acquired in other field domains to which they have formerly established power (Bourdieu, 1993).

Postcolonial theory continues to be helpful in the understanding of how cultural identity negotiated between primary and secondary cultures is subjective to the competitive power dynamics specific to the cultural fields negotiated. The

competition for power in this context of primary and secondary cultures is particularly postcolonial when a secondary, Western culture is negotiated into a primary, non-Western culture. Individuals who face this negotiation must consider the ways that they benefit from the access to Western culture while still maintaining the benefits rooted in their primary cultures. If the Occident's power is established through the ability to categorize which cultural norms are forms of power (and can limit the Orient's power within the Occident). Therefore, when entering an Occidental domain, the individual who associates with cultural norms of "the Orient" is faced with a dilemma of how to acquire power of, and membership to, the Occident without replacing and devaluing their forms of power associated with, what this Occident considers to be, the Orient (Said, 1994). An unraveling, of sorts, is needed to understand how the sinews of cultural power obtain their force.

In order to compose this unraveling, Bourdieu's (2003) theory of language and symbolic power, and his theory of the field of cultural production (1993) are used to interpret how social fields are structured to give power to some positions over others within a particular field. Bourdieu (1993) indicates that within social fields, cultural capital, as a form of symbolic capital, can be traded in for more social power (and is believed to lead to resultant economic capital).

Understanding systems of symbolic capital, such as cultural capital, can help expose the constructed foundation of the Occident and devise strategies to topple the cultural boundaries that further neocolonialism. To consider symbolic and

linguistic capital, and to place these forms of capital within symbolic power associated with hegemony of the Occident is important to this research.

2.1.1 Cultural and Linguistic Capital

The relationship between primary and secondary discourses can be debilitating for culturally marginalized students, because, as Carrington (2001) identifies, “the linguistic market values and legitimizes particular uses of language while negating the value of others” (p. 270). Carrington (2001) also states that “[c]hildren arrive at school with differing combinations and volumes of capital”, and that “[t]he children of the upper classes arrive with the ‘correct’ attitude to schooling and institutional authority” (p. 269). Students who have both economic and cultural capital are usually the ones that are rewarded for “cultural activities and knowledges [that] are valued within the school field”, and the “children of other classes bring other capital combinations and social characteristics with them” that may not connect, and perhaps even “conflict[,] with those validated and rewarded by schools” (Carrington, 2001, p. 269). Canagarajah (2013) indicates that multilingual “student groups already bring such an orientation to literacy from contact zones outside the classroom—from multilingual home environments and new social media, from precolonial community practices and postmodern digital communication” (p. 128).

Cultural dominance can marginalize those who do not align with the literacy orientation of the dominant group, and this can create oppressive conditions for those who associate with what the Orient deems Occidental. Oppression is not necessarily “conscious” or “intentional”, but may be “found in

such areas as education”, and “many people contribute to maintaining and reproducing oppression in carrying out many of their day-to-day activities” (Mullaly, 2010, p. 53-54). According to Mullaly (2010), Western cultured males of Caucasian descent “not only controlled the economy, the political system, the army, and the culture but also controlled the production of ideas and knowledge... and reinforced their claims of superiority and their positions of power and dominance” (p. 50).

TCKs, as further discussed in the Third Culture Kids (TCKs) section of this chapter, below, whose primary culture exists within the margins of hegemonic culture have the potential to be more at risk due to the marginalized level of dominant cultural capital they more automatically acquire through their primary cultures at home. TCKs can be of all nationalities, and on average, international schools across the world often have approximately fifty different nationalities represented (Schaetti, 2015). Frequently, however, the curricula, style of teaching, and hegemonic culture of international schools, lean towards Western culture; therefore, youth whose culture at home (and/or nation) differs from that of their international school may have to acquire a high concentration of Western cultural practices in a short amount of time if they are going to obtain the cultural capital necessary to succeed in school.

Bourdieu’s (1993) research in cultural capital extends to the connection between French *grandes écoles* and positions of dominance within French society. *Grande écoles* are private education systems considered to belong to the elite, and to a great extent, this is also the context of the research site used for this

study. Bourdieu claims that dominant positions, such as: “the Episcopate, the university, employers, high civil service, etc.” are “homologous” with “the *grandes écoles* in relation to the field of power” within society (Wacquant, 1993, p. 20). Bourdieu differentiates *dominant class* from *field of power*: dominance within society is not, in this sense, conflict between classes, but is rather the struggle of the dominant field of power to “[integrate] and [reconcile] its diverse forms of power” (p. 19). Fields of power (Bourdieu, 1993) within educational systems that hold potential for social dominance include areas such as economic, cultural, and linguistic fields. According to Bourdieu (1993) “a field is a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy” (p. 162); fields are “*microcosms* that have their own structures and their own laws” – fields have “their own general laws of operation” (p. 181). There is, of course, a multiplicity of other fields as well; however, cultural and linguistic fields, and to a certain degree economic fields, are of main concern for this research. According to Bourdieu (1993), capital with the potential for a high degree of social domination “must be capable of wielding several forms of domination at the same time. Pure economic domination never suffices” (Wacquant, 1993, p. 25). Therefore, a field is a microcosm with social laws of operation, and the social laws of operation that wield more power to those who can fulfill the social laws hold more capital.

Many of the participants for this research have economic capital in terms of finances and family wealth; however, due to the fact that participants’ primary culture is non-Western, parents may believe that giving their students access to

both Western culture and language will give them greater cultural and linguistic capital for their future. Canagarajah (2013) raises the question of “[h]ow do diverse people represent their own identities, negotiate unequal power relationships, and still manage to use English to get their inter-community relationships accomplished?” (p. 57). This question is central in considering the cultural negotiation of participants within this study. Parents of participants for this research, as well as participants themselves, tend to believe that their economic capital through wealth is not enough if they wish to have more opportunities for success after they graduate high school. Canagarajah (2013) states that

[i]n recent contexts of post-colonialism and postmodern globalization, English has been undergoing further changes in relation to the diverse new languages and communities it has been coming into contact with. Many scholars are addressing the changes English is going through as it travels beyond its traditional homes and speakers. (p. 56)

Through exposure to Anglo-Western culture, and the acquisition of the English language (both a part of global cultural hegemony), the belief is that students will have greater opportunities for success, as opposed to *not* acquiring Western culture, or the ability to speak English, or to conduct academics in English.

This research is concerned with cultural fields of production where some cultures and languages hold more capital than others (Bourdieu 1993). Some Western cultural discourses carry more symbolic power than more marginalized discourses of less hegemonic cultural capital (Bourdieu, 2003). TCKs whose primary culture is non-Western may be more inclined to see Western culture as a form of global cultural hegemony, therefore, may strive to participate in

discourses of Western culture in order to gain the necessary forms of cultural capital from which to be more dominant within certain fields of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993), especially those considered to possess more power within the context of globalization. The combination of fields of power in order to gain greater social dominance is heightened by the habitus, or systematic environment, of the education system, due to the notion that “[a]cademic credentials are thus both weapons and stakes in the symbolic struggles over the definition of social classifications” (Wacquant, 1993, p. 27). There is the perception that education will equalize the opportunity for all individuals regardless of which fields of capital they inherit; however, simultaneously, education, itself, provides a form of capital associated with the intellectual and valued by hegemonic social systems (consider the concept of the literacy myth discussed previously). Bourdieu claims that the state emerges as a “space of bureaucratic powers, as the site of struggles for power over other fields...” (Wacquant, 1993, p. 42). The school, as a politically charged microsystem of the state, provides a canvas for this struggle of power to unfold.

This section discussed the relevance of symbolic capital and power within fields of production associated with hegemonic culture and language; the next section of this chapter introduces Gee’s (1989) discourse theory to provide a basis for how symbolic capital is furthered within socially accepted ways of using language and communication to signal belonging to preferred social networks.

2.1.2 Primary and Secondary Discourses

The concept of a TCK, for the purpose of this research, is placed in conjunction with Gee's (1989) definition of discourse. It is through discourse that TCKs develop a sense of identity as members of the social networks to which they belong. According to Gee (1989), discourse is defined as "a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or social network (p. 18). Gee (1989) suggests that the term discourse refers to ways of communicative behaviour and language that individuals use in order to "take on a particular role that others will recognize" in a specific context (p. 18). According to Gee (2001), discourse is "a sort of 'identity kit' which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize" (p. 526). Reflecting on this concept, Williams (2006) indicates that

[t]he primary discourse is often central to what we consider the core elements of our identity. But it is not until we acquire a discourse, until we understand not just how the language works but how to use it in the appropriate cultural context, that we fully become members of a community or group. Discourse affects everything from how we position ourselves rhetorically to when we use emotion, what we draw on as examples, and when we decide to use humour. (p. 343)

How one feels like they belong to their cultures of home and of school is somewhat determined by how well they learn the "identity kit" for each culture – this identity kit is comprised of the way each culture expects one to communicate and behave. A cultural discourse, therefore, is the way someone within a given culture is expected to behave and interact with others within that culture. For example, in Western culture, it is often considered acceptable for an individual to

express a concern or a conflict through direct body language: eye contact, wide hand gesticulations, louder volume of voice, and an upfront style of verbal language; however, in Thai culture, this same kind of discourse could be perceived as losing face, and thus, disrespectful within the cultural context. Thai culture often expects an individual to use a different mode of cultural discourse within social interactions: eyes lowered or not direct contact, subtle or no hand gesticulations, quiet or softer volume of voice, and indirect or passive style of verbal language – this is perceived as a polite way to communicate conflict in Thai culture, but this could be seen as passive-aggressive (and rude) in Western culture. How should a Thai student having a conflict with a Western teacher, behave, then? This can be very confusing unless both cultural discourses are acquired or understood by both student and teacher. A student looking towards the ground in such a conflict and a teacher who expects eye contact during conflict resolution is a recipe for a cultural misunderstanding disaster in the classroom, and has the potential to further feelings of cultural displacement for the student. Each cultural discourse has specific expectations of how one is to operate within the constructed social norms of that culture, and the way one is to operate within that norm is comprised of the expectations for verbal language and body language (Gee, 1989).

Cultural displacement may be experienced when an individual feels uncomfortable code switching between cultural norms; cultural displacement can also be experienced when one knows how to code switch between cultural contexts but still feels misunderstood through the way that he or she uses

language in order to switch between norms of each cultural context. According to Canagarajah (2013), “[t]ranslinguals treat languages as resources that they can mix and mesh in unusual patterns to construct meaning. The economic metaphor emphasizes the way language is used in relation to one’s social and material interests” (p. 181). The ability to codemesh (Canagarajah, 2013) is a linguistic aspect of successful cultural identity negotiation between cultures associated with different languages. Culture presents the social norms expected of its members within that context, and discourse is the “identity kit” of social communication and behaviour expected of members to use in order to belong to the cultural context. Because this cultural context includes individuals who are expected to communicate and behave in ways that demonstrate belonging to that context, the cultural context, itself, can be considered a space where individuals associate their belonging to others.

In this study, primary discourse refers to cultural aspects of an individual’s initial acquired cultural identity, often the culture of home environment. Secondary discourse refers to cultural aspects of an individual’s secondary culture, often the dominant culture of the school environment. The *third* culture a TCK negotiates is the culture between the primary and secondary cultures of influence, yet this culture has aspects that belongs to each culture and blurs the lines between them. Gee (1986) suggests that primary discourse is defined as the “initial enculturation” that is the first discourse an individual acquires, through native language communication with intimates, individuals “with whom we share a great deal of knowledge because of a great deal of contact and similar

experiences” (p. 20-22). The initial, acquired, enculturated discourse is referred to as the oral mode (Gee, 1986). According to Gee’s (1989) discourse theory, the “oral mode, developed in the primary process of enculturation [is the] ‘primary discourse’” (p. 22).

Other discourses exist in outside institutions apart from the family and/or home unit of one’s intimates; examples of these institutions are places like schools, workplaces, businesses, offices, etc. Gee (1989) calls these secondary institutions, and the discourses that exist, are practiced, and developed within these secondary institutions secondary discourses. Those whose primary discourses compliment the normative secondary discourses are at a greater advantage (in terms of symbolic capital) than those whose primary and secondary discourses conflict in a given situation. For example, a TCK who was born and raised in the United States, to parents who are non-immigrant American citizens, who moves to Thailand and attends an American international school may have a greater chance that school secondary culture and its academic discourses better complement their home or primary discourse. A student who is born and raised in Thailand, whose parents are nationals to Thailand, who attends an American international school may have primary cultural discourses at home that conflict with, rather than complement, the secondary cultural discourses at school.

This section discussed the relationship between primary and secondary discourses; the next section will introduce the concept of a dominant discourse in relation to power dynamics of symbolic capital for TCK youth.

2.1.3 Dominant Discourse

Education is woven into a complex fabric of discourse, which encompasses both language and culture. Individuals of dominant culture are often ensconced within privileged social hierarchy because of their primary access to dominant discourse, whereas individuals possessing marginalized discourses are often devalued in mainstream culture (Gee, 1989). Gee's discourse theory states that "discourses are intimately related to the distribution of social power and hierarchical structure in society. Control over certain discourses can lead to the acquisition of social goods (money, power, status) in a society. These discourses empower those groups who have the fewest conflicts with their other discourses when they use them" (p. 19). Discourse that aligns with what is considered more socially hierarchically powerful is often dominant as it aligns with practices and "identity kits" that have more hegemonic value, and more marginalized discourses that conflict with hegemonic discourse and are, therefore, pushed to the margins of hierarchical of social power, thus creating the separation between dominant discourse and marginalized discourse. Discourses that lead to more social goods are dominant within that social system (Gee, 1989). Gee (1989) suggests that the individual is the "meeting point of many, sometimes conflicting discourses that are socially and historically defined" (p. 20). Culture, as a social construct, carries with it its own set of discourse identity kits, and when individuals are socially exposed to more than one culture their identity meeting point is made more complex.

Without intentional navigation, Western literacy education has the potential to continue devaluing marginalized, primary discourses; this

marginalization provides continuity for linguistic and cultural imperialism within education. Willinsky (1998) states that

Western education stood as a universal standard from which people departed at their own and their children's peril, whether by teaching in an indigenous language either than a European one, or by fostering traditional crafts that took time away from the demands of science and mathematics. At the very least, we all need to go forward knowing something of the history[, colonialism,] that first set this educational perspective in place, however strong the temptation to see it as part of the past. (p. 92)

Feelings of cultural abandonment often increase and are intensified when primary discourses are not acknowledged in the school environment. International schools that offer Western curriculum need to be aware of historical contexts in which education was offered to non-Western students abroad, such as the writings of Sargent (1914) connote during British rule in India: “[w]e provide a civilizing education in exchange for your lands and selves; this education alone may be able to afford you a level of civilization (or maturity) that will warrant you taking charge in your own house” (p. 234-240). More positive outcomes for cultural identity occur when students can engage with culturally empowering adult role models at school, and, therefore, the ability for successful cultural identity saliency not only depends on characteristics of the individual youth(s), but also of the school environment and the adult role models to provide access to resources necessary to facilitate this success (Ungar et al., 2007). By understanding how Western cultural capital is engrained in Westernized education, more equitable teaching environments and cultural resilience can develop.

This section discussed the role of dominant discourse within education that promotes a more dominant secondary discourse over that of primary

discourse; the next section discusses the significance of marginalized discourse within literacy education.

2.1.4 Marginalized Discourse

Discourses become marginalized when they are pushed aside in favour of hegemonic dominant discourses. Sociocultural imperialism and literacy correlate because “learning styles, and behavioural norms, and sanctions against the use of nonstandard English acts as a powerful form of symbolic violence (Carrington, 2001, p. 270). Symbolic violence establishes oppression because “the dominant group universalizes its experience and culture and uses them as the norm” and “reinforces” ideals, stereotypes, and societal expectations (Mullaly, 2010, p. 59). Symbolic violence occurs through the subtle favouring of one cultural discourse over another more marginal one, and often the marginal discourse becomes associated with negative tropes or stereotypes. For example, accents can sometimes be associated with symbolic power: the trope of an English accent promotes that sounding British is more *intelligent*, whereas, the trope of an Indian English accent, for example, is stereotypically associated with negative connotations. This kind of stereotyping of language usage, and the tropes that these stereotypes contain, establish linguistic violence. Canagarajah (2013), when defining translingualism states, “[f]irstly, communication transcends individual languages. Secondly, communication transcends words and involves diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances” (p. 6). This research takes the stance that the rejection of accent prestige should be at the forefront of language

and literacy curriculum within international schools. As translingual locations, international schools should consider

the indexicality of the codes and accents people bring to translocal spaces is co-constructed according to the communicative situation. Such processes of co-constructing indexicalities are important because the translocal space is not limited to a specific geographical domain (or place, hereafter, to distinguish it from space, which I define as social and co-constructed). (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 163)

In terms of the example discussing accents, mentioned above, a student attending an Anglo-Western school, who has an Indian accent when speaking English, may feel inferior (through teasing, bullying, or the lack of representation of this accent in curricula); and this event contains particular symbolic violence because it takes power away from the student's primary culture, which is especially true, in this example, due to the colonial history of India's relationship with England (Willinsky, 1998). A student may feel embarrassed by their accent, and feel as though they need to master a more American or British accent if they are to be taken seriously within school (Pollock and Van Reken, 2009). The concept that accent is associated to intelligence is quite unsettling once the reasons for this are understood as potential forms of symbolic violence – symbolic because there is a covert forcing of individuals to culturally assimilate (Bourdieu, 1993).

According to Gee (1989), “[a]ny discourse concerns itself with certain objects and puts forward certain concepts, viewpoints, and values at the expense of others. In doing so it will marginalize viewpoints and values central to other discourses” (p. 19). A marginalized discourse, therefore, holds less symbolic capital than a more hegemonic, dominant discourse holds. In combination with Said's (1978) theory of Orientalism, it can be argued that a marginalized

discourse serves as a lens of Otherness, where this “difference... entails an *other* and always implies power and oppression” (Mullaly, 2010, p. 36). Gee (1989) suggests that discourses are tied to “social power” and “hierarchical structure in society. Control over certain discourses can lead to the acquisition of social goods (money, power, status) in a society” (p. 19). Marginalized discourse is significant within schools whose curriculum or environment operate in more globally dominant discourses; this is relevant to the concept of literacy and its role within international schools who offer Western curriculum that differs from the curriculum of the host country (Pollock and Van Reken, 2009).

2.2 Literacy

Classical Literacy has traditionally meant that students “[receive] instruction in the three Rs (reading, writing, and arithmetic) in private and community schools” (de Castell and Luke, 1986, p. 89). In the 19th Century, literacy education was designed for the “domestication of a ‘barbarous’ population, whose inclinations toward ‘materialism’ and ‘ignorance’ threatened cultural continuity, political order, and Protestant morality” (de Castell and Luke, 1986, p. 92). According to Western thought, Mullaly (2010) states that “[o]nly children of bourgeois or aristocratic families had the resources to pursue education and scholarship” (p. 49). To neglect the history of classism in education would create a superficial understanding of literacy in schools. Mullaly (2010) discusses the ways that language has been used to discriminate against people of non-Western descent, such as Asian descent, and furthers oppressive power that classist Westerners aim to have over non-Western cultured individuals. Mullaly

(2010) states that this kind of language generates the perspective of dominant Western thought that non-Western identities are a subordinate group and are “inferior because they do not meet [the] standards or norms” of Western culture (p. 68).

According to de Castell and Luke (1986), “[b]eing ‘literate’ has always referred to having mastery over the processes by means of which culturally significant information is coded” (p. 88), and that “significance has varied historically with changes in this kind of information from which power and authority could be derived” (p. 88). Language and literacy has been politically charged with sociocultural ideals, influencing the aim of literacy and language value within dominant discourse (Gee, 1989). Changing modes of literacy and understanding of multiple literacies is an encouraging shift from classical literacy, as multiple literacies empower intertextual discourses and ways of being. Canagarajah (2013) suggests “terms such as codemeshing, crossing, and polyglot dialog [to] require a new orientation to language studies” (p. 6). Canagarajah (2013) “adopt[s] the umbrella term “translingual practice” to capture the common underlying processes and orientations motivating these communicative modes” of intertextual language and communication terms as mentioned above (p. 6). Canagarajah (2013) also states that

[t]o understand translingual literacy, we have to move from product-oriented analyses to process. We have to explore the processes of production, reception, and the negotiation of texts. We also have to move from writing being an independent activity to perceiving it as literacy or, in other words, a social activity that integrates reading, writing, and diverse semiotic resources. (p. 128)

Literacy, more than the ability to read and write the language, is the ability to synthesize many forms of information in order to successfully function within an environment influenced by social norms. Canagarajah (2013) states that “[t]he dominant orientations to literacy are not friendly to translingual writing. We have to consider alternate orientations that present strategies for reading and writing that enable us to deal with textual hybridity” (p. 127). Teaching effective and meaningful literacy and discourse, therefore, requires teachers to have a sense of empathetic and reflexive approaches to literacy instruction.

Corbett (2010), suggests that “[t]eachers of language arts need to become experts in the structure and culture of language use in... communities, rather than missionaries whose calling it is to fix the way people use language” (p. 86). If teachers are in a continual state of fixing, then this is what students hear: *in order to succeed, I need to be fixed*. When teachers’ “professional vocabulary for dealing with this [is] that of ‘recovery’... [and of] language deficit... [it leads] them down a road to simplistic answers...” (Luke and Carrington, 2004, p. 62). The longer that language and cultural deficit boils under society’s surface, with no challenge or opposition, “the thicker it becomes, and the thicker our viscous swirl of education narratives becomes the harder it is for any of us to approach education issues afresh” (Gregory, 2007, p. 12). According to McKenzie (2006), normalized “practices, such as language use, traditions of family and culture, and institutions such as school and media” have “different degrees of authority, with dominant discourses appearing natural or true” (p. 200). Without critical questioning, mainstream representations of the culture circuit continue hegemonic

influences, positing a “natural” identity. Belief in Western cultural discourse as *Lingua Franca* continues as a form of cultural identity practice in current educational environments. Many international students perceive Western cultural as valuable symbolic capital; marginalized students often think that if they are going to be successful, they “need the cultural capital of white middle-class people” (Veerdoodt et al., 2010, p. 524). Canagarajah (2013) suggests that and understanding of translinguality “requires a shift to a different orientation to literacy, that is, from autonomous to negotiated” (p. 127). Literacy as negotiated forms of knowing is central to breaking the domination that classical literacy furthered by cultural capital of Western hegemonic norms.

Canagarajah (2013) defines dominant orientations to literacy as the following:

Dominant orientations to literacy are motivated by the following assumptions: the text should present self-evident meaning; meaning is a product waiting to be extricated from the text; the reader should remain detached from the text in order to employ objective interpretive approaches for accurate meanings; it is the writer’s responsibility to encode meanings in such a way that the text can present its meanings with clarity and ease; if there is any activity in meaning-making, it follows the conduit model, whereby meaning filters from the writer’s mind through the text to the reader’s mind; and whatever time and space the text is located in and travels through, it has the power to convey the same meaning by transcending contexts. (p. 128)

Canagarajah’s (2013) translingualism is an important counter to dominant orientations to literacy. Dominant orientations to literacy, or classical literacy, is *ideological*, “as it is socially constructed, with implications for power relations” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 128), and this form of literacy is what de Certeau (1984) considers “Occidental ambition” (p. 133). Canagarajah (2013) states that “the

orient's multimodal literacy practices were suppressed by European colonization activities" (p. 128). If Occidental power domination in literacy is to be countered, a merging of Oriental multimodal literacies should be considered and legitimized apart from the approval of the Occident.

A point to be further considered is the notion that the literacy myth furthers dominance of Occidental literacy over Oriental literacies. According to Bryson (2012), "the literacy myth is used to dominate those who are classified as illiterate, functionally illiterate, academically illiterate, or another other number of classifications" (p. 255). International education is in a precarious position in relation to Bryson's (2012) form of domination – if third culture kids (or their parents) of non-Western home cultures believe they will have greater success in their future if they are to acquire greater Western cultural literacy at a Western international school, then success and Western culture become synonymous. A literate dichotomy is, therefore, established in this belief: literate being equated with Western culture and illiterate being equated with non-Western culture. Such a dichotomy is subtly reconfirmed when international school curricula promote, albeit unintentionally, Western academia's form of literacy through culturally hegemonic Western canon choices. If one canon of Western authors, philosophers, historians, mathematicians, etcetera, are studied, then the subversive message sent to students of non-Western primary cultures is that of a dichotomy: one is either a Western-cultured academic or a non-Western-cultured academic; this is only reinforced by publisher bias towards Western academics (sociopolitical issues with literacy and classroom bias will further be discussed in

terms of *the hidden curriculum* in a following sub-section, titled “hegemonic teaching practices and the hidden curriculum”).

One major pitfall of education is the promoted belief in the literacy myth, which motivates political and sociocultural aspects of education. A kind of myth, which holds the belief that none *but* Westernized cultural discourse will bring forth power, is established when this question is not raised nor answered. Graff (1991) coined the term “the literacy myth” in 1979 (Bryson, 2012). Graff and Duffy (2007) state that:

The Literacy Myth refers to the belief, articulated in educational, civic, religious, and other settings, contemporary and historical, that the acquisition of literacy is a necessary precursor to and invariably results in economic development, democratic practice, cognitive enhancement, and upward mobility. Despite many unsuccessful attempts to measure it, literacy in this formulation has been invested with immeasurable and indeed almost ineffable qualities, purportedly conferring on practitioners a predilection toward social order, an elevated moral sense, and a metaphorical “state of grace”. (p. 41)

According to Veerdoodt (2010), “[t]he literacy myth refers to the easy and often unfounded assumption that ‘better’ literacy... necessarily leads to all sorts of ‘good things’: economic development, cultural progress, and individual improvement” (p. 526). In order to explore this idea, Veerdoodt (2010) uses popular film portraying classroom or learning environments containing teacher-student scenarios, in which the teacher is offering access to literacy and the student is in need of learning this. Within film portrayals of teaching and learning, Veerdoodt (2010) suggests that there is a commonality of literacy being presented in a dichotomous form: one is either literate or is not literate. Veerdoodt (2010) indicates that “[n]ot only have the concepts of literacy and culture become

multiple, but also personal identities are said to have been multiplied over the past decades” (p. 520). Obviously, film and real life education are not necessarily synonymous, however, one must question whether or not literacy is often thought of in this dichotomous way. According to Greene (1971), traditional curriculum is “too prone to dichotomize: to think of ‘disciplines’ or ‘public traditions’ or ‘accumulated wisdom’ or ‘common culture’ (individualization despite) as objectively existent, external to the knower – there to be discovered, mastered, learned” (p. 127). Reflecting on this concept, Veerdoodt (2010) elaborates that “[c]ontemporary society has become increasingly globalized and culturally and linguistically diverse, a process closely connected to the multiplicity of communication channels and media” (p. 520). To what extent are students believed to have a previously conceived form of literacy prior to entering the classroom, and to what extent do teachers of literacy inherently believe that literacy is something that must be taught? (I ask this as a secondary teacher of English Language Arts, myself). If it is assumed that literacy must be taught, then educators should question which forms of literacy are taught, and whether or not multiple forms of literacy are considered within school curricula.

Noddings (2007) suggests that “[a]s we consider educational aims for the 21st century... [there is] a need to educate whole persons” (p. 400). As we are now well into the 21st century, buzzwords like 21st century learning may be now obsolete; however, the premise of 21st century curriculum, and a call for its diversity should be a continued consideration within schools today (Noddings, 2007). Noddings (2007) however warns against curriculum that becomes “a mile

wide and an inch deep” (p. 403); how to ensure multiple forms of literacies within educational curriculum without that curriculum becoming unreasonably ‘wide’ is, of course, a point for contemplation. If literacy can be termed as the ability to learn to read the world, then indeed, it should provide more power to its beholder. It is, however, when the way to read the world is through hegemonic Western culture, that there are hints of myth within the promise for greater success. Hegemonic Western culture promotes the idea that to be well versed in Western thought will give access to more cultural, economic, and social capital (Bourdieu, 1993). To some extent this may be realistic of social systems like Westernized education, politics, and workforce, but to not recognize the systems that make this so is where symbolically violent (Bourdieu, 1993). Who is to say, however, that another form of literacy would not offer different but equitable forms of power? Yet, the literacy myth is an extremely complex concept, and without consideration, the idea could easily be misinterpreted as suggesting that being literate does *not*, indeed, lead to some kind of success.

Graff (1991), as cited by Bryson (2012), indicates that “[p]art of this myth is the inability to define literacy, what it means to possess or attain literacy, and what literate individuals are supposed to accomplish with literacy” (p. 255). Bryson (2012) states that “[i]nstead, literacy becomes a norm that does not have one accepted definition or one set of implications” (p. 255). The literacy myth does not devalue the concept of being literate, but rather, its aim is to question the systems that place value on one hegemonic form of literacy over more marginalized forms of literacy, and yet still claim that hegemonic literacy is more

valued because they are inherently more valuable (as opposed to being socially constructed to be so). Chan (2006) suggests that “the difficulties in accommodating for the diverse perspectives and beliefs of those involved in the lived experience of curriculum highlight the need to explore in greater detail what it means to develop, and implement, a culturally-sensitive curriculum” (p. 310). According to Graff (2010) it is a myth that literacy “stands alone as the independent and critical variable” – the myth is “the conviction that the benefits ascribed to literacy cannot be attained in other ways, nor can they be attributed to other factors, whether economic, political, cultural, or individual” (p. 635).

Bryson (2012) indicates that,

Graff’s historical work on literacy as well as the theoretical work of New Literacy Scholars has made literacy researchers aware of the existence and pervasiveness of the literacy myth and led to the investigation of these problematic understandings of literacy in recent scholarship. Yet, because of American entrenchment in individualism, the pervasiveness of the bootstraps mentality, and psychological processes that push us to seek order and causality in our world, western society continues to be invested in the belief that literacy is a guarantor of success in all areas of life.

Noddings (2007) discusses the need to redevelop 21st century curriculum that joins factors and disciplines together and suggests “that we push back the boundaries between disciplines and ask how each of the expanded subjects can be designed to promote new aims for the 21st century” (p. 405). It is when literacy, taken at face value, is not considered as something constructed and influenced by other things, that there becomes a myth in our midst – to deny that literacy is socially, economically, and culturally constructed and is subjected to those constructs is mythic. It is not a myth that literacy, if obtained, will give access to greater social, economic, and cultural success; in fact, if one identifies these

things as contributing factors towards what is considered ‘literate’, then it would make more sense to associate obtained literacy, as a tool produced by those factors, as a method to greater success. Graff (2010) says,

Never did [I] claim that there was *no* relationship between [literacy] and economic success, income and literacy skill, labor force attainment and literacy, and occupational change and literacy. To the contrary, [I] emphasized their complexity, variability, and contradictoriness in relationships among key factors, and in more general explanatory and interpretive terms that shape expectations, theory, and policy. (p. 637)

The question for educators, and for curricula development, however, is to what extent should one form of literacy be packaged and promoted as inherently correct? This question is particularly important for educators of international schools who deliver curriculum from a Western country, which is different than the curriculum of the school’s host country, to students whose primary culture is not Western. The literacy myth asks for a consideration as to what it means to be literate, in what context, and whom does a given form of literacy best empower.

A student attending an international school, for example, whose home culture is not Western, is many times taught by educators whose pedagogical perspective often intends to recognize, empower, and be sensitive to students’ home cultures. An international school that follows a Western curriculum, however, likely follows a curriculum influenced by Western thought, and here is the dilemma – how should a teacher of this student validate both home culture and school literacy? To reject the literacy myth in this scenario would be to acknowledge that the literacy of school is a culturally coded concept. Perhaps international school educators are in the best position to do this, given the typical characteristics of international school teachers’ belief that many things are

culturally coded concepts, and their desire to learn more about how these concepts are, indeed, culturally coded. In this way, perhaps the culturally diverse, TCK student of the international school has a greater advantage than the culturally diverse student of the national school. If the international school is founded on the prefix, *inter*, in which its Latin root means to be between, among, mutually and/or reciprocally connected, then perhaps this location will more automatically harbor the belief that literacy is among many, and not just among two: the literate and the illiterate.

When individuals *buy in* to a dichotomous literacy myth, the myth that one form of literacy is better than all others (or that one form of literacy is the only form of literacy) becomes tangible and accepted as factual. Within a habitus of Westernized education, “individuals become representative of schooling systems, for example – to the extent that they are seen to ‘speak’ on behalf of particular capitals” (Bourdieu, 1993; Gale & Densmore, 2001). Teachers within Western education, to some extent, serve as the mouthpiece for hegemonic cultural capital, thus, when the teaching of literacy occurs, it has roots within the belief that the literacy of hegemonic cultural practices will give greater power than less hegemonic cultural practices. Notice that standard English is the vernacular taught in schools as it is considered to be “proper”; the concept of speaking correctly, or speaking right, is subjective to this hegemonic form of literacy.

The literacy myth becomes problematic when “[b]eing ‘literate’ has always referred to having mastery of the processes by means of which culturally

significant information is coded” (de Castell and Luke, 1986, p. 88). What is considered “significant” is politically charged according to the value placed within mainstream dominant discourse (Gee, 1989). Carrington (2001) states, “the linguistic market values and legitimizes particular uses of language while negating the value of others” (p. 270). Additionally, “[c]hildren arrive at school with differing combinations and volumes of capital”, and “[t]he children of the upper classes arrive with the ‘correct’ attitude to schooling and institutional authority” (p. 269). Students who have economic, social, and cultural capital are usually rewarded for “cultural activities and knowledges [that] are valued” within schools, and “children of other classes bring other capital combinations and social characteristics with them” that may not connect, and perhaps even “conflict with those validated and rewarded by schools” (p. 269). The value of cultural capital takes on a greater level of poignancy for TCKs in international schools if the belief in Western cultural norms trumps the value of primary cultural norms students of marginalized ethnic or racial backgrounds possess.

Gee (1986) discusses that teachers (he specifies Language Arts Teachers) “are not, in fact, teaching English, and certainly not English grammar, or even ‘language’. Rather, they are teaching a set of discourse practices, oral and written, connected with the standard dialect of English” (p. 742). These practices present in classrooms establish “the lived experience of curriculum” versus the written framework (Chan, 2006, p. 310). There is a *lived experience* of the official curriculum – what is officially stated to be taught – and the hidden curriculum – naturalized practices in hegemonic culture reflected subtly through how

curriculum is delivered and how students are expected to *behave* (Jackson, 1990). Jackson (1990) discusses the hidden curriculum that saturates the *daily grind* of the everyday classroom; this hidden curriculum is, essentially, a part of the curriculum – the how’s and what’s are taught – but it is not in the *official* curriculum.

Hegemonic teaching practices of discourse believed to prepare students for their futures are often naturalized so that they go unnoticed as many educators unintentionally reinforce them. Even well-intended educators can cause damage in this regard. Western culture and education, for example, often value critical thought; Western teachers who want their students to gain an ability to think independently and critically may also expect non-Western students to demonstrate their critical thought through certain culturally-coded behaviour, such as raising critical questions in class discussions, or verbally offering independent interpretations of information. Students who do not behave in the expected manner may be considered ‘too quiet’ or ‘not participating’ in class. For some non-Western cultures, however, it may be considered socially unacceptable to question instructions from an authority figure, such as a teacher, or to stand out as an individual amongst a group of students. The belief in developing critical thought in students may be a valuable thing to both Western and non-Western cultures, however, how one is expected to behave and communicate (a form of discourse) critical thought depends on the cultural norm one identifies with. For a non-Western TCK attending a Western international school, this example scenario would likely cause some difficulty. He or she would need to decide who they are,

culturally, in relation to the behaviour expected and decide how they will demonstrate academic expectations through discourse. Due to adolescence already being in a peak stage of identity formation, added identity choices create greater risk to the ability to negotiate cultural identity saliency. Small cultural biases of curricula can actually have quite large impacts on TCK adolescents.

Importantly, the hidden curriculum is *not* a *hidden agenda* – it is not “an insidious plot in education that is being managed by some covert, sinister power” (Davis et al., 2015, p. 121). Such an interpretation would detract from finding real and tangible methods for teachers to encourage more positive and socially just classroom experiences for all learners. It is highly unlikely that a teacher, who most likely has chosen a profession to *assist* youth, would intentionally marginalize TCK youths’ cultures. Educators hold influence in students’ lives and affect the *lived experience* of learners; ethical and reflective teaching practices can help readjust the assumptions made by dominant cultural norms to also include marginalized cultures as valuable and crucial to local and global societies. A starting point to uncover and recalibrate hidden curriculum and dominant discourse is to consider various educational frames in which teaching and learning function. According to Willinsky (1998),

[t]he status of the language we speak and of the language in which the young are educated form no less a part of the legacy of imperialism. The degree to which English, as well as French and Spanish, is spoken around the world is not simply an incidental aspect of empire (p. 190).

Awareness of the role that language plays in the formation of cultural identity, and the negotiation between cultures, is essential to what Willinsky (1998) suggests can continue imperialism.

Pollock and Van Reken (2009) suggest that “[i]f the primary school language is not the parents’ mother tongue(s), parents need to decide how they will deal with this reality” (p. 206). The way that the language used at the international school will influence success of cultural identity negotiation needs consideration. A TCK of non-Western primary culture(s) acquire Western cultural capital through the acquisition of linguistic capital through the ability to learn and speak English. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) suggest that “[s]ometimes those in English speaking countries forget that globally nomadic families with non-English backgrounds have extra challenges, particularly when their mother tongue is not one of the world’s main language groups” (p. 206). Linguistic capital of primary cultures assists individuals of that culture to operate within other, intertextual fields of power, such as an economic field associated with the form of power that language allows (Bourdieu, 1993). When a TCK learns a globally hegemonic language (such as English), they may risk losing their mother tongue, and as a result, losing the power that the language ability will give them when trying to enter an economic field associated with the primary cultural field of production (Bourdieu, 1993). When identifying the challenge that this creates for TCKs, who acquire Western culture and language second to their primary culture, Pollock and Van Reken (2009) indicate that this “challenge [for parents] is how to keep their children not only fluent in *speaking* their mother tongue, but also in being able to do academic work in it. This can be particularly true when the children physically look like the majority/dominant culture” (p. 209).

There is a correlation between language and cultural belonging, and it is important to scaffold language skills for TCKs, as Pollock and Van Reken (2009) indicate, so that TCK students have access to their national culture just as they gain access to Western cultures through learning languages like English. Canagarajah (2013) claims, however, that “languages are not necessarily at war with each other; they complement each other in communication. Therefore, we have to reconsider the dominant understanding that one language detrimentally “interferes” with the learning and use of another. The influence of one language on the other can be creative, enabling, and offer possibilities for voice” (p. 6). Bourdieu (2003) discusses that it is a political process that gives authority to an “official” form of language, stating that:

[a]s opposed to dialect, it [official language] has benefited from the institutional conditions necessary for its generalized codification and imposition. Thus known and recognised (more or less completely) throughout the whole jurisdiction of a certain political authority, it helps in turn to reinforce the authority which is the source of its dominance. It does this by ensuring among all members of the ‘linguistic community’ ...the minimum of communication which is the precondition for economic production and even for symbolic domination. (p. 45)

Considering Canagarajah’s (2013) claim that languages can complement one another in communication in combination with Bourdieu’s (2003) claim that the authority of one language is reinforced by the linguistic community who gives it this authority to further their own symbolic dominance. The implication Canagarajah (2013) makes that the dominant understanding of language needs to be reconsidered is relevant to Bourdieu’s (2003) critique of the systems of dominance which legitimize one form of language over another. Languages, and

forms of languages, are to some extent, by-products of fields of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993).

This means that it is not necessarily the languages that are in competition with one another, but that it is the *field*, which claims one form of language is more legitimate, more *official*, than another, that is in competition with other fields. Revisiting Pollock and Van Reken's (2009) claim, mentioned above, "those in English speaking countries forget that globally nomadic families with non-English backgrounds have extra challenges, particularly when their mother tongue is not one of the world's main language groups" (p. 206), through a Bourdieusian frame suggests this challenge is specific to how fields of production legitimize the global authority of English in order to secure its symbolic dominance. The challenge is more than the ability to speak one language over another, as Canagarajah (2013) suggests: "users don't have separate competences for separately labeled languages (as it is assumed by traditional linguistics), but an integrated proficiency that is different in kind (not just degree) from traditional understandings of multilingual competence" (p. 6). The challenge that faces those whose primary language is not English is that hegemonic cultural fields give more power for certain forms of linguistic capital over others, and Western hegemonic fields legitimize the linguistic codes that agents in positions of dominance consider to be official. According to Bourdieu (1985) the agent is "a practical operator of object constructions" within their habitus and fields (p. 14). The agent, therefore, is the individual who exists within their *habitus*, or, "system of durable, transposable dispositions" (Johnson, 1993). Bourdieu (2003) writes that

To speak of *the* language, without further specification, as linguists do, is tacitly to accept the *official* definition of the *official* language of a political unit. This language is the one which, within the territorial limits of that unit, imposes itself on the whole population as the only legitimate language, especially in situations that are characterized in French as more *officielle* (a very exact translation of the word ‘formal’ uses by English speaking linguists). (p. 45)

This tacit acceptance of the official definition of an official language is the very definition Bourdieu (1993) provides for symbolic violence, when one field legitimizes greater capital to certain forms of cultural productions over others through the tacit acceptance that the power one form of capital has over another is inherent and not constructed.

This concept is important for schools whose curriculum differs from that of the host country, and whose student national demographics differ from the national culture of the curriculum offered at the school. Symbolic violence that places inherent value on some languages, and dialects of languages can actually be unintentionally, or intentionally, furthered by educators whose instruction tacitly includes official forms of languages. Bourdieu (2003) states that “[p]roduced by authors who have the authority to write, fixed and codified by grammarians and teachers who are also charged with the task of inculcating its mastery, the language is a *code*, in the sense of a cipher enabling equivalences to be establish between sounds and meanings, but also in the sense of a system of norms regulating linguistic practices” (p. 45). The international school serves as a unique field where dominant norms that regulate linguistic practices can be challenged because of the diverse intercultural backgrounds by many individuals who attend international schools. Canagarajah (2013) writes that “in the context

of such language diversity, meaning doesn't arise from a common grammatical system or norm, but through negotiation practices in local situations" (p. 7). When the local situation within the environment of the international school encourages negotiated language practices, the symbolic dominance that some forms of languages have over others can be challenged. Bourdieu (2003) suggests,

[i]n order for one mode of expression among others (a particular language in the case of bilingualism, a particular use of language in the case of a society divided into classes) to impose itself as the only legitimate one, the linguistic market has to be unified and the different dialects (of class, region or ethnic group) have to be measured practically against the legitimate language of usage. Integration into a single 'linguistic community', which is a product of the political domination that is endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language, is the condition for the establishment of relations of linguistic domination. (p. 45-46)

When international schools legitimize multiple forms of language that complement each other (Canagarajah, 2013), then domination of one form of linguistic capital over another is lessened. Canagarajah (2013) states that "[t]hrough language patterns (in the form of dialects, registers, and genres) and grammatical norms do evolve from local language practices sedimented over time, they are always open to renegotiation and reconstruction as users engage with new communicative contexts" (p. 7). However, if official or hidden curricula offered at the school further legitimizes official languages, such as formal English, over other forms of languages, such as the national host language or other forms of English, then the power of formal English to dominate is strengthened.

The international school is comprised of various fields of cultural production and viewing these fields as intertextual with one another, as opposed

to separate, opens the space of possibles for power and domination to change. The space in which symbolic power and capital are permitted to shift is what Bourdieu calls the space of possibles, and it is in this space, when fields are seen as intertextual, that agents within the field are able to shift and change the positions that determine symbolic power and capital. Bourdieu (1993) says that “[s]ince each camp exists through opposition, it is unable to perceive the limits that are imposed on it by the very act through which it is constructed” (p. 182); therefore, in order to understand the space in which a field operates, one must exclude the social space of which that space is the expression in order to move past the obstacles that compete with one another and prevent social synthesis for agents in association with competing fields. The space of possibles, as an intertextual space, seeks the homology between fields, thus creates a space of possibles where change of the original field of production can actually occur (Bourdieu, 1986).

Canagarajah (2013) claims that “[a]ll semiotic resources work together for meaning; separating them into different systems may distort meaning, violating their ecological embeddedness and interconnection” (p. 7). Considering that “[c]ommunication involves diverse semiotic resources; language is only one semiotic resource among many, such as symbols, icons, and images” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 7), those concerned with cultural empowerment of individuals within the international school must view languages as interconnected resources as opposed to separate systems. An intertextual understanding of language resources will also promote an intertextual understanding of cultural identity as well. When multiple cultures, and languages of those cultures, are

incorporated into identity, the individual is not negotiating between two separate cultural fields, but rather is negotiating between two intertextual fields. Treating semiotic resources as separate, as opposed to interconnected, entities may further feelings of cultural exclusion among individuals who navigate belonging to intertextual cultural fields.

If individuals feel like languages are separate entities, and that they need to detach themselves from their primary language in order to access English as a secondary language, they may experience disconnection with the cultural identity tied to the primary language. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) claim that “[a]s children want to blend in and be socially acceptable, many do not want to learn their mother language or use it lest they be “different”” (p. 206). To reframe literacy as a contextually subjective construct instead of an independent and critical variable would perhaps serve as more emancipatory towards the diversity of all students. If educators believe that literacy is *for* all students and their diversities, then it is liberating (and yes complicated) to also believe that literacy is comprised *of* all students and their diversities. To understand literacy as influenced by many factors and attainable in multiple ways, and to see it for all of its paradoxical complexities, is a better match for educators who reject a Standardized frame of education in favour of the capacity for the strength enabled through the belief in multiple literacies.

This section discussed the role of literacy within this research, and the next section will further discuss the concept of the TCK and its significance within this study. For the section below, I revisit terminology and concepts as are

described by Pollock and Van Reken (2009), and elaborate on further research compiled for the concept of the TCK by additional theorists.

2.3 Third Culture Kids (TCKs)

Although a Third Culture Kid (TCK) may have once been or still be considered an ESL learner, this research will focus more on acquisition of cultural identity rather than acquisition of the English language. A TCK student within this study may or may not have English as their first language. The differentiation between an ESL learner and TCK is essential to the understanding of this research. The two terms will not be considered interchangeable, although it is possible that a TCK that was once an ESL learner may find it more difficult to negotiate cultural identity if the culture of their first language is very different from Anglo-Western culture. The term TCK regards issues of cultural identity, in which language is considered to be one of many factors that influence cultural capital and comprise one's primary cultural identity. It is not the literal acquisition of English as a second language that is the focus for this research; however, the ability to speak English does hold sociological power as a global *lingua franca*. The English language, therefore, is a part of a sociocultural discourse believed to hold significance and power within global society and, thus, serves as a social artifact to be considered in this research as a form of capital.

The following sections will also discuss the importance of postcolonial theory to this research, as one must consider that it is not by chance that English (along with other colonial languages such as French and Spanish) has become a global language, and this concept may influence TCKs, whose primary culture is

not Anglo-Western, to find more difficulty negotiating their home culture while attending a Western international school. As stated in the introduction chapter, chapter 1, Pollock and Van Reken (2009) define the international school as “any school that has students from various countries, and whose primary curriculum is different from the one used by the national schools of the host country” (p. 209).

Frail (1995) adds to this definition by suggesting that

[i]t may well be that many schools overseas consider themselves and indeed call themselves international yet never consider that while teaching an international curriculum to a group of students from many different nationalities, the teaching faculty is 95 percent British or American and inevitably they perpetuate certain national and cultural values. (p. 8)

Within the context of this research, a Western international school is a school that offers a Western curriculum outside of the host country, and is a school whose staff is primarily Western cultured and who are expatriates within the host country of the school. When Western cultured educators do not consider the implications of offering curriculum that differs from than their students’ national country, the experience students have in school has the potential to be symbolically violent. In order to provide more socially just education in Western international schools who cater to students of non-Western primary cultures, educators within the school must be intentionally aware of the role that a Western education plays in competition for students of non-Western home cultures. It should not be ‘a given’, or a natural assumption, that obtaining a Western education will be easy for students of non-Western primary cultures, and educators should be intentional about helping their students through the exposure to Western culture so that this exposure does not destroy or replace students’ cultures of home.

As mentioned previously, TCK identity is influenced by two or more cultures during adolescence. The third culture may be comprised of more than two combined cultures. A common question regarding the term ‘third’ culture is often that, in an ever growing globalized world, an individual may have *more* than two influencing cultures. Therefore, how can an individual with three or more influencing cultures be considered to have a ‘third’ culture when the individual is influenced by more than three cultures? This perception of ‘third’ culture, however, is a slight misconception of what the term, ‘third culture kid’, refers to. For the purpose of this research a third culture will refer to the hybrid culture of two *or more* influencing cultures. If a third cultured individual is influenced by more than two cultures, it is highly likely that he or she will have one primary culture, and two or more secondary cultures, all of which add to their interstitial cultural field (Bourdieu, 1993). The third culture, essentially, is an ‘in-between’ culture; sometimes a person with a ‘third culture’ can pick and choose the elements of each culture that they will bring into their third dimension cultural identity.

According to Pollock and Van Reken (2009), a TCK is defined as:

A person who has spent part of his or her developmental years outside the parents’ culture. The TCK frequently builds relationships to all of the cultures, while not having full ownership in any. Although elements from each culture may be assimilated into the TCK’s life experience, the sense of belonging is in relationship to others of similar background. (p. 13)

Pollock and Van Reken (2009) also clarify that the term, third culture kids, is sometimes misunderstood as referring to a child who has grown up in the third world, and while this may be true for some TCKs, there is no specific relationship

between third culture and third world (p. 14). As discussed previously, the *third culture* refers to the negotiated culture between primary and secondary cultures; this third culture has also been termed the *interstitial culture* (p. 14). Over time, the term TCK has changed as there is a blurring of lines between primary and secondary cultures. In the early days of this term (coined in the 1950s by Ruth Hill Useem) the third culture kid was one who typically lived in compounds established through their parents' work (often that of foreign service, military, missions, or corporate business), but the compound living is no longer the case for many TCKs. Additionally, TCKs could now be of any primary culture, whereas, the original TCK was more typically of Western culture (Pollock and Van Reken, 2009). With the blurring of lines for *third-culturedness*, so comes the blurring of lines for who counts as a TCK.

TCKs who may have been, more conventionally, labeled as bicultural, can justifiably be included within the TCK community due to the fact that sociological and anthropological cultural contexts in which people live are continually in a state of flux. According to Hill Useem (1994), generically, third culture can be considered as the cultural lifestyle “created, shared, and learned” between people and their primary and secondary cultures (personal communication with David C. Pollock , as cited by Pollock and Van Reken, 2009, p. 16). Pollock and Van Reken (2009) make this very important distinction:

These larger definitions are justifiable because of culture in its broadest sense is a way of life shared with others, there's no question that, in spite of their differences, TCKs of all stripes and persuasions from countless countries share remarkably important and similar life experiences through the very process of living in, and among, different cultures – whether or not they grew up in a specific local expatriate community. (p. 16).

This distinction is significant to my research because much past research tends to be either about conventional TCKs, bicultural students, or biracial students. Fewer studies have been done that also include students whose secondary culture of school presents itself as the host secondary culture. At the research site for this study, many TCKs of non-Western primary culture acquire secondary culture through their experience at the school. The school is not a dual-language school, and although some TCKs may be bilingual, biracial, or bicultural, the intent of this study is to explore how individuals whose primary culture is non-Western negotiate an Anglo-Western secondary culture into their identity to better understand this process.

Sometimes, a TCK will experience a cultural identity conflict because of a feeling of not fully belonging to either first or second cultures. Questions such as, ‘where are you from?’ may be particularly difficult for third cultured individuals to answer because of the multifaceted way in which they identify with more than one culture. A great example of this can be found in a short documentary, produced by the TCKid Organization, in which adult TCKs share their experiences of difficulty finding a sense of home and belonging to one place (Magdalen, 2010). The TCKs interviewed express their difficulty to talk with others about where they are from, and also share their experiences trying to fit in and find belonging, particularly when in non-TCK environments. The participants in this short film documentary explains the impact that being a TCK has had on the development of their sense of identity, as well as the potential for feelings of

alienation, loneliness, or depression due to identity negotiation issues associated with being a TCK.

Due to their vulnerable stage of cognitive development, youth are often more at-risk of feeling culturally displaced. Third cultured youth may feel as though they are ‘accused’ by family members, friends, or acquaintances, who identify with the primary home culture (or culture of their parents’ country of passport), of being disloyal to their home country culture or first language. However, what is perceived as disloyalty may actually be “less of a matter of confused loyalty than a deep understanding of the complexity of the human condition” (Schaetti, 2015, p. 5) due to the fact that TCKs often have higher potential to develop intercultural competence than those who have more monoculture life experiences. According to Valenzuela (1999), students whose culture at school differs from that at home may experience either an additive outcome or a subtractive outcome. An additive outcome is one that helps students obtain a sense of biculturalism, and a subtractive outcome is one in which the student is not equipped to fully function in either primary or secondary cultures (Valenzuela, 1999).

The ability for an individual to have a culturally additive experience strongly depends upon the level of cultural competence they can obtain. According to identity negotiation theory, *identity* “refers to an individual’s multifaceted identities of culture, ethnicity, religion, social class, gender, sexual orientation, profession, family/relational role, personal images(s) based on self-reflection and other-categorization social constructionist processes” and

negotiation is the “verbal and nonverbal messages between two or more communicators in maintaining, threatening, or uplifting the various sociocultural group-based or unique personal identity images of the other in situ” (Ting-Toomey, 2015, p. 2). A third cultured individual must negotiate many things, such as ethnicity, religion, social class, gender, sexual orientation, and culture. TCKs with a higher spectrum of intercultural competence may experience more culturally additive outcomes, thus achieving more salient cultural. Identity negotiation theory assumes that all individuals desire positive identity affirmation and that intercultural identity-based knowledge and mindfulness, and that “satisfactory identity negotiation outcomes include the feeling of being understood, respected, and affirmatively valued” (Ting-Toomey, 2015, p. 4). Third culture kids with a high sense of intercultural competence and cultural identity satisfaction tend to demonstrate an ability to lean more towards ethnorelativism rather than ethnocentrism (Ting-Toomey, 2015).

One problematic result from unresolved feelings of cultural displacement may create a “feeling or perception of abandonment by both cultures” and the individual feels somewhat like a “psychological refugee” (Bressler, 2007, p. 241). According to McKenzie (2006), normalized “practices, such as language use, traditions of family and culture, and institutions such as school and media” have “different degrees of authority, with dominant discourses appearing natural or true” (p. 200). One’s discursive ability is his or her ability to transition between two or more cultural discourses, or cultural modes of communication. In this sense, a student’s cultural discourse and discursive ability is their ability to show

cultural belonging to their primary and secondary cultures through the way they understand that they must use different cultural styles of communication.

McKenzie (2006) suggests to engage, examine, and (un)make “one’s own discursive constitution, as well as that of one’s education, and surrounding media and culture(s)” comes into a key role, because this challenge of normative stereotypes has “the possibility of working within that constitution to effect desirable change” (p. 219). Essentially, what this means is that a person, who finds that multiple cultures create personal conflict in the way they must communicate and behave in order to fit into each culture successfully, can raise questions regarding the cultural conflicts that they experience. When the individual raises questions about how and why they experience conflicts of cultural communication and behaviour, they are better able to understand the nuances between what each culture expects of them in order to belong; it is this reflexive process that allows them to “unmake”, or deconstruct, conflicting cultural expectations they experience in order to better understand the conflict (McKenzie, 2006).

TCKs often struggle with the feeling of being caught between two (or more) different cultural identities of their primary and secondary cultures, however, through an (un)making of “discursive constitution”, students can rebuild inclusive cultural identities (McKenzie, 2006, p. 219). (Un)made discursive cultural constitution can move forward into inclusive reconstruction to connect with the multiple cultures of influence; this allows “the possibility of working within that constitution to effect desirable change” (McKenzie, 2006, p. 219).

Through this (un)making students can validate their cultural identity as a viable, valuable, and complex negotiation of cultural discourses. Instead of being cultural refugees, feeling stuck in cultural *no man's land*, a TCK can re-create a new identity as a celebrated, complicated, and complex mix of culturally dynamic discourses. Students can acknowledge the cultural rules of power dynamics that are at play, but could decide how they want to play by them. Cultural autonomy would not depend on conforming with hegemonic views, but could validate and utilize diversity as empowering capital within a culturally competent framework of discourse.

A student whose primary home culture is Thai may not learn this same kind of academic discourse at home. They, rather, may be taught the value of studying math or science content areas, which often includes the memorization of terms and concepts in order to apply to logical sequencing of equations. Expectations of home often value academic GPA success over the ability to have an independent interpretation of a subjective text. Such a student may have the certain cultures of academic discourses necessary to succeed in academic fields such as Medicine or Business, and may have an easier transition into these academic classrooms at school than they experience in their Humanities classes. This is not to say that Anglo-Western academics do not also value and promote the discourses necessary to operate in Math, Science, and Business nor is this to say that there are not strong connections between Math, Science, Business, and Literature, but, a student whose primary culture has greater promotion of the discourses (communication, behaviour, ways of thinking) necessary for success in

one area of knowledge over another may find they need greater support within a secondary academic discourse that does not couple that of their primary discourse of home. Therefore, educational practices provided for TCK students in international schools should be further considered.

2.4 Educational Practice

Teachers need to recognize potentially oppressive hegemonic cultural norms behind literacy and discourse because the notion of power is strongly connected to the mastery of a particular discourse. Discourse, as a means to communicate and operate within particular cultural systems, is tied to the forms of cultural and linguistic capitals that direct modes of discourses. In order to operate within a cultural norm, one must acquire the necessary discourses from which to communicate and interpret their experience within that environment. When educators are teaching TCK students, they must realize that a TCK may be prone to a sense of cultural displacement which could, without the necessary scaffolding and support, challenge their ability to fully operate within one cultural norm. When teaching the discourses necessary to function within hegemonic global cultures, educators in international schools are in a prime location to help TCK students develop a greater sense of cultural saliency; this requires intentionality on behalf of the teacher, and the ability to think reflectively upon the cultural contexts influencing the valuing of discourses taught to students. To raise questions about which forms of culture and society are being promoted in the classroom, and for what reason some forms of culture are promoted, albeit sometimes unintentionally, should be an essential aspect of the international

school as the discourses that connect with hegemonic cultural norms tend to designate more power to some cultures than others.

School curricula often follows cultural norms of the country in which the curriculum is developed, therefore, when curricula are taken from one country and applied to a school in another (for example, using American standards and curriculum in international schools not located in the United States), these cultural norms within the curricula should be considered and questioned. It is through potential linguistic and sociocultural imperialism that curricula represent cultural codes of mainstream groups. Eurocentric curricula, which is often experienced throughout primary and secondary schools, reflect individuals with “access to resources” and “institutionalized privilege and power” (Mullaly, 2010, p. 197).

Sociocultural imperialism relates to what Boldt (2006) says about education perspectives on literacy being “naturalized and privileged”:

The perspectives... hide the way that systemic racism and classism, expressed through the curriculum, standardized testing, and teachers’ unconscious and conscious attitudes, create conditions by which it is more difficult for some children than others to become successful readers and to identify with reading. (p. 281)

Sociocultural imperialism and literacy correlate because “learning styles, and behavioural norms, and sanctions against the use of nonstandard English acts as a powerful form of symbolic violence (Carrington, 2001, p. 270). Symbolic violence establishes oppression because “the dominant group universalizes its experience and culture and uses them as the norm” and “reinforces” ideals, stereotypes, and societal expectations (Mullaly, 2010, p. 59). There is no universal

student identity, and it is ironic that literacy education implies this through standardization.

Sleeter and Stillman (2005) discuss social power structures in school curriculum, suggesting that “knowledge derived from students’ experience[es] is subordinated to school knowledge” (p. 259). Legitimacy given to dominant discourse is often normalized and reinforced by inarticulate “rhetoric of science” (Sleeter & Stillman, 2005, p. 263). It becomes important to reassert “whose knowledge has most legitimacy” (p. 266). Reflection on possible oppressive power structures in inherently taught dominant discourse becomes increasingly important to global and cultural citizens in a cosmopolitan society.

Context matters - as a textual form, curriculum stems from social and cultural contexts (among others), and this is influential to the meaning-making process behind how and why a curriculum exists (Greene, 1971). To understand curriculum not as an objective item in “relative isolation”, but as a starting point from a contextual perspective, received and translated by a “reader” within another contextual perspective (Greene, 1971, p. 127). In an article discussing aesthetic education, Greene (2011) discusses the idea of “turning our attention to additional possibilities of meaning, perhaps to multiple realities” (p. 2). This idea targets benefits of student-centered teaching methods that value contextual perspective of students. In *Curriculum and Consciousness*, Greene (1971) uses metaphor to analyze how outsiders to a foreign city are like learners to new knowledge - in this metaphor she discusses reorientation of learner consciousness. In *Releasing the Imagination*, Greene (2011) identifies that thinking in metaphor

is valuable, because it helps to “reorient consciousness, to make us see differently, to give us an unexpected perspective of what lies around” (p. 2).

The hidden curriculum includes political and sociological ideologies present within the everyday of the classroom, often occurring in the smallest, yet seemingly normal events. Classroom settings includes large groups of people, who are “potential recipients of praise and reproof”, and constantly subject the power of “institutional authorities” (Jackson, 1990, p. 122). The hidden curriculum enforces a subliminal expectation that students become passively obedient to the conformity of normative school expectations for how to behave and communicate *properly*. The hidden curriculum occurs in many ways in day-to-day classroom routines, and to identify the hidden curriculum, one must first identify possible political and sociological power-plays at hand. The problem is that the hidden curriculum and the official curriculum create an odd and resistant polar dichotomy: how can the official curriculum promote critical thinkers, who by nature are argumentative, whereas, the hidden curriculum promotes passively obedient, non-confrontational learners? Students who question school rules are often seen as being defiant, although they may be exercising critical thinking skills (Boldt, 2006). There is a need, as Jackson (1990) reflects, to find balance between the official and the hidden expectations; however, as educators, we cannot do this until we admit to and seek to understand that which is hidden.

Mullaly (2010) distinguishes between “power” and “oppressive power”, a necessary clarification for teachers who, by definition, are in a position of authority: what determines oppression is when a person is blocked from

opportunities to self-development, is excluded from full participation in society, does not have certain rights that the dominant group takes for granted, or is assigned a second-class citizenship, not because of individual talent, merit, or failure, but because of his or her membership in a particular group or category of people” (p.40). As teachers interact with diverse student cultural identities, they must question whose cultural ideals are woven within the building blocks of curriculum, and reflect on how students’ differing discourses are relative to personal beliefs or cultural capital educators hold or subtly favour.

When educators do not think critically about which cultural discourses school curricula reinforce, emphasis on cultural capital, which hegemonic fields deem more valuable, continues to promote an assumption that less hegemonic social fields are not as valuable. TCK students whose home culture is non-Western may experience challenges if a Western international school promotes cultural identities and/or norms dependent only upon Western culture (as a globally hegemonic culture). Postcolonial theorists often interpret the valuing of Western modes of discourse in curricula taught in Western international schools as a form of control over the Orient. According to Makhdoom and Awan, (2014), “the current usage and impositions of English language and literature in most global institutions re-establish colonial relations (or hegemonies)” (p. 414). Said (1994) reflects on how academic texts produced by the Occident (the West) portray non-Western cultures, the Orient, as exterior – that “Orientalism is premised upon exteriority, that is, on the fact that the Orientalist, poet or scholar, makes the Orient speak, describes the Orient, renders its mysteries plain for and to

the West” (p. 21). Wa Thiong’o (1986), reflecting on his own childhood in a Western school located in Kenya, says that

any achievement in spoken or written English was highly rewarded; prizes, prestige, applause; the ticket to higher realms. English became the measure of intelligence and ability in the arts, the sciences, and all other branches of learning. English became the main determinant of a child’s progress up the ladder of formal education... Literacy education was now determined by the dominant language while also reinforcing that dominance. (p. 287)

Wa Thiong’o’s (1986) words closely echo those of Achebe (1997): “Is it right that a man should abandon his mother tongue for someone else’s? It looks like a dreadful betrayal and produces a guilty feeling” (p. 348). Although Wa Thiong’o and Achebe arrive at different conclusions, they both indicate that one’s first language is important to their identity negotiation between cultures. Language and literacy are closely tied to which language is socially perceived to hold more linguistic power within hegemonic culture, and it is difficult to separate the teaching of language and culture from political motivation and dominance. It is important to consider, however, that when reflecting on educational practices that best serve the TCK student, educators should be wary of seeking a culturally utopian perspective that superficially idealizes interculturalism.

2.4.1 Counterproductive Culturally Utopian Ideals

Tate (2012) indicates that “[i]nternational education emerged out of idealism”, hoping to “contribute to the making of a better world” (p. 211). Although educators want students to be socially active participants with positive ideals for the future, “[t]here is a danger... in the West, where international education has its origins, that this idealism slips into utopianism” (p. 213). As

teachers become aware of the implications of culturally coded hidden curricula, it may be tempting to promote cultural utopia as an attainable end goal and to aim to solve all cultural conflicts (Collette, 2016).

A utopian viewpoint becomes problematic when educators promote overly simplistic perspectives of the world, where “diversity” is an ostensible, generalized cultural buffet. Immediate remedies towards cultural resilience, such as an annual ‘multicultural day’, or ‘international food day’ may actually serve as a *cultural Band-Aid* through superficial celebration of interculturalism that masks the conflicts of students’ cultural identities and feelings of displacement. As a result, cultural generalization unintentionally occurs out of the idealization of cultural utopia, creating a normative standard by which all cultures are uniformly and destructively measured (Carrington, 2001). This surface level remedy does not assist TCK students to sustainably cope with and work through personal cultural conflict.

Chan (2006) reminds us that not only educators, but also students and parents have their own “cultures, shaped by the cultural and social narratives unique to their own situations” (p. 311). For educators, Tate (2012) questions, “how much of our discourse and how many of our ideas were to a large extent determined by the social, cultural, political and ideological context in which we lived” (p. 216). To what extent do we, as educators, fall back on ‘what we know’? This can particularly occur for international school teachers, who often move to new locations and need to work through the stress of changing countries. Often when we, as humans, feel stressed by change we cope by relying on what we

know – for educators this may come in the form of curricula we have ‘always taught’. The hidden curriculum, as previously discussed, makes reflections on cultural teaching practices and pedagogy important, especially when they are used to ‘fall back on’.

As teachers practice authentic awareness of personal contexts and cultural ideology, they gain better ability to identify how students’ cultural discourses play a highly complex role in classrooms. If successful cultural negotiation of resources in education is to be attained, it requires reciprocal and equitable efforts from multiple stakeholders involved; dominant cultural groups cannot expect marginalized groups to endure a cultural metamorphosis transforming them into a homogeneous, *perfect* cultural cosmos while denying primary cultural identity (Gee, 1989; Appiah, 2007). Cultural identity empowerment, therefore, is central to curricula, and significant to the experience of TCK youth.

2.4.2 Cultural Identity Empowerment

A more socially just curriculum attempts to limit socio-political marginalization of diverse groups through “legitimize[ing] multiple models of excellence” (Noddings, as cited by Greene, 1971, p. 146). If executed through meaningful and reflective pedagogy, teachers and students can “break through and even disrupt surface equilibrium and uniformity”, not “[replace] one domination by another”, but to “[enrich] our understanding not only of our own culture, but of ourselves” (Greene, 1993, p. 15). Cultural saliency, through the relationship of primary and secondary discourses, is essential to the legitimacy

and empowerment of minority primary cultural identity as well as one's ability to gain access to the benefits of other globally hegemonic cultural identities.

Past researchers have often “contrasted positive outcomes for ethnic and racial minorities with those of ‘healthy’ white middle-class heterosexual, able-bodied populations growing up in western societies” (Ungar et al., 2007, p. 288).

Understanding successful identity negotiation in youth has focused on what hegemonic Western culture deems as valuable indicators, such as: “self-esteem, school performance, attachment to family, marriage, and civic engagement” (p. 288). Not only does this narrowly indicate cultural identity success, but it also reinforces alienating cultural factors, such as the ‘literacy myth’ previously discussed. Research for individuals of diverse cultural identities needs to more adequately understand “people’s own culturally determined indicators” (p. 288). This research intends to articulate culturally conscious indicators of TCKs cultural identity negotiation factors; it seeks to explore how TCK students at an international school in Thailand experience cultural identity negotiation; it aims to develop strategies for TCKs and educators of TCKs to maintain family culture while also benefiting from exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school. Findings of this site specific research may not transfer into other culturally diverse contexts; therefore, it is possible that the strategies for cultural identity negotiation in the context of this study may not fully translate to other contexts. However, the experiences of TCKs whose primary cultures are non-Western will still be of interest and provide insight for Western educators who teach at international schools in non-Western countries.

Educators must explore, and unpack the multiple cultures present in international classroom contexts. Greene (1993) says, “[t]o open up our experience (and, yes, our curricula) to essential possibilities of multiple kinds is to extend and deepen what we think of when we speak of community” (p. 15). Reflective teaching practices will assist educators’ accountability when determining the most effective approaches towards empowering TCK cultural identity in the context of their school. Meaningful strategies both question *and* create access to power dynamics of cultural capital in classroom practices. Individuals should value their culture but it should “never be absolutized”, because that would also devalue openness to multiple cultural identities (Freire, as cited by Greene, 1993, p. 16).

An emancipatory approach, which aims to assist TCKs of more globally marginal primary cultures, should consider the notion that the nature of *emancipation* depends greatly upon the cultural value system of those empowered. Strategies for students’ cultural identity empowerment are contextual and outcomes are strongly influenced by social institutions, such as schools, to provide effective resources to meet the needs of culturally marginalized students (Ungar et al., 2007). It is important to consider international schools as the meeting point for potential TCK cultural displacement and, thus, the location where resources to empower cultural identity negotiation success are most importantly provided.

Educational practice in international schools that offer Western curriculum different from that of the host country should consider the role of Orientalism,

symbolic capital, symbolic power, marginalized and dominant discourse within official and hidden curriculum. Issues of literacy education, specifically with the instruction of and value placed on the English language should be approached through intentional reflection as Western teachers may have a bias towards the favouring of the English language, which can obstruct the cultural identity negotiation process of TCK students. Cultural identity empowerment is central to creating spaces for TCK students to negotiate the hybridity of their cultural identities.

2.5 Review of Other Related Studies

The following sections will discuss studies similar to my own and show how my own research will contribute. Ethnographies discussed will include studies of: ESL students living in Western countries, students of immigrant status or students of immigrant parents, primary school international students, international schools in Asia primarily include research located in East Asia, typically China, Japan, Hong Kong, and South Korea, dual language international schools, and TCKs whose first culture is Western. I first begin with a discussion of D'warte's (2015) ethnography.

2.5.1 Ethnography of ESLs/ELLs and Students of Immigrant Status

Many past ethnographic studies of international students of non-Western home cultures focus on students of immigrant families living in a Western country, and the research site of these studies is often that of public schools. D'warte (2015) conducted one such linguistic ethnography in year 7 and 8 classrooms. D'warte (2015) indicates that "Australian teachers are increasingly

working in complex multicultural, multilingual classrooms, where significant numbers of students are English language learners” (p. 39). Much research in the area of linguistic diversity focuses on a growing percentage of English Language Learners (ELLs) within classrooms that, at one point in time, used to be more ethnically, linguistically, and culturally homogeneous. This kind of research is similar to that of my own as it questions how educators can empower students’ cultures and languages of home, while still giving them access to the cultures and languages of school; however, ELLs of immigrant families who attend public schools in Western cultured countries have differing needs in regards to negotiating cultural identity between home and school. D’warte’s (2015) identifies that such schools are “slow to recognize the complexity of language/s and literacies across all domains of students’ lives” (p. 39). The research site school of this study, however, is not slow to recognize the complexity of multiple languages students possesses, since over ninety percent of the entire school population are ELL learners, and in fact, all teachers are required to complete course training in how to assist and scaffold for ELL students. ELL student profiles are central to the workings of my research site, and although recognition of language identity complexity strongly exists, continuing strategies for empowerment of home cultures that are non-Western and are predominantly of Asian cultures is a desired area of knowledge and growth for many of the educators at the site.

2.5.2 Ethnographies of Asian International School Students

While many ethnographies of culturally diverse students pertain to ELL students of immigrant families living in Western-cultured countries, such as Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada, many ethnographies of linguistic and cultural identity issues in Asian international schools often pertain to schools in East Asia, typically China, Japan, Hong Kong, and South Korea; whereas there are fewer studies located in Southeast Asia.

Deveney's (2005) research is one study that does focus on Thai students attending an international school in Thailand, and investigates how Thai culture influences Thai students' experiences in the classroom. However, the investigation focuses mainly on how students behave in class in contrast to how Western students would normally behave in class, and intends to explore how "[c]ultural differences can manifest themselves in any classroom where there are children, or teachers, of different cultural backgrounds" (p. 155). Deveney (2005) suggests that "[t]his might explain why, when trying to function in an unfamiliar cultural context, some teachers experience a 'de-skilling': lessons that worked before [that] no longer seem effective" (p. 155). Deveney (2005) discusses how Thai cultural norms for student behaviour create cultural differences between Thai students and their Western teachers, and the study more heavily includes data from Western and Thai teachers in order to explore this concept. Although data from students is collected, there is a lesser focus on student data than on the data collected from teachers and staff. My research is different in two key areas: the first is that I do not focus on the experience of teachers and staff when discussing cultural differences, and the second is that I do not collect data from teachers and

staff. Instead, my research focuses only on the experience of students, themselves, who negotiate cultures, and I only collect data from these student participants. Additionally, Deveney (2005) questions whether or not Thai international students could be “likened to ‘third culture kids’” (p. 161), and suggests that “such students might even find themselves in a ‘fourth culture’ – one that is not their home system, not a foreign system in a foreign land and not an international school abroad, but an international school in home country” (p. 161). My own research denies the concept of a fourth culture, and aims to define the ‘third culture’ as the in-between culture of any and all different cultures an individual negotiates into their identity. I have discussed the terminology of the TCK in section 1.1, Terminology and Considerations, where the term “*Domestic TCKs*” (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 31-32) is considered to have more clarity than a ‘fourth culture kid’. I also question the extent to which semantics used to describe the experience of non-Western TCKs may be Amerocentric, particularly with the word ‘kid’, and this notion is not discussed in Deveney’s (2005) study.

Moreover, studies, such as that of Liu (2018), for example, research public-international schools in China and how private school curricula benefits students of higher economic status while disadvantaging students of lower economic status. This study explores concepts related to how Chinese international school students are prepared for greater access to Western universities and how international school curriculum is related to what is considered future academic success. Although my research will touch on how international school curriculum is believed to provide access to future success, it

is more specific to the cultural identity negotiation of non-Western TCK students than to a focus on economic divisions between private and public schools in Thailand. Research in diverse cultural identity of students attending schools in Asia tend to have geographic research sites located in Australia and China, and I found no studies conducted at research sites located in Thailand. My research, therefore, will provide more insight on Thai international schools, and perhaps more insight on international schools in surrounding Southeast Asian countries.

Other studies of private or government international schools extend to participants that are of refugee status, and many of these studies, such as that of Solano-Campos (2017) and Birman and Tran (2017) focus on elementary age students. It is possible that these age categories are selected because students who fall within these categories are at a high level of risk: the former being young and at a crucial time of cognitive development, and the latter attending university at a crucial time of career path development. Still, the needs of these age categories and of refugee status students differs from the ideal-type participant of my research. My participants are not of refugee status, therefore, the ways in which cultural identity negotiation and their potential levels of successful cultural experiences in school will differ from that of a younger or older student of refugee status.

Birman and Tran (2017) identify that teachers of their student-refugee participants tended to take on one of two attitudes towards acculturation – that “characterized as ‘assimilationist’ (requiring students to conform to U.S. culture and school rules) or ‘multicultural’ (respecting and accepting the students

expressing their heritage culture at the school)” (p. 132). Most teachers at the research site school have taught in multiple overseas placements, and it is typical of the international school teacher to continue teaching in international schools due to the value of experiencing other cultures and valuing other cultural ways of being. Some educators at the research site would align more with Birman and Tran’s (2017) identifier as possessing a “multicultural” attitude towards acculturation; however, many of the secondary teachers at the school also teach courses within the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme and the mission statement of this programme suggests the term intercultural instead of multicultural (IBO, 2013).

Marie-Thérèse Maurette (1948), French educationalist and international school pioneer, was of the mindset that education could be the key to a more peaceful future and world. She published a handbook, in conjunction with the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), titled *Educational Techniques for Peace. Do They Exist?* Maurette (1948) discusses the need for education to address cultural interrelations on a scholarly level, as a method for future generations to gain the perspective needed to decrease, what Said (1978) would later call “otherness”. Maurette’s (1948) handbook serves as a precursor for the International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum, established in 1968 (Tate, 2012). Following World War II, IB held a “strong focus on respect for others’ national identity, inter-nationalism and the means to ensure peace between nations”; although this remains true, the programme now places emphasis on “‘intercultural understanding’” in a world

that becomes growingly multicultural (Tate, 2012, p. 207). The IB mission statement highlights the development of “inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect” (IBO, 2013, p. 175). The aim of the programme is to “develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world” (IBO, 2013, p. 175).

As the IB curriculum aims to establish greater intercultural understanding (IBO, 2013), teachers of IB courses within the research site may align with the semantics of an intercultural attitude rather than a multicultural attitude towards acculturation. Much of past research uses the term ‘multiculturalism’, such as the previously mentioned research of Birman and Tran (2017), however, this research will align more with the semantically important prefix, “inter”, due to the belief that in order to empower diverse cultural identities of students, educators must acknowledge not only the fact that there are many cultures present, but also that when a student possesses more than one culture between home and school, they must find a way to inter-negotiate those cultures. I do not believe there is anything inherently wrong with Birman and Tran’s (2017) term of a multicultural view towards acculturation, but I think it does not capture the full ethos of the research site for this study or for schools that promote the IB Diploma Programme.

Although there are differences in research site and participant identity, Birman and Tran’s (2017) study also sought out strategies that teachers used to support and scaffold for students of diverse cultural identities, albeit, their

research considers how to academically support said students' academic success, whereas the purpose of this research is to support the success of cultural identity negotiation. Birman and Tran (2017) identified three strategies they deemed as successful support strategies for refugee students: "building relationships and providing affirmation" between teacher and students; "one one one attention", and "meaningful materials" (p. 139) that contextualized students' cultural norms of home culture within new cultural norms of school. Although the research participants for my study are already academically successful, these same three strategies employed by educators of students of refugee status are also found to be meaningful strategies to use when empowering TCK students' level of successful cultural identity negotiation between home and school cultures at the research site for this study. Within this research, participants' feelings of cultural displacement were lessened when more intentional building of relationships, affirmation, attention, and meaningful culturally-relevant materials were used in classroom settings. In this research, I explore the extent to which these three strategies may be found when educators of TCK students empower their cultural identity negotiation process, and I suggest that more successful cultural identity negotiation occurs with when: rapport between teachers and participants is observed, when experiences of affirmation occurs for participants at school, and when access to culturally relevant course content materials, such as through provoking stimulus, is central to the classroom experience.

Additional research on non-refugee status international school students focuses on the negotiation of language, culture, and identity, for elementary

school children with the intent to demonstrate how concepts of internationalism are consumed by parents. An ethnography conducted by Imoto (2011) investigated the growing number of international preschools in Japan, and why parents of Japanese students desired for their children to “acquire ‘natural’ English ability” (p. 281). Imoto’s (2011) research site is that of younger school-aged children, and focuses on the parents of these children. Although this research is similar to mine in that it raises questions about how Western international schools may be seen by non-Western parents as the place of access to globally hegemonic culture, Imoto’s (2011) research again focuses on ELL issues as a forefront consideration.

Imoto (2011) is interested in why such schools are growing in popularity within non-Western countries. Although it is a phenomenon as to why such an occurrence is happening, my research will consider more so the identity factors for youth and their strategies for negotiating such identities as opposed to the phenomena of increasing international schools in non-Western countries. To reiterate, here is where I think my research is purposeful: past research tends to either focus on students of refugee status, students of younger ages, or the phenomena itself of increasing international schools, whereas, my research will focus on how students of non-Western home cultures negotiate new cultural identities, and will not focus on statistics of why such schools are growing in popularity.

2.5.3 Ethnography of Dual-Language International School

One study, conducted by Fryer (2009), also aims to “reveal the reasons for [national] students attending the [international] school, and to identify the facets of international education” (p. 213). Fryer (2009) indicates that little international school research like this has been done in Hong Kong, and I would agree that this would also be the case for Morehouse International School (the pseudonym used for the research site in this research). Fryer’s (2009) research, however, includes data from three stakeholders of the school setting: students, parents, and teachers; my research, however, focuses on student perspective and their interpretation of how their teachers help them to successfully negotiate their cultural identity.

Another difference is that the research site used in Fryer’s (2009) ethnography was labeled as a dual-language school, where Mandarin and English were supposed to be the languages used at school, with Cantonese being the majority of students’ language of home. The site of my research is not a dual-language school; however, the language (English) used to conduct academic and social interactions at school is different than the languages of home for most students. Fryer’s (2009) research aims to fulfill a void in the research in terms of parental perception of the importance and role of international schools, whereas this is not the focus for my research.

There are some similarities, however, between Fryer’s (2009) research and my own, particularly in the cultural context of students being non-Western and non-refugee status, as well as the role that intercultural mindedness plays within the school context. Students at Fryer’s (2009) research site are “national students who attend an international school”, and while this is not the case for all of my

intended participants, it is the case for the majority of students attending my research site school (p. 213). Although not all of Fryer's (2009) research questions are similar to my own, some of the research questions are quite similar in regards to "international education ethos", specifically in the following two research questions: "how successfully does the school develop in students an awareness and appreciation of Chinese artistic, literary, and cultural traditions along with those of the rest of the world, in particular, the Anglo-Western", and "Does the school successfully develop in students a strong sense of multi-cultural values, especially emphasizing the need for altruism in a global community where people of different cultures, traditions and backgrounds regularly interact?" (p. 215). Although this research has been conducted in Hong Kong, and questions pertain to cultures of Hong Kong and China, I believe these similar questions also relate to my own research and shows that a similar exploration for a school in Bangkok is be beneficial to do.

One interesting difference between Fryer's (2009) findings and the environment of my own research site is that parents at the research school site in Hong Kong were "disappointed that the students did not usually speak Mandarin socially at school, and all stakeholder groups strongly agreed that Chinese culture was under-represented in the Anglo-Western culture-dominated school" (p. 217). Given my experience of seven years working at my research site in Bangkok, I infer, given conversations with administration and school recruitment and marketing offices, that parents of students are disappointed to hear such a high frequency of Thai being spoken socially at school, as they wish to hear more

natural English fluency on a social level, outside of classroom environments in areas such as hallways, student lounges, and school cafeterias. Parents of students attending my school, however, still would like to see Thai culture valued by their children and some students feel as though they are told by parents that they are too Western by culture. Exploring this contrast between the ethos of intercultural mindedness at my research site with the related, but somewhat different, findings of Fryer (2009) would reveal meaningful information to add to the research in intercultural issues of international schools.

Fryer's (2009) research also suggests that educators of international schools, like the research site in Hong Kong, feel as though interplay between home and school languages (Cantonese and English) influences language success in school – if the home language is Cantonese only, it limits the ability to achieve dual-language (Mandarin-English) goals at school, but when the home language (Cantonese) is not included at school intercultural mindedness is lacking and this “perhaps implies to the students that the host language and culture is somehow inferior” to English and Anglo-Western culture (p. 218). The question of how to provide access to cultures at school while also empowering the cultures of home is an area that still remains unclear to many international school teachers, thus is an important area for further research and exploration. Another possible parallel between Fryer's (2009) research site and that of my own is in regards to how educators perceive the level of cultural diversity at the school as being low, whereas, parents perceived the level of cultural diversity as being high. Fryer (2009) suggested that these perceptions were based in differing contexts:

educators referenced the student body population when considering how culturally diverse the school was, but parents referenced the level of cultural diversity in the teaching faculty to determine a high amount of cultural diversity present at the school; this brings to question what ‘international’ means and how it is determined relative to the way in which cultural identities between home and school interact, and is therefore, essential to the future study of international schools experiences similar conditions of intercultural complexity.

2.5.4 Ethnography of Third Culture Kids

In this section, I discuss research of third culture kids, and this will be the last section of this chapter, chapter 2, before I end with the conclusion for this chapter. Now, I discuss research on third culture kids. A third culture theoretical frame is more inclusive of the complexity of cultural identity negotiation that participants at this research site must undergo. A bicultural frame or a biracial frame would place focus on how the student negotiates the parental cultures of home, but would not address how individuals (who may or may not be biracial or bicultural) experience cultural identity negotiation due to the interstitial cultures between primary culture at home and secondary Anglo-Western culture at school. Research that *is* similar to mine in purpose tends to be different in its definition of TCK students’ cultural identity. TCK research often focuses on Western expatriate students, and how students with Western primary home cultures must learn to negotiate non-Western cultures into their identity; the purpose of this research is to understand more about this process for students of non-Western primary home cultures.

Past ethnographies, such as Hopkin's (2015), of TCKs tend to align more frequently with a conventional frame of third culture kids who have obtained culture due to geographic relocation, whereas this study will extend the term TCK to also include Anglo-Western culture at an international school serves as a form of secondary culture (host culture) for students with differing first culture(s) (home culture). For example, a Thai student whose parents are both Thai, but who has attended the school for an extended period of time would acquire Anglo-Western culture as a secondary "host culture", but this student would not be considered biracial. The following will discuss examples of such ethnographies in order to identify arguments as to why this ethnographic study will add to the research in cultural identity negotiation.

Hopkin's (2015) autoethnographic study explores his own experience as a TCK growing up and living in West Africa, and the feelings of cultural displacement when returning home. Within this research, Hopkin's (2015) identifies his own struggle with belonging after returning to the United States, and indicates that he felt, as described by Hoersting and Jenkins (2011), like he was "suspended between cultures" (p. 20). This concept is also true of less conventional TCKs, and this research aims to give voice to the experience one feels when returning home and feeling culturally suspended, even when home is within the same nation as the international school. To feel culturally displaced in one's own country is the vein of the TCK narrative this study explores, which differs from TCK research like Hopkin's (2015).

Fanning and Burns (2017) suggest that the conventional TCK concept often is used to describe cultural binaries, but that this binary may not acknowledge the complexities of how hegemonic culture influences identity for non-Western cultured youth. Although the term, third culture kid, “continues to touch the intangible qualities of disrupted education, adjustment and cultural displacement, seeing both advantages and disadvantages” of this, it, perhaps, is “framed in the vernacular of mid-twentieth century binaries of West vs Rest” (p. 148). As more conventional research of TCKs focuses on Western culture as the primary culture, and the fact that the term uses a very Amerocentric colloquialism, “kids”, one can see the possibility of what Fanning & Burns (2017) suggest here in regards to Western geo-political self-centeredness with this term. It is for this reason, that I feel strongly that research in non-Western primary identities is essential, with emphasis placed on the need to help students of such identities gain access to both non-Western home and Western school culture, without having hegemonic domination of the latter over the former. I propose research that attempts to explore a more intertextual field (Bourdieu 1993) of cultural inter-hybridity to question assumptions that a TCK must reference a cultural “non-ness” (Fanning & Burns, 2017) in order to suggest that there is validity to empowering cultural identity negotiation through an intercultural (and paradoxical) both-ness. Here is where the terms bicultural and biracial can also only go so far as to depict the complex cultural experience of, perhaps, what we should consider a working definition of the third culture kid. The extent to which

understanding culture and race in these two forms may oversimplify the complex culturally belonging that a TCK negotiates into their identity.

Fanning & Burns (2017) theorize that cultural identity is “not a simplistic migratory or cultural dialect, but interaction that is substantive on its own terms; not merely interstitial to the larger powers” (p. 150). Fanning & Burns (2017) suggest the term “liminal” as an alternative to interstitial, and perhaps the connotation of *liminal* is, indeed, more appropriate to consider issues of intercultural identity empowerment. To have a liminal belonging to cultures connotatively suggests that one can occupy both or all sides of cultural boundaries simultaneously, hence, empowering access to the benefits of both. To have an interstitial belonging to cultures, however, suggest that one can only occupy the intersected spaces between cultures, therefore, not fully belonging to any culture until moving fully into one or the other. Perhaps a more perceptive way to research third culture kids would be to consider the possibility of them being culturally liminal as opposed to culturally interstitial.

Perhaps one method to further understanding the complexity of non-Western TCKs who may not fit more conventional interstitial implications is through furthering training in cultural competency; Fanning and Burns (2017) suggest that “education systems and teachers need training in cultural competency” and this study aids in furthering this kind of training (p. 157). There is a need for further consideration of research in TCK theory, to consider research that has “no need for a discourse of retreat ‘back’ to normality, or a non-space in between. Instead, questions of centre and periphery are surfaced and addressed in

ways that challenge conventional views of dominant societies” (Fanning & Burns, 2017, p. 160). It is for this reason that I believe my research is necessary to the field of TCK theory as it will expand and reconsider subtle nuances of cultural identity negotiation and aims to find empowering strategies for TCK youth through the questioning of hegemonic value placed on Anglocentric frames of thought more conventionally used to understand and assist identity negotiation of those often described as being third culture kids. In this last section on past research, I discussed research of third culture kids, and in the next section, I will provide an overall conclusion for this chapter, chapter 2, the literature review.

2.6 Chapter Summary

The purpose of the critical ethnographic approach to this research is to explore how Third Culture Kids (TCK) experience cultural identity negotiation through their exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school. One cannot deny that the cultural identity negotiation process, for youth who straddle non-Western home cultures with Anglo-Western school cultures, is extremely complex. Students whose culture at school differs from that at home may experience either an additive outcome or a subtractive outcome.

Cultural capital plays a significant role for TCKs whose primary culture is non-Western and who attend an Anglo-Western cultured school, as the English language pervades globalized society and often places English and its cultures in a hegemonic position. Literacy coincides with this hegemonic position as literacy is a culturally coded process that values certain kinds of Western-cultured literate forms over others. In this study, primary discourse refers to cultural aspects of an

individual's initial acquired cultural identity, often the culture of home environment; secondary discourse refers to cultural aspects of an individual's secondary culture, often the dominant culture of the school environment. This research claims that the relationship between identity, culture, discourse, language, and literacy is tied to cultural hegemony of Western culture and that this has particular influence on the way that non-Western TCK students negotiate their cultural identities.

This complexity is palpable for youth whose primary home culture differs from that of Thai national culture *and* from secondary Anglo-Western culture absorbed from the school environment; such complexity, however, is also true for youth who *do belong* to Thai national culture, in a technical sense, but for whom this primary culture differs from the secondary Anglo-Western culture of school. Culture presents the social norms expected of its members within that context, and discourse is the “identity kit” of social communication and behaviour expected of members to use in order to belong to the cultural context. Furthering an understanding of the TCK experience is, therefore, relevant to both TCKs and educators of TCKs in international schools, and an exploration of the TCK experience has the potential to empower more successful cultural negotiation for TCKs who experience questions of where they best belong, culturally.

To reiterate, past ethnographic research includes studies of: ESL students living in Western countries, students of immigrant status or students of immigrant parents, primary school international students, international schools in Asia primarily include research located in East Asia, typically China, Japan, Hong

Kong, and South Korea, dual language international schools, and TCKs whose first culture is Western. The ethnographic approach of this study intends to add to this research in terms of the exploration and understanding of how TCKs experience cultural identity negotiation, and to help educators of TCKs develop strategies for TCKs to maintain family culture while through the exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school.

The participants for this research are TCK youth whose primary culture of home is non-Western and who have acquired or are exposed to a secondary, Western culture at school. This research aims to empower the narratives of participant perspectives in order to establish culturally emancipatory research that gives voice to participant experiences, and also asks participants to be active researchers in their own story telling. Postcolonial theory continues to be a considered frame throughout the emancipatory, ethnographic approach to this research process, specifically through the consideration of how best to give voice to participants. Postcolonial theory has been employed to consider the extent to which the researcher, myself, can speak *for* the participants as opposed to allowing them to speak for themselves through the research. As an individual whose primary culture is Western and whose secondary cultures are non-Western, it is very important that my role as researcher does not continue to further marginalize the voices of the culturally marginalized. I cannot employ postcolonial theory within my research and also speak for the participants in this study, as I would continue the very thing, cultural marginalization and oppression, that the Postcolonialist intends to dismantle. The process for selecting

participants, and the strategy for empowering participants as active researchers is further discussed in the methodology section. Next, I provide a summary of this chapter, chapter 2, the literature review.

The research site for this study is Morehouse International School, a pseudonym for the school, which is located in Bangkok, Thailand. The next chapter, chapter 3, presents the methodology for the research approach, data collection, and data analysis of this research. In chapter 4, the research findings, I will revisit the theoretical frames discussed here in chapter 2, in order to interpret meaning as it arises through the data analysis plan, discussed, next, in chapter 3.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This chapter, chapter 3, discusses the research methodology used for this study. This research uses an ethnographic approach to explore how Third culture kids (TCK) experience cultural identity negotiation, and to help educators of TCKs develop strategies for TCKs to maintain family culture through exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school. The following chapter elaborates on the methodology used to explore this concept, and will outline the data collection and data analysis framework, guided by Carspecken's (1996) guide to *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research*. As this research focuses on the cultural identity negotiation of TCK youth, I first revisit the definition of the TCK, and then discuss why an ethnographic approach is best used to explore the TCK experience.

According to Pollock and Van Reken (2009), a TCK is defined as a “person who has spent part of his or her developmental years outside the parents’ culture. The TCK frequently builds relationships to all of the cultures, while not having full ownership in any” (p. 13). A third culture kid is a youth whose life experience has required him, her, or them to negotiate more than one culture into their personal identity. Student primary identities, including sociocultural discourses, are continuously impacted by exposure to secondary cultures in school. In highly intercultural school environments, home culture sometimes differs from what is expected or practiced at school. The classroom is a meeting point of these differing, and many times, conflicting sociocultural discourses, and multicultural students in these environments are often referred to as *Third Culture*

Kids (TCKs). The third culture refers to the negotiated culture between primary and secondary cultures, and is also termed as the interstitial culture. Although a TCK may be considered an English as a Second Language learner, this research focuses more on acquisition of cultural identity rather than of the English language. This research aims to enable narratives of participant perspectives in order to establish culturally emancipatory research that gives voice to participant experiences, and it also includes participants as active researchers in their own story telling.

Conflicts with culture and identity, as aforementioned, surface a number of important questions within education, such as: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the relationship of the multiple cultures students negotiate into their identity? How might hegemonic educational practices influence cultural identity negotiation? How can educators help TCKs maintain a strong sense of their family culture (primary culture) through the exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school?

3.1 Ethnographic Approach Rationale

This section, below, describes why an ethnographic approach best explores the experience of the TCK. The intention of this research is to discover possible factors that influence greater success of third culture identity negotiation of TCK youth in order to provide a call to action for educators whose aim to provide empowering, inclusive and socially just learning environments for third culture kids. The nature of this research is abstract and contextual, therefore, a qualitative approach is best suited for identifying common themes students

employ in order to negotiate cultural identities successfully. Creswell (2012)

defines the qualitative, ethnographic research designs as:

qualitative procedures for describing, analyzing, and interpreting a cultural group's shared patterns of behaviour, beliefs, and language that develop over time. In ethnography, the researcher provides a detailed picture of the culture-sharing group, drawing on various sources of information. The ethnographer also describes the group within its setting, explores themes or issues that develop over time as the group interacts, and details a portrait of the group. (p. 21)

Feelings of cultural disconnection unique to third culture kids suggests that an ethnographic approach is meaningful in order to better understand issues of identity for this particular culture-sharing group. The culture-sharing group in this research will be TCK youth (who have at least one non-Western home culture) attending an international school in Bangkok, Thailand.

Within the context of this particular TCK culture-sharing group, cultural marginalization corresponds with primary cultural identity belonging to a cultural group other than globalized Western cultural hegemony, while attending a school that operates in and promotes the use of Western-cultured discourse. Ethnography permits detailed description of both the participants and the research site in order for the nuances that influence and create meaning in regards to cultural identity negotiation to be best understood. It is my intention for this research to serve as a call to action for international school educators who are interested in empowering TCK students' ability to negotiate multiple cultures that shape their identity.

3.2 Methodology Overview

The section, below, describes the methodology used for this research. I first begin with a description of participants, and then continue to elaborate on the

research site, methodological issues, and the data collection processes used to gather data. I will then describe the data analysis procedures of the study.

The research study included a total of eight participants whose culture of home contains at least one non-Western culture. Participants are Grade 12 high school students attending an international school in Bangkok, Thailand. Data was collected over an 8-week period, and was comprised of overt observation with field notes using thick description, individual interviews which were transcribed, focus group interviews which were transcribed, and individual participatory audio or video journals, were also transcribed. Observation field notes and transcriptions were shared with participants, who were asked to add, remove, or change data collected so that it best fit their experience and perspective. Participatory alterations to data were permitted up until the end of the last data collection stage, stage three. Carspecken's (1996) reconstructive analysis was used to provide detailed and thick description, and to code thematic data analysis in order to narrate inferences from the data. In the sections below, I will describe the following: the research site and its sampling procedures; the participants and selection procedures; the interpersonal, technical, and ethical methodological issues; stages one, two, and three of data collection procedures; the data analysis; credibility; and lastly, transferability and dependability of the research. Research validity of claims and limitations are discussed in chapter 6, the conclusion of this research. First, I provide a description of the research site and its sampling procedures.

3.2.1 Description of Research Site and Selection

The selected research site is an international school in Bangkok, Thailand. The high school student handbook states that at Morehouse International School, “courses are modeled on an American curriculum, adapted, and enriched to serve our international student population”. The school, although an American international school, posits a student body comprised mainly of, but not limited to, middle to upper class students of Thai, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean citizenships or cultural backgrounds. Approximately ninety percent of students come from homes with at least one non-Western culture, and all students attending the school can be considered a third culture kid. Because of the prevalence of American culture, specifically American pop culture, on a global scale, it is important to recognize the context that academic courses at the school are adapted from an American curriculum. Students of American citizenships are in the minority of student demographics, whereas, teachers of American citizenships comprise the majority of the teaching staff demographics. Therefore, it is important to consider how an adapted American curriculum offered by a majority American-cultured staff, to a majority non-American student population may influence the experience of the participants’ environment when negotiating their cultures. Acknowledging this context is important when considering the cultural codes that students interact with and acquire at the school. The experience of participants to negotiate their cultures would occur differently in other cultural contexts influenced by different cultural demographics of students and/or teachers.

The site is selected using LeCompte and Preissle's (1993) criteria based sampling techniques: primarily as an Ideal-Typical case sample, and secondarily, as a Convenience sample. The site's cultural context matches the research problem and questions of cultural identity negotiation, hence is ideal. I have access to this research location, because I live in Bangkok and am currently employed at the school. The fact that I am employed at the school influences my subjectivity; however, this subjectivity is essential to the positioning of my role as researcher in terms of trust and access. However, as described in the participant selection procedures, below, I did not use my own students, or any student for which I have direct authority over, as participants for this study. Within the cultural context of this school, participants' backgrounds stem from cultures in which trust (especially with cultural outsiders) is established over an extended period of time: my extended and professionally involved role at the school for the past seven years helped build trust with participants, educators, and administrators, in order to provide access to the research site. Given my role as Head of High School English Language Arts Department, my access to conversations with administration often regards feedback on policy change; therefore, I am in a position of advocacy for the needs of participants regarding cultural identity negotiation. Advocacy for curricular and cultural frameworks, as well as for further cultural identity negotiation issues, is provided in my recommendations, in chapter 6.5.

Although arguably categorized as a warm-culture context, in which, typically, there is a socio-cultural value on collectivism, Thai people are often

hesitant to quickly establish deep relationships. This is partly due to Thailand's historic resistance to colonial rule, as well as the transient nature of most foreigners, whose brief residence as a tourist or short term contractual employee is seen as reason for caution when investing in any sort of immediate or long term relationship. Additionally, Thai Buddhist beliefs promote a lifestyle of quiet, respectful humility, in which aggression and forcefulness are perceived to be socially inappropriate. As mentioned, I have already built trust within the school community over seven years, the convenience of this research site will be of assistance when working with various stakeholders of the site, including: participants, their families, colleagues, and administration.

Thailand belongs to the Global South, yet was never colonized by a foreign power; as one result, there is a strong sense of cultural identity grounded in what it means to be Thai. Interestingly, there is also a strong perception amongst many students, within the research site, that artefacts of Western culture represent social power and capital amongst middle to upper class societies. For students attending the school, Western cultural capital includes education and the ability to speak English. Western universities, many times Ivy League universities, are thought by students to be a pinnacle of prestige, therefore, attending a Western international school is thought to be one of the building blocks towards this possibility of success. Graduation from the research site school is also perceived as a step necessary to admittance into top Thai universities as well, especially rigorous, Thai medical schools. In addition to academic prestige, the cultural concept of shame, central to many Asian cultures,

also contributes to cultural factors relating to the motivation to attend Western universities, as perceived academic success is a form of social capital within the research site, and may be associated by students and their parents with bringing respect and honour to their family.

One motivating factor for my interest in socially just international school education for youth of more marginalized global cultures is because, frequently, educators working in international schools, like me, come from hegemonic, Western cultural backgrounds and passport countries. As educators, I think we can better serve culturally marginalized TCK students when we better understand how culturally diverse students negotiate identities between their cultures of home and school.

All students at the research site school qualify as one of Pollock and Van Reken's (2009) TCK identities. Most students at the site are "cross-cultural kids (CCKs)", "Educational CCKs", and "traditional TCKs" (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 31-32). Some students at the research site are "children from bi/multicultural homes", "children from bi/multiracial homes", "children of immigrants", "children of borderlanders", children of minorities", and "domestic TCKs" (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 31-32). As mentioned previously, approximately ninety percent of the research site is comprised of students of Thai nationality. Seven to eight percent of students of other Asian country nationalities, and two to three percent is comprised of students of Western country nationalities. Educational staff is primarily comprised of individuals of North American, European, and Australian passport countries, with few educators of Thai, and

other Asian passport countries. For some educators, this job placement is their first overseas experience, while others have been working internationally for a longer period of time. The average time that teachers remain on staff is between two and five years, with some teachers on staff between ten or more years.

One reason that I selected this particular research site as being Ideal-Typical is because, for years, I have anecdotally observed students negotiate cultures, and they seem to be able to do this well because of their ability to code switch between cultures and languages. Given the cultural demographics of the school, I think by exploring the participant experiences, in this particular research site, other TCK students could also benefit from the results presented in the findings (in chapter 4), in the suggestions and call for future research (in chapter 5), and in my final recommendations (in chapter 6). The description of culture-sharing patterns of behaviour, belief, and language that students, at this research site, will serve as a framework for better understanding the TCK experience.

3.2.2 Description of Research Participants and Selection

The participants of this study are Third culture kids (TCKs) whose primary culture of home is non-Western, and who negotiate a secondary Western culture into their identity. In total, eight participants were used for this research, and were between the approximate ages of sixteen to eighteen years old. Participants are students at the research site, but are not my own students. TCK participants whose primary culture is non-Western, may be associated with a more marginalized cultural identity due to global hegemonic capital associated with Westernization.

The term marginalization will refer to students whose primary discourses do not possess equivalent cultural and/or social capital as dominant, hegemonic discourse often associated with Western culture. In the context of this study, dominant cultural discourse is that of Western hegemony, because the school's curriculum is Western-based, and many employees come from Anglo-Western backgrounds. It should be noted that this research does not assume that Western culture is the only form of dominant, hegemonic culture, however, it is one culturally hegemonic power within the context of this particular site. Participants of this study are those whose primary cultures of home environment differs from the secondary cultures of the school. For the purpose of this study, TCKs whose primary culture belongs to Western hegemonic culture are not used, because the cultural negotiation challenges this kind of student faces differs from the focus on more globally marginalized cultural identities considered for this research. TCKs of Western primary discourse are more at risk in different ways than TCKs of non-Western primary cultures, therefore, to include both would deviate from the focus of this particular research.

Similar to the site selection, this study uses LeCompte and Preissle's (1993) criteria based sampling techniques. Participants who possess non-Western primary discourses are selected according to typical and ideal-typical case criteria. Because this study seeks to explore negotiation of marginalized cultural identities with that of hegemonic cultural identities, participants must possess at least one marginalized primary culture of home and negotiate a secondary, globally hegemonic culture (Western culture, in the context of this study) into their

identity. To describe participants and how they negotiate their cultures, Pollock and Van Reken (2009)'s suggestions on the benefits of being a TCK is helpful, which is that TCKs have an "expanded worldview" (p. 88), a "three-dimensional view of the world" (p. 93), and are "cross-culturally enrich[ed]" (p. 95). In order to select typical and ideal-typical (Preissle, 1993) participants who possess Pollock and Van Reken's (2009) traits, above, I chose to focus on participants enrolled in the International Baccalaureate (IB) programme offered at the school. The IBO (2013) mission statement indicates that it "works with schools, governments and international organizations to develop challenging programmes of international education and rigorous assessment" (p. 175), which relates to the TCK "expanded worldview" (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 88). The mission statement also says that IBO (2013) aims to "encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right" (p. 175), which establishes a "three-dimensional view of the world" (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 93). Lastly, IBO (2013) states that it "aims to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect", which aligns with the TCK trait of being "cross-culturally enriched" (Pollock, 2009, p. 95). Due to its alignment with positive traits of the TCK, students enrolled in at least one IB course were deemed as typical and ideal-typical (Preissle, 1993) participants for this study.

An arms' length method was used to recruit participants so to mitigate power dynamics of my role as teacher and head of department at the school. I

worked with the IB Programme Coordinator at the research site to email an initial recruitment letter to students (appendix C) and to parents (appendices D and E), and this recruitment letter was also reinforced by follow-up with classroom teachers of IB students. Classroom teachers who permitted me entrance for participant observation also did so through the mitigation of power dynamics, as the High School principal shared my permission request transcript, in my behalf, with potential classroom teachers. Students who were interested in participation of the study volunteered through either the IB Diploma Coordinator and/or their classroom teacher. Mitigation of power is further discussed in the validity of claims discussion provided in chapter 6.2. The recruitment letter provided participant candidates a description of the desired cultural identity for the research, so that volunteers could verify whether or not they were eligible for participation. After voluntary participation and consent, I initiated stage one of observation data collection, described in the data stage collection procedure section that follows my discussion, in the next section, of methodological issues.

Through the initial sampling techniques previously described, volunteers included participants who aligned with at least one of the following cultural identities: a Thai national who has attended the school since junior high school or earlier; a Thai national who has lived outside of Thailand for an extended period of time; an individual of non-Thai and non-Western descent who has attended the school since junior high school or earlier; an individual of non-Thai and non-Western descent who has lived outside of Thailand for an extended period of

time; and an individual of biracial descent and/or multiple-ethnic descents of which all ethnicities are non-Western.

The rationale for the aforementioned participant cultural identities is described in the following rationale. A Thai national who has attended the school since middle school or earlier has been exposed to the cultural ethos of the school for multiple years since early childhood, and therefore, may identify with both Western and Thai cultures. A student of non-Thai and non-Western descent surfaced data that represents a cultural identity whose citizenship country differs from both Thai and Western cultures, important to the research because the predominant primary culture of home is Thai and the predominant operative culture at school is Western. An individual of non-Thai and non-Western descent who has lived outside of Thailand for an extended period of time assisted in providing thick description of the nuances between participant experiences negotiating culture. And lastly, an individual of biracial descent and/or multiple-ethnic descents helped to limit generalization of cultural identity, as to acknowledge the diversity of cultures present within the research site. Limiting cultural generalizations decreases superficiality of the findings and, therefore, assists in the credibility of the report.

3.2.3 Methodological Issues

Interpersonal, technical, and ethical issues are discussed in the section below. Entrance into the school and permissions to collect data was negotiated with the key stakeholders of the school, including: the head of school, head of high school, and the Director of Strategic Initiatives who also advises on Thai

law. In order to gain access to the research site, I received written confirmation from the Head of School, Head of High School, and the Director of Strategic Initiatives/HR. As mentioned previously, because of my leadership position at the school, the Head of High School (HS Principal) mitigated power dynamics and requested access to classroom observations on my behalf. The IB Diploma Coordinator and IB classroom teachers mitigated power dynamics and assisted in participant recruitment on my behalf.

As the participants are minors, consent was obtained from both participants and their parents or guardians. The consent letter (appendix A and B) uses participant-friendly language so those not familiar with the research field could understand the conditions of agreement. The consent letter was also translated into Thai for parents or guardians who do not read English. All participant identities, in addition to the school name (Morehouse International School), are protected through the use of pseudonyms to retain anonymity. Participants pseudonyms include: Petrie, June, Karla, Aida, Salem, Lisa, Ronnie, and Alyssa. The gendered pronouns used for the participants align with their personal gender identities. Recorded audio files, video files, transcriptions, and field notes are stored in password protected hard drives and in encrypted files or folders. As a requirement of the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research, data will be stored for a minimum of five years after the conclusion of this research.

Issues of reciprocity are considered by consulting participants to verify the accuracy of observation and interview data; transcriptions of interviews and

participatory audio/video journals were shared with participants so they could add, remove, or change data up until the final day of the data collection. Data collection also includes participants as co-researchers as five out of eight participants volunteered to compile and submit a personal audio or video journal discussing their additional, personal thoughts on cultural identity negotiation. In field notes and in the findings chapter, chapter 4, of this research, thick description is used to provide data to capture the experience of each participant.

Allowing participants to share the power dynamic throughout the research process is essential to the understanding of their own contextual cultural identity negotiation. Advocacy issues are considered throughout the process of this study. It was important that participants and guardians understand the parameters of the research, including the extent to which the research will serve as an emancipatory avenue to be heard by the administration and other educators – this information is included in the letter of consent. To prevent further marginalization of cultural identities through, albeit, well-intentioned research, instead of speaking *for* the participants, this research intends to share their first hand experiences of cultural negotiation through dialogical data transcriptions. In chapter 4, the research findings, I intentionally include longer passages of transcribed interviews and participatory journals to allow the original perspective and response from participants to be heard within context.

As an educator-researcher, the resource of time is a technical issue considered throughout this process. Observation could only occur during the school day, and in the following contexts: classroom/academic settings are limited

to my own scheduled preparation blocks, of about sixty-five minutes in length; social contexts are limited to lunch and student break times; extra-curricular activities are limited to availability after school or during student committee in-school meetings (these issues are further considered in the limitations section of the conclusion, chapter 6, of this research). The time frame for data collection was eight weeks, and during this time, I observed and interviewed the participants.

During the eight-week time frame, clear communication with classroom teachers established that my position was not evaluative of teaching methods, as it is important that educators, as stakeholders in this research, know that I am observing the participants and not judging classroom teaching practices. Before beginning each observation, I announced to the class or club why I was present, and that I was not collecting data on their teacher, or on any student who did not sign the letter of consent to participate in the research (appendix G). Where appropriate, boundary spanning informally occurred as I asked classroom teachers to elaborate on classroom context important to my interpretation of participant observation. Teacher responses were not included in the official data, but, in addition to participants adjusting data, classroom teacher perspectives were helpful to ensure I was interpreting the classroom context validly.

3.2.4 Data Collection Procedure: Stage One

For the observation stage of the data collection I used “passive observation” (p. 51) and thick description during the first stage of the research so that I impose myself upon the site as little as possible (Carspecken, 1996). Using McKernan’s (1996) concept of a shadow study, I followed participants to key

locations at the school, such as the classroom, cafeteria, and/or extra-curricular activities in order to observe intersection of home and school cultures and how participants behave in relation to their negotiation of cultural norms. Field journals record thick description of participant behaviour and speech juxtaposed with the cultural environment at school. Primary locations for observation are classrooms, where participants learn to adapt to the Western cultural norms of school, and where the language of instruction (English) may metonymically represent Anglo-Western culture. Additional observation locations were for courses where the language of instruction matches the language of the national host country. Secondary, overt observation locations include: offices, student lounges, cafeterias, school libraries, sports complexes, assemblies, and student activities. As mentioned in the last section, the official time frame for data collection outlined on the letter of consent was eight weeks, however, I have been present at the school for seven years.

As Marshall and Rossman (2006) suggest, I used a structured observation frame in order to ensure that observation data is explicitly recorded. For participant observations, I used LeCompte and Preissle's (1993) guide for stream-of-behaviour chronicles to format my field journals using stream-of-behaviour chronicles: with field notes on the left side of the page and researcher comments and analyses on the right. Observation and thick description first prioritize everything the participant says or does, second, anything anyone else says or does, and third, elements of setting important to the research. The primary record and field journals recorded observational data on: speech, body movements, body

postures, frequent record of time, context information, speech, and diagrams of research areas. Twenty-six observations occurred, and very thick descriptive primary notes were taken for sixteen of these times. I did not use covert observations because of ethical boundaries observing minors.

Field journals use Carspecken's (1996) procedures for recording thick description in field journals, in order to "ground inferences made on less thickly compiled notes, for these often display the same patterns of behaviour captured thickly" (Carspecken, 1996, p. 48). Carspecken (1996) discusses how participants within ethnography are observed in a primary location, such as the classroom, but that interactions and social behaviours within the classroom are subtle and must be understood through the combined observation of secondary locations (offices, teacher and student lounges, cafeterias, school libraries, homes, neighbourhoods, etcetera). Notes recorded in the primary research location are called "the primary record" and notes recorded in the secondary locations are called field journals (p. 45). Carspecken (1996) indicates that the notes are titled as such because the primary record is where thick and focused notes will be taken as a "data anchor", sections of the primary notes were, in a later stage of the research, entered into "a series of word processor files, and copies of these same notes to which codes, commentary, and sections of expanded analysis" were added after the observations are complete (p. 45). In order to do this process, and to later code the data, I used a password protected computer programme, called Dedoose, which also made available qualitative data charts and coding fields. Codes are further discussed in the coding section of the findings, in chapter 4. Field notes of

secondary sites were less thick, and were taken after the observation has taken place – these field notes were used to better understand the primary research location within the research site, and to assist in constructing meaning fields during the reconstructive analysis (discussed in the data analysis section of this chapter, chapter 3).

The classroom served as the primary location for this research, because it is in the classroom that TCK students must negotiate their identities to the expectations of the learning environment and to the cultural expectations of the classroom. It is also within the classroom that some of the tools acquired by students to negotiate of primary and secondary cultures occurs. Experiences in the classroom, however, are influenced by the ‘whole package’ of the school environment, thus, the secondary field notes are needed to deepen the thick description of the overall research site experience.

The thick description of passive observations during this stage of the research helped “reduce analytic complications brought about by any Hawthorn effects” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 52). The “Hawthorn Effect”, named after a 1920s research study on the Hawthorn plant, was coined due to how great the presence of research observers had on the variables of the research. Within an ethnography, however, the focus is not on determining a relationship between dependent and independent variables, but rather on “one category of action conditions: cultural milieu or the norms, values, and beliefs of the people being studied” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 52). Any changes in participant behaviour due to the presence of the research observer, therefore, do not “correspond to alterations in cultural milieu”

(p. 52). Thick description is essential so that the cultural milieu of participants is passively observed during the first stage of the research so that during reconstructive analysis (Carspecken identifies this as the second stage) any changed behaviours over the course of the data collection process can be observed and analyzed according to the cultural norms of the participant group studied. In this way, Hawthorn effects created by the research observer are not suffered. Contrasts of participant behaviour between stage one (passive observation) and stage three (researcher as facilitator of talk and discussion during interviews) is essential to the understanding of the beliefs and practices shared by the TCK participant group (Carspecken, 1996).

3.2.5 Data Collection Procedure: Stage Two

In this section, I discuss stage two of the data collection procedure: the preliminary reconstructive analysis. According to Carspecken (1996), stage two of the data collection process is when coding of data commences, although this coding was checked and adjusted during stage three of the data collection process. Stage two of the data collection procedure constructs tacit and subjective information observed in stage one of the data collection process. After completing initial observations, I made a note of possible “underlying meanings” that may “suggest patterns as well as highlight unusual events that may be important to [my] analysis” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 95), and through this process constructed possible meaning fields (Carspecken, 1996). As I reconstructed the data, I looked for action patterns as well as any action that serves as an anomaly to the patterns I identify; this information was copied into a new word processing file so as to

allow for the primary notes and field notes to remain intact in their original form. Within these new files, I went through the copied notes line by line to “add discursive articulations of tacit modes of meaning” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 95) I believed to be important to the actions recorded and coded.

Next, I include the possible meaning fields (labeled as MF) that I generated during this stage of the research. After observing community as a recurring concept during my observations, I used Carspecken’s (1996) ethnographic research framework and initiated possible meaning fields for this code, first. Then, I looked for codes that intersected with community, and constructed meaning fields for those codes; after, I looked for more intersecting codes and constructed meaning field for those codes as well. Below, are meaning fields that I considered to be significant:

1. Possible meaning fields [MF] for COMMUNITY:

[MF]: Community and collectivist culture are highly connected, therefore, building community builds or relates to collectivist culture, and as a result creates environment relative to the collectivist culture that this research TCK belongs to.

[MF]: and/or, community is influenced by the classroom routines established

[MF]: and/or, community is influenced by the amount of comfort the student feels

[MF]: and/or, community is influenced by the way in which cultural customs are present in the class or brought into the class through discussion

[MF]: and/or, community is influenced by the way in which the teacher permits pushing boundaries, or 'breaking norms' or 'freedom from authority' in the classroom.

[MF]: and/or, community is influenced by the way in which fun, or enjoyment, is established by the teacher or permitted by the teacher or by students in the classroom.

2. Possible meaning fields [MF] for TEACHER-STUDENT RAPPORT:

[MF]: Rapport is built through classroom routines, and the space for students to test boundaries behaviour is a coupling of rapport with classroom structures. It is the classroom structures that allow the testing of boundaries to still be appropriate and not destructive and then build rapport between teacher and student. Rapport is built through the balance of speaking Thai and speaking English.

[MF]: Rapport is very prevalent for participants, and is a clear aspect of community building. Aka: No rapport with teacher, no community.

[MF]: rapport is built through structured and routine discussions.

[MF]: rapport is built through humour.

[MF]: Community, therefore, is built through rapport, which is dependent upon: routine, structure, discussion, humour, speaking Thai/Speaking English, pushing boundaries

[MF]: And. Establishing relationships with teacher is important to TCKs trying to negotiate identity. Perhaps counter is true, establishing relationships at home is also necessary and important to successful cultural identity negotiation.

3. Possible meaning fields [MF] for CULTURAL HYBRIDITY:

[MF]: cultural hybridity is an important aspect to a students' ability to successfully create the interstitial culture that helps negotiate and benefit between culture of home and school. Cultural hybridity is influenced by the following factors:

[MF]: and, the role that language use has on identity formation, such as the combined ability to speak both English and Thai at school as representatives of primary and secondary cultures, and the access permitted by language to both. When students are able to find ways to express themselves (the power of expression) in both language and culture for both primary and secondary culture, the negotiation and beneficiary of both cultures is heightened. When language use is code-meshed, it scaffolds successful schemas for interstitial (third) culture.

[MF]: which relates to/and the availability of primary culture at school. Perhaps influenced by the role of discussion in the classroom and teacher rapport.

4. Possible meaning fields [MF] for HUMOUR:

[MF]: humour is highly present in all or most observation contexts.

[MF]: humour is a trait of community, and, therefore, in a collectivist culture, it is highly important to developing the ethos of the community. It is also a strong aspect of individualistic culture as well as it helps people connect as individuals. It is also an individualistic identity expression, It, therefore, is important to both collectivist and individualistic cultures and is why it is the interstitial environment for identity negotiation.

[MF]: and, because of this cultural meeting point factor, it builds confidence as it is trading piece in both. It also takes confidence to be humorous, so it is a cyclical circuit.

[MF]: and, humour and discussion naturally correspond as community building factors and are often present together.

[MF]: and, language and identity are tied to culture and community as well as tied to the way in which an individual negotiates this identity could be through humour as a safe-guarding or coping mechanism of the stress of not belonging. Since support is essential in this context, teacher rapport (and their allowance for humour) is important to the success of a coping mechanism (or tool) used to negotiate more successfully.

5. Possible meaning fields [MF] for SPEAKING ENGLISH:

[MF]: when speaking English is done in environments that build community (through discussion, fun, rapport, practicing skills and humour) it can empower individual identity expression and language and identity, which builds hybrid cultural identity negotiation.

[MF]: and, when combined with the ability to translate into language of primary culture (Thai) it is more beneficial to the negotiation of culture.

[MF]: and, the scaffolding of code switching or the instruction on this skill is helpful.

[MF]: and, the ability to speak English in this community environment builds language confidence, and as a result, confidence that one can independently negotiate cultures.

6. Possible meaning fields for LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL BELONGING:

[MF]: How identity is determined by language use may be relative to the way in which language is focused on at home or at school.

[MF]: and/or, when language, and the way in which it enables third culture identity negotiation is more successful, and the individual may negotiate both (or all cultures) more successfully.

I identified these possible “meaning fields” and used them to further code the data to create a range of possible meanings I had observed during stage one – this range was readjusted through the data collection process, again during stage three (described in the next section), and through the continuation of the data analysis process after stage three was completed. The findings chapter, chapter 4, presents the data in a way that readjusted data after the final reconstructive analysis stage, stage three. According to Carspecken (1996), “meanings are always experienced as possibilities within a field of other possibilities”, which is essential to remember during the data reconstruction period (p. 96). The initial reconstructive process is subject to possible error, and as previously stated, was revisited again after stage three had been completed in order to recalibrate the reconstructive analysis done in stage two. The dialogical data collected in stage three is essential to the reforming of this reconstructive stage. It is important, thus, as Carspecken (1996) suggests, to maintain low levels of inference of data during this stage so that my bias was kept under control. Carspecken (1996) writes an important note on researcher bias, and says that:

Values [of the researcher] are not exactly “chosen”[.] Highly value-driven researchers like we criticalists most often feel compelled to conduct research as a way of bettering the oppressed and downtrodden. It is a personal need to do so, not exactly a choice. But that pertains to our value orientation, to the reasons why we conduct research and to our choice of subjects and sites to investigate. This orientation does not determine “the facts” we find in the field. Here, in the realm of “fact,” the realm of validity claims made at the end of a study, values and facts are interlinked but not fused. And the sorts of values involved in research findings need not be the same as the values defining our orientation. This distinction is

an important one because good critical research should not be biased. Critical epistemology does not guarantee the finding of “facts” that match absolutely what one may want to find. (p. 6)

The argument Carspecken (1996) presents, above, regarding researcher orientation is why I have included my own personal researcher narrative within the introduction chapter of this research. Additionally, in chapter 6.2, in the validity of claims, at the end of this research, I discuss my experience existing in the threatened space of my research findings and conclusions. In this section, I discuss how some of my findings do not match what I originally wanted to find; this threatened space of the research is important to the limiting of my own bias.

Higher levels of inference regarding meaning fields and codes were employed during the horizon analysis phrase, during which theoretical frames, as discussed in chapter 2, the literature review, are revisited in the findings chapter, chapter 4. Stage two of reconstruction analysis, however, helps put into words the tacit information collected from participants during the observation process of stage one. Tacit information may be expressed by participants through things, such as: “the complexities of vocal tone, posture, gesture, facial expression, timing, prosodic form, and so on”, therefore, reconstructing this information into words helps drive the research forward through stage three (Carspecken, 1996, p. 97).

Carspecken discusses the definition of the horizon analysis, by suggesting that we “understand an idea against a horizon from which that idea is brought forth” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 103). Essentially, information perceived is gathered from inferences drawn from the relationship between the focus action in the

foreground and the background information in which that foreground is located. Meaning fields and resultant coding structures are important to the way in which inferences are made in this research, therefore, I looked not only for foreground information (the vertical inferences made directly in the field), but also the background information (the horizontal inferences, or horizon analysis, based within the theoretical framework of this research).

3.2.6 Data Collection Procedure: Stage Three

In this section, I discuss stage three of the data collection procedure: the dialogical data. Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were used to generate narrative and thick description. As cited by LeCompte and Priessle (1993), I used Patton's (1990) structure for interview questions, which probe for experience, knowledge of subject, opinion, sensory description, feeling, and background/demographic information. This interviewing technique allows participants to share key information and reveal shared beliefs and behaviour, and the open-ended nature of the questions provides space for the complexity of the research problem to unfold naturally. In addition, I facilitated Carspecken's (1996) framework for semi-structured interviewing, which consists of a topic domain and relative questioning according to this domain. Carspecken (1996) indicates that researchers using this framework should also include covert categories of information the researcher desires to obtain from participants. These categories allow the researcher to keep the focus of possible desired outcomes of the interviewing process, while also allowing for the participant to determine the direction of the interview process dependent upon the responses to interview

questions given. As previously stated, conflicts with culture and identity surface a number of important questions within education, such as: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the relationship of the multiple cultures students negotiate into their identity? How might hegemonic educational practices influence cultural identity negotiation? How can educators help TCKs maintain a strong sense of their family culture (primary culture) through exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school? The aforementioned questions substantiate the research questions of this study, and drive the following interview and focus group questions (appendix H) used for this research:

Research Question One: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the relationship of the multiple cultures students negotiate into their identity?

Topic Domain One: Cultural Identity Negotiation Issues

Lead-off question: Without naming specific people other than yourself, can you describe a time where you have had to change the way you act at home or school because there are different things expected by each culture? Tell me as many details as you can about that situation. What did you say and do?

[Covert categories: beliefs of cultural norms, opinions on speaking English at school, expectations for home culture versus school culture, strategies for how to identify with school culture versus strategies for how to identify with home culture]

Possible follow-up questions:

1. How does it feel to have to fit into more than one culture?
2. Do your peers have to fit into more than one culture?
3. Do you feel more understood by people who have to fit into more than one culture?
4. Are there certain kinds of people that you think don't understand how you feel when trying to fit into one culture?
5. Do you feel like you belong to one culture more than another?

6. Can you describe some things from each culture that you appreciate the most?
7. Can you describe some things from each culture that you find the most difficult to deal with?

Research Question Two: How might hegemonic educational practices influence cultural identity negotiation?

Topic Domain Two: Cultural Hegemony and Educational Practices

Lead-off question: Have you ever felt like you don't fully belong to one culture? Describe what happened as if you were trying to give me as much of a detailed story as possible.

[Covert categories: feelings of cultural belonging, feelings of cultural displacement, personal values placed on culture, preferred cultural norms, feelings of being misunderstood, sociocultural insecurity, value placed on language acquisition, beliefs on economic power associated with cultural capital, issues relating to the literacy myth]

Possible follow-up questions:

1. Can you describe an experience you had where you didn't feel understood because of your culture?
2. Are there any traditions or events you do with your family that you find difficult because of your cultural identity?
3. Are there times at school where you feel the cultural expectations are in conflict with the cultural expectations at home?
4. How would you place value on Western education?
5. Do you think you are more successful because you have a Western education?
6. What are your opinions on the extent to which learning English will open doors for your future?
7. How do you think attending a Western school is perceived in the culture of your family?
8. Do you remember a time when you found it difficult to understand a new concept in school because the example given was too Western?

Research Question Three: How can educators help TCKs maintain a strong sense of their family culture (primary culture) while also negotiating the exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school?

Topic Domain Three: Enablement of Home and School Cultures

Lead-off question: Can you tell me about a time at school where you felt like your family culture was best understood? Pretend you have to give me

the full amount of detail so I can understand a vivid snapshot of this experience you had, but remember not to reveal the identities of others.

[Covert categories: feelings on being culturally understood, success in cultural identity negotiation, educator strategies on how to empower students' multiple cultural identities, benefits of associating with peer TCKs, school practices or pedagogy that help foster culturally empowering environments for TCK students, perceived educator strategies on how to recognize the importance of cultural identity]

Possible follow-up questions:

1. Think about a time when you felt like understood your culture was best understood by teachers. Can you tell me the story about this experience? Include as many details about your experience as possible, but remember not to reveal the identities of others.
2. Do you remember any experiences in a class where teachers talked about how culture is important to you and your classmates? How did this make you feel? Remember not to reveal the identities of others.
3. Are there any school events that you think help bring your family culture to your school experience?
4. What would you suggest teachers could do to make you feel like they understand your challenges of belonging to more than one culture? Don't talk about specific teachers, but instead talk about specific strategies any or all teacher(s) could do.
5. How does it make you feel when teachers use examples in class that relate to your family's culture? Can you think of any examples that you could give me details on? Be specific about your experience, but do not reveal the identities of others.

I used these same interview questions for the group interviews, to see how participants may balance ideas off of one another or generate new ideas whilst in a group setting with other TCK students of similar experiences. At the beginning of the interview, the following transcript was recited to participants:

For all the answers you give, it is required and extremely important that you do not identify others in your answers. You can say things like "my friends" or "my family" or "my teachers", but you cannot state their names, or say any details about them. The information you give me cannot identify other people, because they have not given consent to their information or personal identities to be collected for this research.

After observation and group discussion procedures, student video diaries were used to collect data, following Hutchison's (2011) visual ethnographic method. Data collected from student generated videos allows for stronger participatory research, essential to critical ethnography as participant research provides more emancipatory data collection. Another aspect of student videos is that my presence as researcher is not required at the time of data collection, hence I was able to have less of a physical impact on the research site of this data collection. Participants had the full control over their participatory journal, but I provided directions with possible prompts to use if they needed (appendix I). The prompts were worded the same as the interview questions used for individual and focus group interviews. Participants were given the opportunity to edit their film as they saw fit. To ensure ethical requirements of consent, participants could participant in some, none, or all of the data collection. All participants participated in the observation(s), individual interview, and focus group interview. Five out of eight participants submitted an audio or video participatory journal, with three participants declining to submit (this information is further detailed in the limitations section of the research conclusion chapter, chapter 6).

3.2.7 Description of Data Analysis

Aligning with an ethnographic approach, I provide detailed and thick description and use thematic data analysis in order to narrate inferences on conclusions I determine through the data (Creswell, 2012). First, I locate shared patterns of meaning (belief, behaviour, and/or language) amongst the data I collect (Creswell, 2012). The analysis of this information began during stage two,

the primary reconstructive analysis, of the data collection process. Low inferences were used to begin this analysis and low-level codes were employed. Low-level coding began with the primary record and primary field notes, and the coding process did finish until after the completion of stage three. Low-level codes remained as objective as possible from the beginning, and aimed to employ language that portrayed actions of participants, only. As the low-level coding continued through the observational stage, I placed more interpretation upon codes as was “supportable through horizon analysis” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 147). After over one hundred codes were compiled I used member checks with participants, who were asked to review how I interpreted meaning in primary field notes.

At the end of stage three, more abstraction was used to code data. Before abstraction and high-level codes were determined, however, I compiled a set of raw low-level codes, which intersected and showed redundancies (Carspecken, 1996). In order to create this set of codes, Carspecken (1996) suggests six steps: locate word processing files that contain the original primary notes; create a blank secondary file electronically adjacent to the primary file; when anything from the primary notes is deemed worthy of a possible code, paste it to the blank coding file with corresponding explicit detail as well as the file and page numbers from the original, primary record; continue coding primary records creating new codes and starting to create sub-codes where appropriate; and, lastly, use reconstructive analysis on sections from the primary record to which my attention has been drawn, and, from the results of this analysis, start to form high-level codes.

Carspecken (1996) indicates that one must go back through primary low-level coding to find codes that align with high-level codes to determine the viability of the high-level code. Said high-level codes are also based on “a horizon analysis of one possibility within a meaning field” (p. 150). As I conducted Carspecken’s (1996) coding processing, I used more current computer software, specifically Dedoose, in order to house this information and create coding hierarchies. Dedoose maintains original text transcriptions and helps to create copies of coding excerpts that can continually be viewed in the context of the whole transcription. This program was helpful to both analyze codes and retain data collected in their original context.

As mentioned, codes were first listed as raw codes, which were then re-organized to create a hierarchical structure of codes in a “tight hierarchical scheme” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 150). This list also includes the file and page number of the primary note document for coding reference. Carspecken (1996) also suggests to tag low-level, high-level, and very high-level codes using the asterisk in order to differentiate which codes used low level inferencing and which codes used high level inferencing. For my research, I identified low-level codes by using no asterisk at all (as there were many more low-level codes than high-level codes). I labeled high-level codes with one asterisk, and I labeled very high-level codes with two asterisks. Labeling codes in this way helped me place interpretation on the data within the appropriate timing of Carspecken’s (1996) three stages of the data collection process. For example, when I constructed meaning fields, in stage two of the data collection process, I used only low-level

codes, which is what Carspecken's (1996) guide suggests. To reiterate, low-level codes labeled behaviour or concepts in the most objective way, and I only aligned these codes with theoretical frameworks after the initial meaning fields had been constructed (during stage two) and the data collection had finished. Then, in the last stage of the data analysis, I included some high-level codes and few higher-level codes (Carspecken, 1996) that matched the horizon analysis and theoretical frames used for this research. The high-level and very high-level codes placed high inferencing on data, primarily according to the theories of Said (1994) and Bourdieu (1993; 2003). Any high-level or very high-level codes that did not align with the horizon analysis or any of the theoretical frames (discussed throughout this research) were not included in the data analysis as the high-inferencing of these codes was not supported by the final data analysis.

Carspecken (1996) also indicates that the hierarchical reorganizing of codes should not begin until stage three of the data collection is completed so that the dependability of code hierarchy would not be compromised before dialogical data was collected. The hierarchical organization of codes revealed key categories, which are identified and further discussed in the findings chapter, chapter 4. How one determines the categories and emphasis of these categories should align with the theories to which the research aligned. I, therefore, went back to the literature and theories in order to assist with locating categorical emphasis for codes, and to rebuild the literature as required after analysis of the data.

According to Carspecken (1996), “good coding will almost deliver your final analysis, particularly when reaching the stage of code reorganization” (p. 153), and I found this to be the case for this research. In order to provide the analysis of findings and suggestions for future research, I depended on my thorough coding approach completed through reconstructive analysis. Detailed and thick description was provided with narrative analysis in order to give a well rounded depiction of the critical issues raised and to better understand the importance of the advocate and further a plan for change (Creswell, 2012). I also placed data analysis within the context of the participants and research site and I articulate how the analysis is tied to the cultural context of the site. As mentioned, in the findings and call to future research chapters, chapters 4 and 5, I return to the literature to align my interpretation with the theoretical frameworks used for this research.

In previous sections of this chapter, chapter 3, I have provided a rationale for an ethnographic approach and determined that this approach was best-fit to exploring and providing more understanding for the nuances of the TCK experience negotiating cultures. I specified three stages of data collection procedures, and discussed the data analysis plan. In the next section, I briefly include the credibility of knowledge claims and discuss the extent to which the claims are generalizable to other contexts. Validity of research claims is more extensively discussed in chapter 6, the conclusion of this research.

3.2.8 Credibility of Knowledge Claims

To achieve internal validity, I ran a pilot of observation field notes to ensure the foreknowledge of behaviours to identify, afterwards, I reflected on observation categories, which may be used as a checklist for some of observations to be conducted (von Diether, n.d.). These categories were initiated in phase one of the research, discussed in the previous section of this chapter, titled ‘Data Collection Procedure: Stage One’. Additionally, as elaborated in the previous sections describing stage one, two, and three of the data collection procedures, observation field notes used thick description.

As for external validity, the extent to which the claims made in this study can be generalized to other culturally diverse populations is limited to the cultural context that influences the environment for third culture kids. Postcolonial theory of Orientalism (Said, 1994) and the field of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993), symbolic capital, and symbolic power (Bourdieu, 2003), however, can be applied to external situations of differing contexts in order to determine different nuances of cultural identity negotiation within other cultural contexts and fields. Arguably, studies pertaining to the cultural identity negotiation of TCKs in other contexts would be beneficial to the diverse needs of culturally diverse students within ever-growing cultural globalization.

3.2.9 Transferability and Dependability

As is applicable within research that uses an ethnographic approach, the findings of this study are highly contextual to the environment of the focused culture-sharing group, therefore the boundaries of this research remain within the cultural context and lives of participants involved. Observations, interviews, and

audio/video diaries are strongly connected to the atmosphere and ethos of this particular research site, and to the experiences and perceptions of the participants, themselves. To claim the findings of this cultural context are transferable to all other cultural contexts would generalize, and perhaps even stereotype, the specific needs of third culture kids. As previously mentioned, cultural identity negotiation discussed in this research is framed using postcolonial theory (Said, 1994), and theories of the field of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993), symbolic capital and power (Bourdieu, 2003); therefore, research framed in differing theoretical frameworks would determine alternative results.

The participants of this study are unique due to important factors, such as: the combination of cultural backgrounds they possess, the cultural backgrounds of other individuals they interact with at the school, the location of the school in Bangkok, and the predominantly non-Western cultural student demographics in comparison to other international schools in Bangkok whose student cultural demographics are different. The cultural identity negotiation within this study is specific to the participants and research site environment, therefore, the findings of this cannot be replicated.

3.3 Chapter Summary

This research uses a qualitative, critical ethnographic approach to identify common themes that arise from studying how students of global marginalized cultures negotiate cultures of home and school into their identities, and aims to better understand issues of identity for Third culture kids (TCKs) attending an international school in Bangkok, Thailand. The purpose of the research is to

explore how third culture kids experience cultural identity negotiation through their exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school.

Eight participants who possessed at least one non-Western home culture and who acquire a secondary Western school culture volunteered for the research. I primarily used data collection and analysis strategies advised by Carspecken (1996) and by LeCompte and Preissle (1993). I used overt observation to collect data to shadow participants to key research site locations, such as classrooms, cafeterias, and extracurricular activities to observe intersection of home and school cultures and how participants behave in relation to their negotiation of cultural norms.

Field journals and thick description of participant behaviour and speech were recorded. Primary locations for observation are classrooms, where participants learn to adapt to the Western cultural norms of school, and where the language of instruction (English) may metonymically represent Anglo-Western culture. Secondary overt observation locations included: offices, student lounges, cafeterias, school libraries, and co-curricular student activities.

The time-frame for data collection was eight weeks, although I have been employed on campus as a high school teacher for seven years. In stage one of the data collection process, I formatted field journals using stream-of-behaviour chronicles: with field notes on the left side of the page and researcher comments and analyses on the right. Observation and thick description prioritized everything the participant says or does, second, anything anyone else says or does, and third, elements of setting important to the research.

Stage two of the data collection process began with observational data coding. Although this coding was checked and adjusted during stage three of the data collection process, stage two coding constructed tacit and subjective information observed from stage one of data collection. After initial observation completion, I recorded possible underlying meaning fields and patterns. I labelled meaning fields to code data observed during stage one – the codes were readjusted during the stage three of data collection and coding continued through final data analysis. During stage two, I maintained low levels and data inferences to help control bias; higher levels of data inferences were employed towards the end of stage three and during the final analysis when I revisited the theoretical frames for this research.

Semi-structured, transcribed interviews and focus group discussions generated narrative, thick description. I used Patton's (1990) structure for interview questions to probe for experience, knowledge of subject, opinion, sensory description, feeling, and background/demographic information. I facilitated Carspecken's (1996) framework for semi-structured interviewing, consisting of thematic topic domains and questioning according to this domain. Thematic topic domains to be used for questioning include: cultural identity negotiation issues, cultural identity displacement, and the negotiation of home and school cultures. After observation and group discussions, student audio/video diaries were used to facilitate participatory data collection. Audio/video diaries collected participant narrative data on cultural negotiation participants experience at home and school.

I provided detailed and thick description and used thematic analysis to code and narrate inferences from the data. I located shared patterns of meaning regarding culture and identity negotiation (belief, behaviour, and/or language). Data analysis began during stage two of the data collection process through low-level inferences and low-level codes. Initially, low-level codes remained as objective as possible, and used the language and actions of participants. As the low-level coding continued, I placed more interpretations upon the code terms in alliance to the theoretical frames used for this research.

At the end of stage three, more abstraction was used in the coding process. Before abstraction and high-level codes were determined, however, I compiled a set of raw, low-level codes, which intersected and showed redundancies, and were later re-organized into a hierarchical structure of codes. Hierarchical organization of codes revealed key categories to which these codes can belong, and the emphasis of these categories aligned with the horizon analysis and the theoretical framework in which this research is placed.

In order to present the findings, in the next chapter, chapter 4, I revisit the literature and theories in which the research is based to assist categorical emphasis for the coding process. Next, I present the findings of this research, and will begin with more information on research participants.

Chapter 4: Findings

The following chapter uses an ethnographic approach to explore how participants, Third Culture Kids (TCKs) with at least one non-Western primary culture of home, negotiate a Western secondary culture into their identity. The research seeks to enable participants to negotiate different cultures between home and school into their cultural identity. TCKs who negotiate a secondary, Western culture into their identity may experience challenges as more hegemonic, Western culture is negotiated with primary non-Western culture(s) of the home. Aligned with a postcolonial theoretical approach, as is discussed in the literature review chapter previously, the research aims to value non-Western primary cultures while also giving access to the cultural and linguistic capitals associated with more globally dominant Western cultures. Postcolonial theory is briefly referenced later in this chapter, specifically in the findings summary section, to comment on the significance of Western culture in globalized society. Postcolonial theory, specifically that of Said (1994) will also be revisited in the call for future research chapter, chapter 5. Moreover, a Bourdieusian (1993; 2003) theoretical approach is another main frame used to interpret and analyze the data presented in this chapter, below.

4.1 Participants

In this section, I provide information on research participants. This participatory research studied eight different participants whose primary cultures contain at least one (or all) non-Western home culture, and who negotiated at least one Anglo-Western secondary culture into their identities. The data collection

process for this research included between one to three observations for each of the eight participants, one individual interview for each of the eight participants, one focus group interview for seven out of eight of the participants (one participant consented too late in the study to conduct a focus group interview), and independent audio or video journals for five out of eight participants (three declined the submission of an audio or video journal). The school name and participant names are replaced with pseudonyms, and the personal pronouns of each participant may or may not match their own pronouns - this is done to ensure all possible efforts are made to safeguard the anonymity of the research participants. Some of the more gendered pseudonyms also may not match the gender of the participant. The school research site, Morehouse International School (its pseudonym), is an international school located in Bangkok, Thailand. Educators at the school are primarily Western cultured, and most students who attend the school come from non-Western primary cultures at home. Because the consent for this research included the condition that all possible efforts would be made to ensure the anonymity of participants, I have used “Thai culture”, “Culture-B”, “Culture-C”, and so-on, as anonymous terms for their cultural and/or ethnic identities. Because Thai culture is prominent for all participants in some way, and will not reveal participants’ identities by using this term, I did not label it ‘Culture-A’ and, instead, just use ‘Thai culture’. The eight participants for this research include: Petrie, June, Karla, Aida, Salem, Lisa, Ronnie, and Alyssa.

The data collection process involved participants by asking them to change, add, or remove data should they choose to, and participants were asked to

complete the audio/video journal in order to give additional information they felt was not asked of them during the interview process. Participants were observed in classrooms, extra-curricular activities, and/or lunchtime settings. Overall, I observed participants all content area departments offered on the high school campus. Interviewing followed the observation process, and the audio/video journals was the last stage of data collection.

4.2 Coding

The research data, below, is presented in transcription form, and includes individual interviews, focus group interviews, and participant journals. The ordering of sections has been guided by the hierarchical coding system used to analyze the data. Coding was used as a guide, and was based on critical ethnographic strategies discussed by Carspecken (1996). Meaning fields, such as those discussed in chapter 3, were constructed during stage two of the data collection procedure, and then reconstructed for final data analysis and reconstruction (Carspecken, 1996). It is through these meaning fields, in addition to the theoretical frameworks discussed in chapter 2.1, that I analyzed the data and present interpretations of codes, below.

The following codes, in descending hierarchical order, were found to be the most prominent concepts to arise in the data: community, teacher-student rapport, humour, discussion, speaking English, fun, cultural hybridity, cultural customs, speaking Thai, practicing skills, cultural belonging depends on environment, individual identity expression, dedication, taboo behaviour, cultural belonging, language and identity, respect for cultural practice, respect for others,

confidence, empathy, motivation, cultural disconnect, classroom routines and structures, comfort (in school environment), cultural exclusion, primary culture, stimuli (used by teachers during instruction), primary culture present at school (specifically), code switching, language and translation, cultural inclusion, stress (good/productive stress), and misunderstanding of cultural belonging (of others to participants). The research presented in this chapter aims to tell the stories of participants as naturally and transparently as possible, and so interview transcriptions are often included within the context of my questioning, and the participant responses. The coding system used was to help direct the importance of information and the pathway of data interpretation, but was not done in a way that would superficially confine the interpretation: I did not want to enter into quantitative analysis, as this study uses a qualitative research approach which aims to share the unique stories of participants who negotiate cultures in their own ways. Additionally, as Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) theory is used to interpret the data, the way in which coding is used to present the data, below, does so *intertextually* as opposed to *statistically*. Therefore, an ethnographic approach, which allowed me to take advantage of dialogical, qualitative data collected from participants, better enabled them to share their stories of how they negotiate cultures. It was important to me to tell the individual and unique perspectives of each participant, and to recognize them as individuals who negotiate their cultures in unique ways, but to also give voice to a common experience of third culture identity negotiation.

The data suggests that the way participants experience community is significant to their individual process of negotiating their cultures between home and school. Throughout this findings section, I weave together participant perspectives, my ethnographic interpretation based on field notes, meaning fields, and the theoretical frameworks used for this research. It is my hope that the perspectives shared below will further enable the understanding of TCK youth, and assist educators who care about the cultural negotiation, development, and autonomy of their students.

In this section, I provided an overview of codes used to analyze the data. In the next section, I discuss the first code of significance, *the role of community* for TCK participants.

4.3 TCKs and the Role of Community

The concept that produced the highest frequency of code was the *role of community*. Within the research site observations, individual interviews, focus group interviews, and video/audio journals, I identified the concept of community as highly important to each participant. Below are field notes of participants for whom I observed ‘community’ (including its connection to rapport between teachers and peers, as well as the connection between community and humour) as was present during my observation(s) of participants in classroom or co-curricular environments:

1. LISA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Classroom is set up so that tables are in rows and students sit side-by-side.

Stimulus are hung on the wall.

Classroom aesthetics are nice.

Pictures of students and school are hung on the wall.

[Observer comments: clearly care has gone into the room for students to feel 'at home'. The room looks more like a remodeled university classroom instead of a traditional high school classroom].

2. KARLA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTE (LUNCHTIME/CAMPUS):

Environment of the library is filled with students, and this environment is clearly where students go to either hang out or to do work together before their next class period.

[Observer comments: although Karla has taken me 'to get lunch', we end up in the library where she locates her different friends having fun, playing games, studying, hanging out, etc]

3. ALYSSA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Arrangement of the room is so that tables are side-by-side. Posters on the wall set up a comfortable classroom vibe. Some posters refer to the content studied in the class, and others are more for fun. Seems as humour used to create a comfortable environment in the space of the classroom.

[Observer comments: Alyssa's class arrangement facilitates classroom discussion]

4. RONNIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Turns to right to talk, turns to left to talk, reads article, jovially reads article, sings with his group for a moment (not distractingly).

Turns to right, shows his partner where to find a class document. Turns to left peer. Grabs their hand.

[Observer comments: Ronnie seems to enjoy the friendly environment created in the class]

5. PETRIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Music is played for the environment to be more relaxing and comfortable.

[Observer comments: I think the teacher has intentionally selected a playlist that will make the students feel more relaxed and at home.

Aida also mentioned, in her focus group interview, that when teachers let her class choose background music that she feels like the classroom is 'their place'].

6. JUNE AND AIDA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM)

June laughs and falls to the floor, lies on floor with Aida, who also 'falls down' in laughter, both laughing at how they 'messed' up the last part of what they practice.

[Observer Comments: the teacher practices the classwork alongside the participants, and it seems as though the teacher has constructed a

classroom environment where students do not fear failure. In this case, June and Aida have completely ‘messed up’ what they are practicing, and instead of getting frustrated at themselves, they are roaring in laughter at their mistake. The teacher also joins in and teases them, too, and the whole class seems to laugh it off, together. The environment is very welcoming and fun].

7. SALEM, JUNE, AND AIDA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITY)

All participants are waiting around for the co-curricular activity meeting to begin.

June gives Salem a hug, Salem, June, and Aida all laughing together. Singing Hamilton, joking. Sitting on chairs laughing about with friends. [Observer comments: body language is close and ‘family’ orientated.]

Salem talking with other peers. Aida planning schedules. June hugging a friend. Participants ‘spilling the tea’ [their words, meaning sharing story that happened to them earlier] – speaking in English.

June gesticulating as they tell a story. Salem showing memes to friend. [Observer comments: all of these interactions seem like a big family and organized chaos]

...

Aida comes up to stage to help others know what to do.

Salem applauds her peers when they finish.

[4:37] Aida helps center props on stage and gives feedback for location. Keeps running notebook.

Notebook contains direction for cast members on how to express emotions in a more believable manner. Includes emotion directions like: “more emotion”, “more frustration” and includes timing instructions like “Go slower” and “SLOW DOWN”.

[4:43] Aida helps her teacher.

Within the research site community is best defined as the presence and availability of human connection and group belonging. During observations, I often noted the ways that teachers established a community environment in their classrooms. For example, many teachers had arranged their desk arrangement so

that students faced each other so that discussion could naturally occur. In some classes, teachers used no desks at all to promote kinesthetic interaction amongst students. I also observed that many teachers had posted student work on their walls, which gave the class the atmosphere that the room belonged to the students, and that it was a place for *them*. Another thing that I observed to build community was the high level of discussion that happened in all courses. I observed participants in every content area department within the high school, and noticed that teachers used a variety of discussion techniques to generate student peer dialogue. Apart from an effective learning strategy, I observed this discussion to also empower students' ability to bond with one another and make connections with their peers.

It was not only in the classroom environment where I observed community building environments. During a lunchtime observation with Karla (described in Karla's observational field notes, above), I observed the way that community building social interactions took place in areas such as the cafeteria, campus side-walks, and the library. Karla led me around to all of the places she usually goes at lunch, and in 45 minutes we 'buzzed' around to multiple locations. Karla met me in my classroom building, and we walked to the cafeteria. Along the way, we stopped and chatted with a number of Karla's friends, which meant that we slowly meandered to the cafeteria where buying lunch seemed like a secondary priority to the social interactions that occurred. In fact, I was the only one who bought lunch, whereas Karla said, "oh, no, I don't eat my lunch at lunchtime", and implied that lunch was her time to run around and find her

friends. I asked Karla if there was a place she usually meets up with her friends, and she said there was not, but rather her friend group “just kind of found each other”.

The campus is spread out on sizable acreage for a school campus in the urban outskirts of Bangkok, and the campus gardens are well maintained with tropical foliage, fish ponds, and bird cages, and it is not uncommon to see a monitor lizard strolling along the sidewalk as you walked between buildings. The impromptu social interactions during my observation with Karla reflected the almost-circular campus layout. During this observation, Karla and I met Aida, and chatted with her for a few minutes. At this point, Karla told me that we had to go and visit her friends in the library, where some were playing board games during their lunch. Here, Karla met Lisa and they joked together and laughed. I realized that the campus layout offers students multiple spaces for them to ‘exist in’ throughout their school day, and the combination of these spaces between classrooms, lounges, the cafeteria, the library, etc., create opportunities for lots of interaction. Both classrooms and other campus areas seemed to be organized ‘circularly’: desks in circles, walkways in circles, and the campus building layout was rather circular. This was reflected in my observation with Karla, because the point we started was also a circular point that we ended at as well, when Karla walked back with me ‘full circle’ to my classroom at the end of the observation. The physical layout of classroom arrangements and the school enabled community building because participants more naturally interacted as they were led to do by the circular nature of the campus design. A campus layout that is

more linear might not allow students to ‘bump into each other’ in the same way, and so interestingly, I observed there to be a connection between the physical spaces of the school and the participants’ opportunities to associate with community.

Another thing that I observed in regards to the community is that the structure of social interactions was important to participants. Before the data collection process, I hypothesized that the concept of belonging would be highly important to participants, which is true; however, this occurred in a way that I did not expect. I originally thought that participants’ sense of belonging and cultural identity negotiation would depend more strongly on the way in which their primary home culture was made apparent or available at school, and that a sense of belonging would occur more if the participant was able to recognize their primary non-Western culture within the Western, secondary culture of the school. I thought that participants would experience a higher sense of belonging if their primary home culture was a focal recognition, and the presence of their primary culture at school would give the primary culture a higher sense of cultural capital as it would be adjacent with Western cultural capital.

On the contrary, participants voiced that what was most important to them was the acceptance from others that they belonged to more than one culture equally. When there was a higher level of acceptance regarding their cultural belonging, they felt like they were better understood, therefore, felt stronger ties to community belonging. Petrie shared that, when teachers asked her how something in Western culture could be perceived in her primary culture, it is

important that the *way* they ask assumes she already belongs to Western culture. When teachers ask questions like, “how would this event be perceived in your home culture”, Petrie suggested that it *could* come across condescendingly, as if they teacher might think that TCKs are ignorant of Western culture, and therefore, need to be asked to complete a cultural translation. As an international school educator, I assume that when Western cultured teachers (myself included) ask students how something would be perceived in their culture, it is out of the intention to relate class content to students’ primary cultures; however, participants suggested that the way such questions are posed should come from a place of understanding that the TCK student already knows about Western culture, therefore, do not necessarily need it to be ‘explained to them’.

The ‘explaining’ of Western culture is what some participants perceive to be ‘talking down’ to them, which furthers a position of cultural inferiority as opposed to sociocultural equality. For TCKs like Petrie, asking about cultural norms should be prefaced with a culturally empowering lead (below Petrie suggests teachers should give a ‘heads up’) before asking about home culture. I would suggest to be careful with questions like ‘how would this be perceived in *your* culture?’, because the connotation implies that the TCK student only belongs to one culture, that of their home. Of course it is important to validate home culture, but Western teachers need to be aware that the connotation of questions they ask about culture may be perceived as though Western culture is placed more intelligible over non-Western cultures; this can create detrimental miscommunication and have a potential negative effect on teacher-student

rapport. Petrie helped me better understand how she experiences this issue, and she shared her thoughts in her individual interview:

RESEARCHER: So if you want to have that asked of you - how would being Thai culture influence your understanding of [Western culture] - is there a way that teachers could ask that without it first seeming like they're accusing you of not being western?

PETRIE: Not really. I feel like the teacher could maybe give us a heads up first, that they're not trying to offend us or anything. They're just curious.

RESEARCHER: Cause do you think it could be a... Is the potential for it to be offensive, is that because it might come off or seem as though your teacher is saying you're not good enough to be western or is it offensive because it's just you feel like they don't understand you?

PETRIE: It's offensive because it's like saying ... It's almost implying that we're different in terms of... Divided basically.

RESEARCHER: And you want to be understood as being a whole thing, not a half of a thing.

PETRIE: Yeah, like 'we're all the same' kind of thing.

RESEARCHER: Yeah, I can understand that.

I do think that what empowers participants' negotiation of home and school cultures is that both cultures are presented with equal value, however, what is important is that their primary culture has equal cultural capital within the field of the school environment, and this is not dependent upon whether or not Western educators decide it to be so.

In one particular observation of Ronnie, I noticed that the teacher employed effective critical thinking strategies, through questioning, that allowed students to come to their own conclusions about culture. In combination with stimulus material, the open-ended style of questioning allowed Ronnie to make associations about culture, on his terms. Even though the teacher had asked how

empathy was important within the scenario of the prompt stimulus, Ronnie commented on how empathy allows understanding for different cultural norms and related the question to culture in his own way.

Globally speaking, Western cultures tend to be more hegemonic than non-Western cultures (Mullaly, 2010), however, the environment of Morehouse International School reworks this hegemony, which is especially revealed through the inclusivity of its mission statement, to provide an “inclusive and academically rigorous education for students to be balanced, successful, and compassionate individuals”. Morehouse International School also holds the principles to promote an “open minded” community that “embrace[s] diversity”. Within a larger, Westernized global scale, those of non-Western cultures “are owners of a dominated form of power” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 164), meaning that non-Western cultures may hold less globally recognized symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1993; 2003), and individuals who associate with non-Western cultures may feel they need to acquire additional Western culture in order to possess more hegemonic cultural power. Because participants gain access to a globally hegemonic Western culture, they benefit from this culture as they gain more cultural capital within a globalized cultural field of power. Western culture, however, does not need to replace participants’ primary culture, and one factor that increases their ability to negotiate home and school cultures while benefiting from them is acceptance, from both themselves and others, that they belong to both cultures simultaneously.

As the TCK negotiates two (or more) separate cultural fields, they are “enjoined to a double status, which is a bit suspect: as a possessor of a dominated weak power, [they are] obligated to situate [their self] somewhere between the two roles represented” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 165). It is not that a TCK is a dominated individual, rather, a Bourdieusian perspective would suggest that a non-Western TCK possesses a primary culture that occupies a dominated *position* within the hegemony of a Westernized sociocultural system. In order to gain more power within a globalized field, the non-Western TCK “maintain[s] an ambivalent relationship with the dominant class within the field of power... as well as with the dominated, the ‘people’” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 165). When asked where they feel like they culturally belong, participants said that they belong to both cultures - not just to one. In order to empower TCKs, one must criticize the systems that give power to one cultural position over another. Instead of focusing on the concept of *being dominated*, criticize the way in which both dominator and dominated positions of cultural power participate in a field of power that values the cultural capital obtainable for a position of power over the capital obtainable for a position of less power (Bourdieu, 1993).

If community involves understanding of one’s identity, then this is important to TCKs of marginalized primary cultures because their cultural identities undergo constant negotiation in order to locate who they are and what their culture means to them on an individual level. Participants said that what made them feel like they belonged to a community, and better helped them negotiate their multiple cultures, are the times that they felt understood by others,

including their teachers and peers. Participants indicated that they felt understood when they felt accepted by others, and when others did not make assumptions about their cultures, or base perceptions of their cultures off of cultural stereotypes or cultural appropriation. It is most devastating for the participants when they feel rejected from both cultures *and* when they feel like others are not accepting of them belonging, interstitially, to both cultures. To be told that they do not belong to a singular culture, but also that they must choose one culture to belong to is highly frustrating (and impossible) for participants. Applying a Bourdieusian framework, this is a “double rejection of the two opposing poles of social space” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 168). Participants said that what is important to their feeling of belonging and cultural identity acceptance was how ‘open minded’ others were to understanding the duality of their cultures.

In her individual interview, June spoke to the importance of teachers being open-minded when trying to understand the primary culture and cultural negotiation of a secondary, Western culture that TCKs experience. She also spoke of the importance of teacher-student rapport as a contributor to cultural understanding and the effectiveness of this understanding when it is based on mutual respect:

RESEARCHER: What are your thoughts on... So you've experienced these moments where you have felt isolated from your culture. From one culture. But then you've talked about how in order to connect with cultures you've learned to be very adaptable.

JUNE: Yeah.

RESEARCHER: Do you think you would have learned to be adaptable if you weren't isolated to begin with to some extent? Do you think that

because you experienced that frustration of being [culturally] isolated that you also have this superhero gift of being adaptable?

JUNE: Yeah, um. It also happens in the Western culture too. It's almost like I was naturally learning to be adaptable because I'm already in the environment and so I have to. If I wanna feel like I belong, I have to be adaptable. [Hesitates] There are times when in my culture, in [Country-C's] culture and the Western culture where I do [feel], sometimes pockets of isolation. But since I'm, in a way, in a situation where I am forced to, I can learn to be more adaptable. I do find ways where I can be a part of something in both of them [cultures, primary and secondary]. So yes.

RESEARCHER: To people who might not understand how that feels to be forced to adapt, could you put to words or try to explain to them just how that feels for you?

JUNE: For me it's... I think in most perspectives it's seen that being forced to being adaptable is negative. But for me I... it was actually very positive. I brought the experience of being forced to be adapting to environments. So with the positive mindset, it was actually easier for me to get into them [both cultures]. Does that... make sense?

RESEARCHER: It does make sense, completely. Yeah. And there's a lot of research that talks about third culture kids in your situation. That adaptability that you have is a great strength 'cause it transfers to other situations, too, in your life, that might not have to do with culture.

JUNE: Yeah.

RESEARCHER: Yeah. To go to the question, now, about what people [teachers] can do to better understand your experience, how would you advise... 'cause you're not really often times in a position where you can have a conversation with a teacher and say, "Let me give you advice."...

JUNE: Yeah.

RESEARCHER: [asks for confirmation] Right?

JUNE: Yes.

RESEARCHER: But here's your time for that [to advise teachers/authorities]. Because we [teachers] need to hear that advice.

JUNE: [confused]. Excuse me?

RESEARCHER: That's fine, yes. Here's a great time for you to say, "Please do this and please don't do this."

JUNE: [Nods. Understands]. Hum. [hesitates as she is thinking] It is very difficult....

RESEARCHER: Yeah.

JUNE: 'Cause while both cultures [Culture C and Western culture] are similar, there are different ways of taking it in. I am not sure how to explain. The first thing that comes to mind is being open.

RESEARCHER: So when you say, "Be open," do you mean, like, that the teacher, you would like, as you suggested [before], the teacher to be open to culture, or to be open to understanding you, or to give *you* the space to be open?

JUNE: I think "open" as in we are both going to learn. It's not that I'm not trying to say that... In my opinion this is not rude. I think that every individual has room to learn whether you are older or younger. This is not to be rude and this is just we're learning from each other and that when I'm giving advice I'm not trying to be rude, I'm just trying to help both of us come into the middle and come together as one in the middle.

RESEARCHER: So if I can understand... it's like in order to understand or best help you the teacher also has to be willing to be helped.

JUNE: Yes. [Nods, gesticulates]. Both of us have to be willing.

RESEARCHER: Both ways.

JUNE: Yes. Both ways.

RESEARCHER: Then part of that might be like they need to be open to hearing from you, your side.

JUNE: Yeah, like we both surrender. It's not that one person... 'Cause it's hard. 'Cause one person can be so defensive even though I don't want them to feel hostile about what I have to say. I just want to come into an agreement of something or come into understanding to something. I don't want them to feel like I'm hurting them or feel hostile 'cause I understand it's hard for them and I would like them to also understand that it's hard for me, too [referencing cultural identity and cultural norms]. And so we can find a middle ground.

I think because the participants experience and perceive belonging to their primary cultures differently than others, they value belonging to social groups and human connection as important through the way this presents itself as “community” within the school. In one of June’s observations, I noticed that the class was doing research as a part of their course material. Part of what June and her peers had to do was survey other students, and it was clear throughout the lesson that the teacher wanted students to make their research their own. As the teacher was guiding their research questions, it was clear that there was a middle ground intentionally created where students were free to follow their own interests, but also had the necessary guidance from their teacher.

The presence of community also intersected with other important codes, such as: discussion, humour, having fun, rapport between teachers and students, rapport between peers, comfort, practicing skills, and the presence of cultural hybridity. These coded concepts seemed to be the main things that influenced the presence of community within the research site. Community seems to be a gateway to cultural identity negotiation, which surfaces as cultural hybridity, and is cultivated and nourished by other intersecting factors (discussion, humour, having fun, rapport between teachers and students, rapport between peers, comfort, practicing skills). In order to understand participants’ negotiation of their home and school cultures, the data suggests it is important to understand how the participants experience belonging, as to negotiate cultures is to negotiate the perception and experience of where one belongs.

In this section, I discussed *the role of community*, and in the next section I will expand the discussion of the role of community to the next code, *community belonging and interaction with peers*.

4.3.1 Community Belonging and Interaction with Peers

Belonging within a community is often crafted by how participants engage within their community. Johnson (1993) suggests that, in Bourdieusian theory, the way that participants engage, through their behaviour and dispositions, would be their *habitus*, and the way in which the habitus of the individual works is determined by the *field* in which it exists. Bourdieu (1993) defines habitus as a:

system of dispositions - a present past that tends to perpetuate itself into the future by reactivation in similarly structured practices, an internal law through which the law of external necessities, irreducible to immediate constraints, is constantly exerted - is the principle of the continuity and regularity which objectivism sees in social practices without being able to account for it; and also of the regulation transformations that cannot be explained either by the extrinsic, instantaneous determinisms of mechanistic sociology or by the purely internal but equally instantaneous determination of spontaneist subjectivism. (p. 54)

This means that participants' habitus operates as an internal law which is threaded to external laws of particular fields, therefore, the way in which the habitus exists is determined by the field. Explaining this concept, Johnson (1993) says that "[a]gents do not act in a vacuum, but rather in concrete social situations governed by a set of objective social relations" (p. 6). The set of social relations, or fields, govern how agents act. Johnson (1993) says that "[t]o account for these situations or contexts, without, again, falling into the determinism of objective analysis, Bourdieu developed the concept of field (*champ*)" (p. 6). In this way, the participants' actions are not objective, they are subjective to the laws of the fields

in which their habitus operates. The habitus is governed by a series of hierarchically organized fields (Johnson, 1993). This research aims to explore the habitus of participants as it is placed within the context of three cultural fields: Western culture, Non-Western culture, and the third, interstitial culture, which is argued as its own, separate, yet intertextual, field. Participants who negotiate cultures well have been able to tailor their habitus so that it is selectively governed by particular rules of each of these three fields of culture. This research aims to understand how participants can acquire Western culture, benefit from its forms of, what Bourdieu would call, symbolic capital that this secondary culture gives them, but not have it diminish, cheapen, or replace the symbolic capital they possess from their primary culture. Bourdieu (1993) explains symbolic capital as the following:

Alongside the pursuit of ‘economic’ profit, which treats the cultural goods business as a business like any other, and not the most profitable, ‘economically’ speaking... and merely adapts itself to the demand of an already converted clientele, there is also room for the *accumulation of symbolic capital*. ‘Symbolic capital’ is to be understood as economic or political capital that is disavowed, misrecognized and thereby recognized, hence legitimate, a ‘credit’ which, under certain conditions, and always in the long run, guarantees ‘economic’ profits. (p. 75)

In order to understand how participants, called *agents* in Bourdieusian theory, acquire and trade symbolic capital, we must place their experience within an intertextual framing of fields which they enter into and compete for power within. In order to benefit from symbolic capital, agents must understand how it works (an understanding that is not always a conscious one); they must be able to possess “cultural capital as a form of knowledge, an internalized code or a cognitive acquisition which equips the social agent with empathy towards,

appreciation for or competence in deciphering cultural relations and cultural artefacts” (Johnson, 1993, p. 7). Theoretically, participants associate with other agents, who, like them, belong to the interstitial cultural field, in which part of their shared habitus is to determine ways in which to acquire cultural capital from their secondary (Western) cultural field while also maintaining capital from their primary (non-Western) cultural field.

The data suggests that one of the factors that influences the ability to negotiate their cultural fields is strengthened by the presence of strong social bonds with their peers. I observed June, Karla, Aida, and Salem during an after school practice for an upcoming event, and something that stood out to me was the level of camaraderie these participants had with one another. Throughout the observation, I noticed they consistently gave words of encouragement to each other, laughed together, and had fun together as they practiced. I observed similar peer rapport in other observations as well. I observed Alyssa quietly chatting with a friend in one of her classes, as did Lisa in another observation; Ronnie consistently interacted with his peers as he made jokes to make them laugh; Karla also liked to tease her friends, as I observed in the lunchtime observation previously described; and, Petrie often initiated discussion about class materials with her peers.

What at first glance might seem like ‘friendship’ has a deeper implication for the participants in that the bond they create with one another is a form of capital they are able to use in order to solidify their position and belonging to their interstitial culture. The interstitial culture is almost like an apex that must have

strong definition in order for participants to associate with their cultural codes on ‘either side’ of the interstitial culture. This means that in order to belong to both primary and secondary cultures, participants must also, simultaneously, belong to the interstitial culture which acts like an overlapping middle ground between the two polar fields of primary and secondary culture. Salem, in her individual audio journal, discussed how belonging at school is significant to her experience negotiating cultures:

SALEM: It feels important to me that I feel like I belong at school, and at home with my culture, but to be honest my culture doesn't really affect much, since... well, it effects at home more than at school... since, at school, I'm more exposed to Western culture and I watch a lot of Western stuff, which makes me feel like I'm more exposed to the Western stuff, but also mixed with the Asian culture. That's why I feel like I belong at school more than I... I can negotiate well at school more than at my home, 'cause [at home,] we would often fight about our beliefs and stuff.

Without the zone of the interstitial culture, participants may have no place in which to negotiate cultural identity and belonging to each adjacent culture, and in a way, the interstitial cultural field acts as a cultural capital compensator when the participant experienced difficulty negotiating capital between primary and secondary cultures. For this reason, bonds between other agents within the interstitial culture become a form of symbolic capital within the interstitial zone, or field, because it gives participants one of the highest commodities for a TCK individual: belonging.

Participants who negotiate cultures well initiate their belonging to school communities, and their belonging is enhanced by social bonds made with peers whose cultural habitus is negotiated similarly. The participants seem more successful at negotiating their cultures because they are in an environment where

their peers must also negotiate. At Morehouse International School, cultural negotiation between Western culture and non-Western cultures of home, and the presence of the interstitial culture is a norm rather than an outlier, and the data suggests that this environment is conducive to better cultural identity negotiation because those who must negotiate are not alone. Activities, clubs, teams, and classes that help the participants engage with one another in natural ways help them find belonging and negotiate cultural fields into their habitus. Such is the case for Karla, Ronnie, June, and Aida, in their focus group interview, when they describe their experiences finding belonging in extracurricular activities and in classroom environments. Karla described her experience playing sports for a school team:

RESEARCHER: Yeah, so let's talk about community a little bit more. In all of the observations that I've been in so far, I've noticed that community is there in some kind of way. Can you tell me a little bit about how you experience community in your classes or maybe, you know, on other parts on campus or through other school events or anything? How is the concept of community relative to you? [Looks to KARLA] Do you wanna go first for us?

KARLA: I would say, like for the community there's a big difference between whether I go outside to a sports event or being here in school. Cause I feel like when I'm here in school my social group is much smaller and it's much more tight-knit because it's more of the people that I know and I have some kinda connection to... like they might have the same kind of ideals as me or have the same kinda mind as me. So I attract more of that group... But then when it comes to like Thai culture, people or those of Asian-descent I feel like they wanna stay with their community and speak [language of] Thai culture or speak the language and go to their separate group more than me. I feel kinda excluded sometimes, especially like if I had to, of course, put stuff in to actually get into it and it feels kinda awkward for me. And so when I go to a sports event I feel that everyone is on the same score as me. It's much easier to make friends, you can, it makes me feel like, 'oh, that was a great pass', and just start a conversation like that. Much easier and it flows much quicker. And everybody there is just so like into the same

things. It's just like, if you feel like it's easier to find commonalities with each other.

Karla indicated, however, that being involved in sports (as shown above) has helped her make relationships with both Thai culture and non-Thai culture international school students in a natural way. Interestingly, Ronnie, in his individual interview, also mentioned that there is a connection between sports and cultural community for him as well:

RESEARCHER: Are there any things outside of school, either at home or with your friends, that help ground you in your Thai culture culture? So the things you've mentioned, they've talked mainly about grounding you in Western culture. What about the opposite of that? How do you feel like you've been able to remain true to your Thai culture culture at the same time as learning Western culture?

RONNIE: One of the main ones is probably going to be soccer. Soccer in my opinion, in Thailand, is one of the most popular sports, and I think it reeks of Thai culture in a way because it's communication, it's cooperation, it's being forgiving to one another, trying to become one big group. I feel like that's collectivistic nature of Thailand in a way. Soccer, for me, is one of the activities that I can completely express my Thai-ness. Whenever we play, we always speak in Thai because our team is mostly Thai culture and communicate in language we'll understand. And also because when you speak in Thai, you express your Thai culture-ness more, you become more friendly in a way, I think. And yeah, so when I play sports, especially soccer, I feel like I become more grounded to my Thai-ness.

In this instance, however, sports, specifically football (soccer), is where Ronnie feels like he is able to connect with his primary Thai culture culture, whereas for Karla, sports were a way she could find belonging to community. I think an important concept in common between both participants is the concept of 'oneness'. Amidst cultural disconnection, sports allow each participant to find belonging whether it be for Karla through teamwork and natural connections, or for Ronnie through an experiential metaphor that allows him to experience his

primary collectivist culture on the field. It can be argued, therefore, that activities, such as sport teams, allow students an interstitial space to connect with peers and develop belonging to community. Extra-curricular and co-curricular programmes, which are often cut or underfunded in schools, could be important for some international school students who negotiate cultural identities. TCKs may be able to negotiate identity through their social interactions as they participate in teams, clubs, or co-curricular activities if they see that these spaces offer them opportunities to find a sense of belonging to peer groups. Some students, who may not find a strong sense of peer social belonging in the classroom environment, could find other opportunities to create bonds with peers through extra-curricular and co-curricular programmes.

Karla indicated that classes that allow students to interact physically with other classmates make it easier for her to connect with other people; this is affirmed by the perspectives of June and Aida, during their focus group interview:

RESEARCHER: Without naming names of like your actual teachers, do you think there are any classrooms where you go in there and you feel like the teacher has done a really good job about creating a feel where you belong there?

KARLA: I'd say the Performing Arts... the Performing Arts does a very good job of that because they really try to have events or certain activities students to go through to build connections with each other. Every morning, my teacher gets us up and get us to really open ourselves up and to be more ready physically for learning and communicating and working together.

JUNE: Same.

AIDA: Same. And we have a Performing Arts teacher, too. We also have our Psychology teacher.

JUNE: [Confirms] Psychology teacher.

AIDA: And my Business teacher. [Talking about creating community] I think they help, it was pretty open because we had a lot of projects that we did for the group in front of, like, the entire class. So, it became a classroom environment where we all relied on each other and we could all open up to each other without any like fear of any of discrimination.

RESEARCHER: Yeah. So you have group work and class projects where you're working in teams. What else? Like, is there anything, even about like the classroom set up or the way the desks are arranged, or like stuff on the walls, or the way in which the teacher interacts with you, that creates that feeling that you belong there?

AIDA: There is, that, because it's like some of the classrooms have sofas and it's fun because people like to talk about, like compete, on who gets the sofa or in [names a course] there is, like, tables but they're tables that surround group.

JUNE: Surround. Yeah.

AIDA: [Looks to June and defines what 'surround' means]. Some classes have like the tables arranged in a circle so you can kinda see everyone. Or it's just, like, in the performing arts you can just, it's (the table arrangement) in a line, but then there's a practice room that you can go into [at the school practice rooms are open spaces with no desks or chairs to allow more physically oriented group work).

RESEARCHER: Right.

JUNE: [Confirms what Aida says] It's open space. It's very open and we could see everyone. That's how... what I observed is set up as... Yeah.

RESEARCHER: Being able to see everybody? [June nods].

Bourdieuian theory holds the belief that all agents, for whichever hierarchy of fields they associate with, are in competition for the symbolic capital within those fields. What makes the interstitial cultural field unique is that the symbolic capital of peer social bonds, which has some level of agent competition for, is built upon interdependency, something which seems paradoxical with competition. When Aida says, "we all relied on each other and we could all open up to each other

without any like fear of any of discrimination”, her words can be interpreted as evidence as the need for interdependency. In order to acquire stronger peer social bonds, agents must experience interdependency with their peers.

In this section, I discussed the *community belonging and interaction with peers*, and in the next section, I will discuss the next predominant code, *teacher-student rapport*, as it relates to community.

4.3.2 Community and Teacher-Student Rapport

One significant aspect I found consistent in all of my observations of participants is the high level of teacher-student rapport, and I observed how this rapport between participants and their teachers helped build community and group belonging within the classroom. Participants clearly enjoyed their classroom teachers, the environments of the classes, and the relationships they build within their classrooms. Overall, I observed participants in every content area department that the high school offers, and I found it particularly impactful how genuine, meaningful, caring, and mentoring the participants had with their teachers, which was made clear by the obvious rapport participants uniquely had with each teacher. During the observation phase of this research, I noted most classroom seating arrangements were located in a way that students could face each other and physically interact: the set-up of classrooms helped facilitate the high amount of verbal discussion that happened in each class. Teacher desks were either non-existent, or unimportant during the class sessions, as teachers were physically ‘one’ and proximate with the classes they were instructing. I think the physical arrangement I noticed in the classroom settings helped create a comfortable

environment that communicated to participants that they belonged in the space, and that it was there for them to interact with each other and their teachers in a way that built rapport.

The participants indicated that the way in which teachers support students and the level of teacher-student rapport are important and helps them transfer belonging into their school environment and assists in how they are able to negotiate between their cultures of home with the secondary, Western culture of their classes and instructional styles of their teachers. Aida, in her individual interview, had a lot to say in this regard:

RESEARCHER: Any other ideas about how culture was brought in or your first culture was recognized in school?

AIDA: I have Culture-B ancestry and my Dad wanted me to learn [Language of Culture-B] but I was really, really struggling with the language because we didn't... my Dad speaks it but we don't use it at home and it's just not that common that he uses it at home. We tried when I was younger but then we... we just stopped and then I forgot all of the entire language. So, that happened and my [Language] teacher was reaching out to me trying to view if there was anything wrong because she was reaching out to help me with my work because I was always... I was a bad student [grins sheepishly] so I always was turning things in late and struggling and then getting low scores so I didn't understand what was, like, being said and all the things we were learning. And she reached out to me and then she also reached out to my counselor, my high school counselor as well as my parents to talk about it.

AIDA: But she was really... she was really kind. So I really do like my teacher. It's like, it's one of those weird ones [describing an experience with the teacher] where you love the teacher but you still hate the subject [smiles and laughs]. It's usually where you hate the subject because you hate the teacher. Funny, [tries to correct herself] I didn't hate the subject. I suffered with the subject... I don't hate it. [excited and placed emphasis] But I *love* the teacher.

RESEARCHER: Yeah. Well, I even noticed after [another class] that you saw [the Culture-B Language teacher] in the hallway and you ran up and

you gave her a hug and I thought that was, I don't know, was a really beautiful moment. Yeah.

AIDA: Thank you. I like her. [Corrects herself] I *love* her [smiles happily].

In the hallway, I had observed Aida run up to her teacher and give her a big hug to say hello. When this happened, I was struck by how moving it was that there was such a strong bond between Aida and her teacher. This interaction had occurred early on in the observation phase, and it solidified other observations of participants who had strong relationships with their teachers.

Aida and June behaved similarly with another teacher they both had. The lesson I observed was more kinesthetic by nature, and so the class was moving around and practicing skills they had learned. When Aida and June would ‘mess up’ what they were practicing for the class, I noticed that the teacher would smile and joke with them about the mishap, and then both participants would run to their teacher and either put their hand on the teacher’s shoulder or give the teacher a hug. Both Aida and June later mentioned how this particular course provided them the opportunity to express themselves freely, and that they felt supported in this teacher’s classroom. The caring relationship that teachers construct with Aida and June was something that they indicated made them feel like they belong somewhere within the school, therefore, this data suggests that caring relationships with teachers provides students with an environment to be who they are. Feeling safe to express oneself in community settings is something that carries great impact for TCK students who continually negotiate who they are, and where they belong, culturally.

Petrie, in her individual interview, added to her ideas on how teachers approach her home culture. When asked about how her teachers create a welcoming classroom environment, she acknowledged that although it is important for teachers to ask about culture sensitively, combined with other community building activities, does make her feel culturally welcome:

RESEARCHER: What about other things that your teachers do for everybody in the class that help create a welcoming feel?

PETRIE: I guess getting to know each other. Those ice breaking activities and the teacher trying to talk to us and getting us to talk to each other. The teacher that I told you about, where he asked me about being Thai culture and my perspectives on things, I feel like it's a little weird, but it's quite nice too. We get to share our personal experiences.

For Salem, the support and encouragement she has received from her teachers has made her feel welcome and like she belongs to the school community. She communicated that she often felt self-doubt, especially when speaking English in front of her class, but that she has had teachers who have helped her overcome this fear. There is a fear of 'messing up' for the participant population because there is a combination of academic pressure from home (common amongst some families) and the difficulty of needing to use language to bridge the gap between home and school culture. But for Salem, the rapport she has built with her teachers through her fear to fail seems to have helped her ability to feel more secure and find belonging at school. Salem shared the following in her individual interview:

RESEARCHER: Do you have an example from a class, without naming the name of the teacher, where you feel like they really helped your ability to be open minded? What's an example of that?

SALEM: I don't know whether this is about open minded, but the class, everyone was complaining about the test, and so was I, but then I'm naturally bad in this field. I told him I'll try my best. He said, "You should because this is an important test." But when the result came out, I didn't get what I expected. I failed. I felt very bad and I started crying and he said, "It's fine because we're all different. [Gesticulates from one side to the other] You're good at this, and I'm good at this. We're good at different things. So you shouldn't think that just one failure in this class means that you're a failure in life." That makes me feel he is understanding.

RESEARCHER: Was your relationship with this teacher... was it strengthened from that experience?

SALEM: I think it was strengthened because I like him a lot now. Whenever I see him, I would call his name out loud, but I don't know whether he feels the same.

RESEARCHER: Well, I'm sure he does because, as teachers, we care about you very much.

This is something that I observed frequently in classes – the environment that teachers constructed seemed like a safe space to ‘fail’ in. In many Asian cultures, failure has the potential to carry a lot of shame, and may create a situation where students feel like they lose face in front of others. I observed, however, that teachers who gave permission to participants to fail, while also supporting them to try again, seemed to be the courses that participants said helped their self-confidence. When participants were asked about how their teachers helped them negotiate their cultures, they often said that teachers who allow them to be free, or to be themselves, helped them negotiate cultures, and there is a correlation between the ability to ‘be free’ in a class and the permission to ‘mess up’ and try again at whatever task is attempted.

Later in her individual interview, Salem told a second story about how another teacher helped her overcome fear of giving an oral presentation in front of her class:

(continued)

SALEM: I was even too scared to get in front of the class to talk. I need a friend with me or else I would panic.

RESEARCHER: Wow. So, what did the teacher do? Are there any strategies that you have... that some teachers or a particular teacher have done that helps you give you confidence?

SALEM: Well, one teacher, he gave me time because I had to debate with another friend and that friend is very smart and I knew for sure I was going to lose. I was so afraid to embarrass myself and I refused to go up and I cried. He said, "it isn't a huge deal", and he told me, "it's fine. You know you will lose so there's nothing more to lose then". "So, just breathe, and I'll give you time tomorrow". Which kind of supports me, even though it feels so little, but usually the teacher will be, like, "Just go up. Just go up." But he told me it's okay.

RESEARCHER: And just gave you extra time. That's nice.

SALEM: [Nods. Confirms.]

Lisa, in her individual interview, spoke of how it was difficult for her to transition culturally between Western and Thai culture cultures after she moved from the United States back to Thailand. She said that one thing that helped her ability to transition and negotiate her cultures was when a teacher caringly reached out to her when she was having a difficult time.

RESEARCHER: So in this moment that you just described, about it kind of being a little bit confusing, if you were to list maybe, like, three things that teachers, or club advisors, did that really helped you, or that they can "do this" to help other kids like you - what would those three things be? And we're thinking about, like, things to do with how a teacher, or an adult, or an advisor can do to help a student like you, who has two cultural experiences and, who after coming back, has these kind of experiences where they feel like they don't belong culturally and, therefore, feel like

they don't belong individually. What would educators, teachers, mentors, adults do that help the process for you to figure out who you are?

LISA: I had a teacher who was very concerned with both my physical and mental health, because he saw it slowly deteriorate over time. And so what he did was he often just gave me a small reminder after class each day to not worry about unnecessary things, and to put myself first. Another teacher was very angry with me for a long time because I refused to speak in class, because I was afraid of being wrong. He eventually found out that once I became comfortable around my peers I began to speak more often. And so I think it's important for teachers to understand that students may take time to adjust to their new environments and to try to slowly encourage them rather than 'shove them off a cliff'.

Here, Lisa mentions that two things (when a teacher reached out to her, and when another teacher gave her extra time she needed) helped her when she was culturally trying to transition and negotiate her belonging and identity. A teacher caring to reach out, and a teacher giving extra time are the two things that Salem (as mentioned before) also said helped her negotiate her cultures in the classroom setting and to figure out where she belonged, too. The combination of teacher care and extra time, therefore, are helpful tools to empower TCK students figure out who they are, where they belong, and how to negotiate their cultural identities. Strong teacher rapport with students was observed to positively influence participants' ability to belong to community, especially when they simultaneously are able to bond with their peers to establish peer rapport, as is discussed in the last section of this chapter.

This section discussed the data associated with *teacher-student rapport* coding, and the next section discusses how *humour* is significant to the participants' classroom experiences.

4.3.3 Teacher-Student Rapport through Humour

Participants also said that something their teachers do that makes them feel welcome and that they belong is when they either use humour in class, or allow humour to unfold, even if it might disrupt the course of a lesson planned. Humour frequented school environments in which I observed participants, and many discussed humour when they spoke about what made the school environment a place they felt like they belonged to. In classroom or co-curricular activities, I often noticed participants ‘playing around’, and I wondered if their teachers would be upset as they sometimes seemed ‘off task’, but as I continued to observe, I realized that the participants were, for the most part, completing their work and on task, but were just joking around while doing so.

In one particular observation, Ronnie seemed to slyly joke with his classmates as they completed their work, however, the teacher welcomed this kind of humour and seemed to operate under the assumption that Ronnie was still on task. The way the teacher made room in the class for humour built trust between Ronnie, because allowing someone to make jokes may be seen as a way to ‘let loose’, which relates to what June has indicated in terms of feeling like good relationships with teachers are ones that are ‘open’ and mutual. This mutuality is something that seems to be essential to the TCK experience negotiating cultures, because mutual relationships between teachers and students are allowed a more even-handed exchange – something important to students whose primary culture may not carry the same cultural hegemony as Western culture on a global scale. Teachers and participants at Morehouse International

School seem to value each other and their cultures, which I think was particularly empowering for participants.

Humour is also one factor that I believe to be a catalyst for the high level of rapport I observed between participants and their teachers. For participants whose home culture differs drastically from the Western culture at school, the relationships they have with their teachers is extremely important. Strong bonds with teachers and caring adults at the school is one thing that seems to help the participants negotiate their cultural identities between home and school. In their focus group interview, Karla, Aida, and June told me two stories where bonds with one another and their teachers occurred through humour:

RESEARCHER: So, something that I notice a lot in observations is there's usually a sense of either, like, having fun, or humour - either between peers in the class, or between you and your teacher. Can you guys think a little bit about the role that humour plays in your experience at the school?

JUNE: [says with determination] We need it!

AIDA: Yeah, we laugh together, we bond more.

JUNE: It's like, you work hard, you play hard. Like for the three of us we actually work very hard. We need it [humour] a lot to keep ourselves sane. It's the truth.

RESEARCHER: Yeah. Are there any teachers that you just find that you laugh a lot when you're in their class? Without naming their names, just describe the experience.

KARLA: I remember being in a teacher's class, and I'd always come in, and it was one of the most fun classes, I would look forward to it because my Dad is very big on that content and he has done very well in his degree in that area, and so that course has always been a very big part of my life. So when I came into that teacher's class, it was one of the classes that I actually enjoyed going to when I was younger. And I found that because of their nationality they had that kinda sarcastic personality and they would very much self-deprecate, but also be able to, like, take it *and* give it back. Which was very helpful because I find here in this school that very

few people can really take a joke very well, and that, like, like some people people have difficulties understanding my jokes and my sense of humour and my sarcasm, at times, and so like I try to be very careful with what I say to other people. I found myself being able to express myself more in their class and joke more light-heartedly with that teacher than with other teachers, [grins] even though I might have taken it a little too far at points [laughs].

For Karla, humour with her teacher, her teacher's acceptance of her sense of humour, and tolerance for her humour is what made her feel like she could be herself. After I asked her if humour is a way that she feels like she belongs to a class, or if humour helps her feel the freedom to be who she is, Karla added:

KARLA: I would say humour does play a big part in that. But it also helps that I try to be very open minded and accepting of other people and their ideas. If you open yourself up to other people, people are more likely to open themselves up. You give and you take, it's both ways. Humour is a big part because it allows me to lower people's guard and create that mutual understanding. Humour is also a good point where it's hard to find the balance between the two cultures and two ideals with humour. It can sometimes be hard to navigate at certain times but I would say humour does play a big part in how I identify with other people in other cultures.

RESEARCHER: Do you think that is one reason why you also think you like to be involved in performing arts?

KARLA: I think when I started performing arts, it was more to help me gain confidence because I was trying to find who I was and where I belong. So performing arts was an outlet to help me gain the courage to interact with people honestly because before when I was living in the states, I felt like I was wearing a mask because I always try to be the representation people wanted me to be and so I found myself lying to myself more of who I was and where I came from. So that was a really big issue that I needed to overcome and now, performance is like you said, a way for me to look at different people and how they go through life and how they experience different things and how to overcome different ideas and it really does warm me up to understanding different perspectives and becoming more understanding and in tune with other people's feelings. Which will help me with interacting with other people especially when I feel like an outsider or I feel like I need to take the other step to really get to know people. Performing arts pushes my boundaries.

RESEARCHER: So you said that it helps build confidence so one last question I have is, what else have you experienced in school or outside of school that because of something that someone has done or because of a scenario or because of an experience that you have felt like it has given you more confidence? Just in general, what helps give students confidence?

KARLA: I think confidence is built with experiences especially for me. Because I experience a multitude of different things and I'm still experiencing things. For instance, in Thai culture they focus a lot about the body and making comments with the body and I had to understand that all the comments I experienced in my day to day life were just going to have to be pushed to the side.

Karla indicates that confidence is built through experiences. In order to undergo a symbolic revolution, Bourdieu (1993) suggests that “the most innovative enterprises are the privilege of those who have inherited both the boldness and the insurance that enable this freedom to grow” (p. 170). Although the insurance Bourdieu is talking about in this circumstance is economic, other forms of capital can also serve as insurance. Karla has indicated the importance of confidence, a concept which arose many times during observations, interviews, and journals for many of the participants. I propose that the insurance needed for TCKs to successfully revolt against cultural norms that dominate their position of power includes confidence as a form of symbolic capital. Community belonging is built through things like humour, and rapport with mentors, and after community is established and an individual feels a sense of belonging to it through the norms it operates under within its field, that individual can then acquire more confidence (which further empowers them). Confidence creates Bourdieusian insurance for potential lapses in cultural identity negotiation because it rebuilds the ability to ‘try again’, to continue to try to negotiate cultural belonging with the

foreknowledge that there is a safety net of community belonging which can ‘kick in’ to sustain the agent as they wait through the “time-lag” needed to restrict the field of power that subjugates their culturally marginalized position to domination (p. 169).

Later, Karla mentioned that she often uses humour to ‘test out’ whether or not she can be herself with someone, and if they can’t take her joke, she decides that this is when she needs to be more careful with them. Karla’s cultural background is extremely diverse, and I think one successful way that she negotiates her own cultural boundaries is through humour. Humour takes life events and makes them more taboo, and I think there is a parallel between a TCK whose cultural identity is ‘taboo’ when compared to the norm (in this case the ‘norm’ a non-TCK teenager who does not have such diverse cultural boundaries to cross) and the taboo nature of humour. In their focus group interview, June, Aida, and Karla discuss their own experience with humour in the classroom:

RESEARCHER: Can you think of an experience or a teacher where you walk in and you're just, like, “I have fun here, and the teacher is funny or they allow me to be funny”.

JUNE: [Names two courses]

JUNE: [Confirms course identified with Aida]

AIDA: Yeah. [Smiles]

AIDA: [Names a third course]. Oh and ...

JUNE: [Names a fourth course]. [laugh together reminiscently]

Both June and Aida had lots of courses they think were fun, and where the teacher was funny or lets them be funny. They banter back and forth before they decide which one to tell a story about:

AIDA: There's, like, this class... but partly because of the teacher... and also like the students that we have in the class... Oh, there's this one time... it was sooooo funny... where the power went out and there's only two boys in our class and they like screamed soooo loud! They were, like, went to the wall and climbed down like the shelves! [June cries out in laughter at this memory].

KARLA: They thought it was a terrorist attack and everybody started screaming. They were all hiding behind and under the desks. And the teacher was like, "what is happening to our class?"

The participants continue to talk about how the rest of the class was, essentially, derailed from both the power outage and because the whole class was in an uproar about two of the students who screamed and hid when the power transformer blew. They talked about how the teacher was not angry with the class for laughing and having fun together in the moment, but that the teacher let them have their sense of humour instead of being strict about the class lesson. This allowance, within reason, for taboo behaviour seems to be one of the factors I observed that all participants all posited in some way throughout their classrooms. The data suggests, therefore, that humour and taboo behaviour may be tools that TCKs use to 'push the boundaries', almost as if mirroring the way that they push the boundaries of their own cultural identity.

All the while, however, there is an underlying safety net, or insurance, that the community of the school and classrooms create: rapport with teachers makes the participants feel safe, safe to be different, and safe to discover who they are. When asked how they might advise teachers on strategies to make TCK students,

like them, feel welcome and like they belong to the culture and community at school, Karla, Aida, and June suggested the following in their focus group interview:

RESEARCHER: All right so the last like question I want to ask you is, can you pretend you were to write one of those 'books like for Dummies', right? Like a chapter called 'Connecting with Culture', or, like, 'Helping Me Belong', and your audience for this chapter is teachers. If you were to tell us, "here's what you have to do to make me feel like I belong to the school" or "I belong to your class" or "I belong to this group we have in this room", what would your strategies be? And it can be anything from something small, like waiting outside and saying hello to you, or, being kind, or, I don't know...

JUNE: Like, to fix the disconnect? Like, be a little, like, open.

RESEARCHER: So what does that look like? Like, what would *you* like?

JUNE: We want you to care.

KARLA: I think like a loving initiative, like, open, like, a doorway where they would joke with us, or start a conversation with us that's very light hearted, and if anybody could enter [the conversation] and then we'd get a lot more friendly of an atmosphere. Especially, like, in the morning if we're tired and we don't wanna be in school or just wanna sleep...

JUNE: It doesn't have to be big.

KARLA: No, just like, How are you? You know, Did you see that game? Or, Have you heard this joke? Or like something, a knock-knock joke or a ...

JUNE: It can be awkward. It can totally be awkward. [meaning the thing the teacher does can be awkward]

KARLA: [agrees]

AIDA: They can be open to have fun with us. They can be open to having fun. And maybe we can have like a session, where, after like, we know most of the people in class, so it's comfortable... it's a comfortable environment already... so make it so that we're comfortable with not only the teacher but with our peers, and then maybe have one day where, instead of discussing class, we have a classroom discussion - like it doesn't have to be about what we're learning, but just about our lives in general.

KARLA: Maybe just be like watching one video, just talk about something funny or like a little snippet or cartoon. Something light-hearted.

JUNE: A heart-to-heart.

AIDA: [adds] Some teachers have the option where you can pick the music that you can play. Like you can do that or you could also be like, Oh yeah, I saw this funny video but it's like a little bit of like laughter and like a little bit of yourself that you can show and share.

KARLA: [agrees]

JUNE: Like, give us the access to be... to be kids! Because we're still kids. We're not adults yet.

KARLA: yeah

RESEARCHER: [laughs] Yeah, neither am I.

KARLA, AIDA, JUNE: [laughter].

AIDA: We all want to have fun. Let's make it fun.

RESEARCHER: Yeah, so, we have: playing music, asking about your life, saying hello, telling a joke... What else did you mention? You mentioned a couple of other things.

JUNE: [adds to the list] How are you?

RESEARCHER: [remembers] Just asking simply, "how are you", [adds to the list] it's okay to be awkward...

AIDA: Respect... as like, it doesn't have to be "reverence" but just respect us as a person. Like, there's some biased teachers.

JUNE: Yeah, like ... UM

RESEARCHER: Without naming their names, can you tell me about that? What do you mean?

JUNE: Like I have, it may not be teachers but, I heard from our school that our freshman males, like, according to a few teachers I know, are misunderstood and some teachers are saying that they are bad students when really they're just being boys or like ...

RESEARCHER: What do you mean, like just being silly?

JUNE: Just being silly. And they actually need that. And they just need to be a little bit understood that they need to be a little more silly.

From the participants' suggestions, here, one could argue that 'being silly' is a form of being taboo, of letting loose. The story these participants told about a time they felt welcome in a class, or a time that they have a fun class, was an experience they had when a teacher let them "be silly" and let loose. It seems as though the participants indicated that teachers who let them be silly and show their humour are the teachers that they feel accepted by.

The feeling of being accepted is extremely important for this TCK population because they may not feel fully accepted by each of the cultures they navigate as they simultaneously want to be understood as belonging to all of the cultures that they associate with. The teacher-student rapport code co-occurred with community multiple times during the data analysis phase. When teachers support students and build nurturing relationships with them (through things like being open or by allowing humour), students experience greater belonging to the community of the school and classroom environments.

This section discussed ways that participants experienced *humour* in the research site and how this influenced community belonging, and the next section will move on to discuss how *acceptance and understanding of culturally negotiated identity* is significant to participants' ability to negotiate cultures.

4.4 Acceptance and Understanding of Culturally Negotiated Identity

To summarize findings thus far, participants indicate that what is important to their ability to negotiate cultures is the space/community provided for them at school to feel like they belong, and to feel like one belongs occurs within the context of a community created for one to belong to in the first place. After the participants indicate that they have felt belonging to a school community, as is influenced by teacher-student rapport, peer-peer rapport, humour, and the freedom to be oneself, they have indicated that what helps them negotiate their cultures is the acceptance of who they are, and an understanding that they belong to both home and school cultures simultaneously.

This code primarily surfaced within the dialogical data, as it is relatively difficult to observe participants' inner feelings of acceptance and understanding. Additionally, after I observed community to be such a significant factor to participants' observed experiences in school, I wondered how community was significant to their cultural identity negotiation process. When asking about their experience negotiating cultures during the interview process, which occurred after observations, I discovered that part of the reason community seemed so significant to participants during the observational stage is linked to their dialogical data, also presented in this section, that focuses on how acceptance and community are linked: one cannot feel acceptance if they do not have a community to which they belong. Below are field notes from separate observations of Ronnie and June, for whom I observed acceptance and understanding of culturally negotiated identity during my observation(s) of their classrooms environments:

1. RONNIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

[7:40] Discussion Question: What would happen if we did not know that other people had their own sets of thoughts?

Ronnie initiates the first discussion with the group, listens to others discuss, turns to his right to discuss, turns to his left to discuss, and then turns to his table and states:

“you would make every decision concerning yourself”. “Other people’s thoughts may be better than ours.”

Makes eye contact with teacher when discussing the concept of empathy.

[Observer Comments: I think that this kind of discussion question has high potential to transfer into how one accepts cultural norms practiced by others].

2. JUNE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Asks to dance to a Chinese dance, and cheers when teacher gives permission.

[Observer comment: June appears to value Chinese cultural customs shown through dance].

Practices a dance learned for Chinese New Year celebration ceremony.

Class ends.

June wai’s [highest form of Thai gesticulation for gratitude, in this case, equivalent to prayer] to god of dance and art to end class.

[Observer comments: June appears to value and respect the cultural practice of this Thai custom, which is to pray to the god of dance and art before and after class. June is not Buddhist, but she does this gesticulation out of respect for Thai culture and an acceptance of this kind of cultural practice].

Next, I discuss the code, *acceptance and understanding of culturally negotiated identity*, in relation to dialogical data generated through interviews. In her individual interview, Ronnie spoke about how his teachers create an environment of cultural acceptance and understanding through their course curriculum and teaching strategies:

RESEARCHER: All right, let's go on to another question. Can you tell me, because you identify with Western culture and Thai culture, is there one culture that you feel like you belong to more than the other?

RONNIE: It depends where I am, really. In the school, since I have a lot of Thai culture friends, I think the Thai culture becomes more predominant because we see each other more and we use Thai quite a bit, more often than English. However, when I was in an English speaking class, or when I went on summer camps abroad, when I've been going with people who do use English, then I feel like my Thai culture becomes a bit inhibited. So, in my opinion, I think that, at least for me, I kind of can transition into culture when I need to. And, well, when I have to use different languages and have different cultural lenses in order for me to be able to communicate with others, I feel like I can change myself in order to fit in.

RESEARCHER: How does that feel that you can change yourself to fit in? Do you think that's a strength, or is that a struggle, or is it both?

RONNIE: I don't really feel any struggle from it because if I'm in, say, [mentions course name] or something, and I speak English with friends who do speak English, I don't actually feel like I'm missing out on my Thai culture because as soon as I contact my Thai friends or come back to Thailand, I can all of a sudden switch back. It's not really an issue as long as you're just okay in your position, you're comfortable, and you're having a good time.

RESEARCHER: So the fact that you can contact your friends or family that belong to both cultures kind of makes you feel a little grounded in each one?

RONNIE: Yeah. Of course. It's kind of like a buffer zone. It's not too Thai culture, or not too Western, so you can always have a, what do you call it, a middle ground for where you can be in both cultures at the same time.

It is important to understand that Ronnie is indicating that the school offers him a “buffer zone” where he can exist between cultures and be with people who understand him and his cultural negotiation. As peer rapport was coded frequently, the data suggests that the rapport between like-minded peers (as discussed in the ‘Community Belonging and Interaction with Peers’ section), who also must negotiate cultures between home and school is important to the validity of the cultural buffer zone that the school environment provides TCK students at Morehouse International School. Additionally, teacher-student rapport was coded

frequently as well, and the data also suggests that the way that participants feel accepted and supported by their teachers (as discussed in the community and teacher-student rapport section) is influential to the way that the school is their cultural buffer zone and allows them to negotiate belonging to both non-Western and Western cultures simultaneously.

In this regard, Ronnie adds:

RONNIE: In my opinion, I think an international school, like here, acts like a neutral ground for cultures to be exchanged. Since we have people from different ethnicities, different nationalities. Of course we have interactions between one another and basically as interactions go on we have exchanges of our own cultural beliefs and cultural values. So I think that an environment like this one is always open for cultural exchanges in forms of exchanging beliefs in anything, really. I think our students are at least very open about it, and teachers as well.

One reason why I think this research site contains so many students who seem to be able to successfully negotiate cultures is because, through the community and environment of belonging, it creates a context where the TCK participants, and students like them, can come and experience an interstitial zone where they are free to be both cultures simultaneously and are accepted for that identity. Within Bourdieusian theory, this buffer zone would constitute itself as its own field, and acceptable discourses within this field are adapted, reconstructed, and/or rejected from the fields of primary and secondary cultures. What is important to participants is that no one asks them to choose one over the other, and this is empowering:

(Continued from above)

RESEARCHER: Yeah. So with that middle ground, that kind of in-between area, do you have any kind of experiences at school in which you feel like you've tapped into that middle ground between cultures?

RONNIE: I feel like a lot of subjects are taboo in Thai culture, in a way. I'd say stuff about public displays of affection and stuff like that, I feel like at school with my friends who are not entirely Thai culture, or belong to Thai culture, they're more understanding than, or they're more willing to be accepting, of PDA. And I think that's the entire culture at our school, really. You're not afraid to express yourself which is obviously different to what Thai culture is. In Thai culture, you're very concerned of what other people will think of what you do. You're supposed to be very reserved in a way. But here, the fact that we've been educated in a Western education, which is a little more liberal, and at the same time, the fact that we're Thai culture allows us to stay true to our culture and what to do and what not to do.

RESEARCHER: Without naming names of your exact teachers or your peers in those classes, can you think of any experiences in class that you've had where you felt really allowed you to just be expressive, maybe about culture but maybe just in general, to express yourself?

RONNIE: In one class, the teacher always asks us about our own cultures. I'm sure he wants to know more about the Thai culture, but it's always... I think culture has a lot of parallels to the IB [International Baccalaureate] curriculum, and there's always discussions about culture that we have in class, and it allows us to express our thoughts on the culture clashes that we have, and how we have to integrate into a culture and understand others, which is, I think, really important.

RESEARCHER: So can you think of the style in which you're able to do that? Is it class discussions, or is it a written reflection, or is it just stimulus that the teacher exposes you to?

RONNIE: It's more like stimulus that leads to verbal class discussions. So basically the teacher would put up, maybe, a news article or something that we read in class and then he'll be like, "What do you guys think about this? Is this the same in Thailand?" And stuff like that.

RESEARCHER: Do you have any other experiences where teachers have asked you to compare Western culture with your Thai culture?

RONNIE: I feel like also in another class, we get to do that because some parts of the course is about culture. There's a lot of discussion about cultural differences and acculturation, how people can become integrated in other cultures and how they can be excluded. So I think that's also an aspect to it.

RESEARCHER: So it sounds like the balance between being able to make the connections between culture and discuss it in one class is combined

with the analysis of how cognitively the human mind works in terms of developing identity [in your discussions in another class].

RONNIE: Yeah.

Ronnie reveals something important about his experience in school: his ability to understand his culture, to understand other cultures, to negotiate between cultures, and to find empathy and respect for himself and for others is not created by one teacher alone. His experience learning how to negotiate cultures and understand cultures within the school environment is created through the scaffolding he is provided through cross-curricular opportunities, and is enhanced by the work of many teachers, combined; this collaboration is an important aspect to this research site's culture of community.

In her individual interview, Aida discussed the importance of teachers and students relying on one another. Co-reliance between teachers and students shares power dynamics, and as a result, is empowering for students. I also think that sharing power, especially between Western cultured teachers and students whose primary culture is non-Western is empowering, because it helps dilute hegemonic beliefs that one who is of Western culture is more powerful than one who is not. Additionally, Aida discusses the role that academic courses of TCK students' primary culture plays in her school experience. By including academic courses which relate to students' primary cultures the 'hidden curriculum' of the school research site suggests that there is equal value between differing cultures, which combats the belief that Western cultured academics or arts are more important. While observing June and Aida in a performing arts course, I noticed that the teacher promoted the cultural practice of 'wai'ing (Thai gesticulation of respectful

greeting) the god of performing arts. All students, regardless if they were Thai, participated in this classroom routine. This routine gave value to many of the students' home cultures. In her individual interview, Aida discusses similar support she has received from her teachers:

RESEARCHER: So, just observing you with a number of your teachers, it seems like you have a really nice rapport with all of them, and they're all very different content areas. Can you think of a time and maybe give an example of when you felt like your cultural identity was sort of brought into your classroom experience?

AIDA: So there is my dancing, so we can kind of ignore that one because it is Thai culture dance. But the other ones ...

RESEARCHER: Well, do you think, for example, with the Thai culture dance and some of the classes that you have available here, do you think that makes it a better transition between culture because that's [non-Western academic course option] an available course for you to get credit here. What if that wasn't offered?

AIDA: I'd be fine. I'd like to learn to dance, Thai culture dance. But I'm fine because I like the arts so I can just do different art curriculums like that. So it's not a big problem. It's just nice to be able to learn something like this in school because not a lot of places offer traditional [classes], or maybe they do, I do not know...

RESEARCHER: But maybe they don't offer the kind of traditional kind of styles of dance like that. Is there any other experience you've had in any class, and remember, don't name the name of the teacher, but experiences where you felt like the teacher allowed you to transition or code switch in a way that was helpful for you? You mentioned sometimes your teachers allow you to, kind of, say the word in Thai culture first and then come to a translation of what the best translation is. Is there anything else like that, that you can remember that teachers tend to do that help acknowledge that your Thai culture culture, but also acknowledge you have your western culture, too?

AIDA: Oh, sometimes because they don't know the language, they ask us how to say things in Thai, and then we help them with pronunciation and how to say the word, and which word means what exactly. So that does happen where they ask us how to say something in Thai, or when they need something. Like when one of the staff members come up and they don't know how to communicate when they're on the phone with some

kind of food delivery because it's in Thai, they ask us to help talk for them in Thai.

RESEARCHER: How does that make you feel?

AIDA: I feel fine because it's... just sometimes I'm nervous because I get mixed up sometimes with my Thai words unless I'm comfortable, sometimes I forget what the Thai word is and, I'm like "uh, uh, uh," on the phone.

RESEARCHER: Yeah, does it make you feel important that your teacher needs you to help you translate on the phone, or what do you feel like, or have you ever thought of that before?

AIDA: [humbly] Not as being important, more it's like, "oh she can rely on me for this" and "I hope I don't let her down by ordering the wrong thing".

RESEARCHER: Yeah. And that's something I think it's been really cool to observe in your classes is just this co-reliance. I really like seeing that. That it was clear that you rely on your teachers. But they also rely on you. And it was a really neat relationship to be able to observe.

AIDA: Thank you.

I observed this kind of co-reliance during one of Aida's observations, where Aida was recording notes on a performance she and her friends were preparing for. I noticed that Aida's teacher was helping other students, but all the while, Aida, herself, was taking a leadership role to help guide her peers as her teacher was busy with others. It seems as though it was Aida's regular routine to assist others through providing feedback, which I found to be a good example of teacher-student co-teaching, and also an example of a power-sharing teacher-student co-reliance.

In her experience, Aida indicates that it is when the teacher asks her for help with language translation that she feels like there is codependency between teacher and student. Teachers asking students for help understanding the language

or the culture of the student's primary home culture is significant. It is important, however, as Petrie discusses in her individual interview, below, that the way in which a teacher asks for understanding about primary culture, in this case, Thai culture, should be done with care and sensitivity:

RESEARCHER: You might not have thought about this before, but when your teacher asked you about how you would experience that [specific class experience], like as being Thai culture, how did that make you feel? Did it make you feel like you were recognized or important or did it matter to you?

PETRIE: It was... at first... I felt a little weird that he kind of emphasized [me] being Thai culture, but I kind of understand as well because the whole 'different culture' thing.

RESEARCHER: So why did it feel weird? I could think for myself why I would feel weird if my ethnicity was emphasized, but could you explain for yourself, why did it make you initially feel a little odd or a little weird?

PETRIE: I guess it's because I've been here in an international school since very young, so I guess I was kind of used to being considered western growing up... So, since he emphasized it, I was like, [hesitates] "Oh wait, I'm still Thai culture...", and there are still these cultural values that I, like, have to still consider...

RESEARCHER: Hmm. So for you it was kind of like, "Well, I'm Thai culture, but I understand what you're talking about. I'm also Western."

PETRIE: [considering] Sort of.

RESEARCHER: [asks for clarification] Sort of?

PETRIE: [nods] Uh-huh. [confirming researcher's interpretation of her experience].

I think for many of the participants, they found it hard to put into words their perception of being culturally understood. It seemed as though, on the one hand, they wanted to feel like others knew they belonged to both cultures, and on the other, they wanted others to understand that they also belonged to individual

cultures... separately and equally, and this paradox of wanting to be known as belonging to both cultures and each separate culture was hard to put into words. This paradox is challenging for experience for TCKs whose primary home culture is not Western. At school, they encounter Western teachers who deliver Westernized education; their teachers are aware of this, and that the student's home culture is different than the culture at school. Often the teacher will try to 'reach out' to include the student's home culture in the context of the Western culture of school; the intent of this is to recognize and value other cultural ways to understand and do things. The danger is, however, that well-intended act, if not done with sensitive forethought, can actually come across condescendingly, as though the teacher is suggesting that in order to be 'enlightened' in Western culture, the student has to admit to their non-Western culture they have, and participants suggest that it can imply that they are tainted in some kind of way. The way that teachers discuss primary culture of students should imply that the teacher understands that students have knowledge of and successfully operate in Western culture - that they are not *half* of any culture or *ignorant* of culture - they are culturally whole, and it is a positive attribute that they are able to code-switch between cultural norms because it makes them more understanding and empathetic humans. In this way, perhaps the connotation of a Third Culture Kid needs to shift, semantically, to one of an All Cultured Kid. June, in her individual interview, touches on what a positive perception of cultural negotiation means to her. Although this section has been mentioned previously, it is also relevant again:

RESEARCHER: Do you ever feel like you don't fully belong to either culture. Do you feel like when you're back in [foreign Asian country], do you feel like you're not fully [foreign Asian culture]?

JUNE: Ah yes, yes I do.

RESEARCHER: What does that feel like for you, does that frustrate you, or do you care?

JUNE: I do care. It's a little bit isolating. I feel like I'm a little isolated from the culture I was born into. 'Cause they can speak the language [Language-C]. There are kids of my age who can speak my language completely fully. But I cannot, and so there's this gap between relating with someone and for me personally, I have to feel like I can relate, or we can have a connection, where we have an understanding, and so there is a feeling of... that... a part of me is not fully connected to my culture or my language.

RESEARCHER: So you've said two things that sound like they might connect. You've said that at first you're very adaptable.

JUNE: Yes.

RESEARCHER: And then just now you've said sometimes when you go home to your home culture that you feel a little bit isolated.

JUNE: A little bit.

RESEARCHER: Do you think that there's any connection between feeling isolated and being able to adapt. Do you see any kind of connection between those two? Like because you've felt isolated, that it has allowed you to be able to adapt?

JUNE: Can you say that again?

RESEARCHER: Yeah, sure. You might not have ever thought of this before... So you've experienced these moments where you have felt isolated from your culture. From one culture. But then you've talked about how in order to connect with cultures you've learned to be very adaptable.

JUNE: Yeah.

RESEARCHER: Do you think you would have learned to be adaptable if you weren't isolated to begin with to some extent? Do you think that because you experienced that frustration of being isolated that you also have this superhero gift of being adaptable?

JUNE: Yeah, um. It also happens in Western culture too. It's almost like I was naturally learning to be adaptable because I'm already in the environment and so I have to... If I want to feel like I belong, I have to be adaptable. There are times when in my culture, in Culture-C, and in Western culture, where I sometimes feel "pockets" of isolation. But since I'm, a way, in a situation where I am forced to, I can learn to be more adaptable. I do find ways where I can be a part of something in both of them. So yes.

RESEARCHER: To people who might not understand how that feels to be forced to adapt, could you put to words or try to explain to them just how that feels for you?

JUNE: For me it's... I think in most perspectives, being forced to being adaptable is seen as negative. But for me I... I was actually very positive. I brought the experience of being forced to be adapting to environments. So with the positive mindset, it was actually easier for me to get into them [the cultures].

June reinforces the idea that TCKs in her position see their ability to cultural adapt as a positive thing.

In order to empower successful cultural identity negotiation, it is important to have understanding and acceptance that the cultural experiences of TCKs are positive life experiences and not negative ones, that TCKs are not "lesser than" because they have had to negotiate cultures, but they are greater for their experiences. As Ronnie and Petrie indicate in their focus group interview:

RONNIE: Well first of all I think the fact that we're from two cultures, the fact that we're bicultural, it's something that I feel like teachers, at least in this school already notice, in a way. I see through communication and stuff, just things that the teaches say. It doesn't necessarily exclude our culture, nor act like we don't belong to their culture, it's more like reinforcing it in a way. So stuff that teachers might teach might be, like, maybe helpful in creating new knowledge that helps you become more familiar with the culture. For example, me personally, I'm Thai culture and I'm in this Western American school. So, basically, I feel like I belong to both cultures. When teachers speak to me about culture-specific things, things that I don't actually know about, they do a good job to educate me

without trying to discriminate or exclude me from the fact that I don't know what they're talking about and stuff like that. I think that's nice.

RESEARCHER: Do they use prompts or things like that? I noticed in some of your classes that there were a lot of just stimulus or prompts and you're being asked questions about that. Does that-

RONNIE: -I guess that helps, but just talking about it in general also helps. Even though we're bicultural, I don't think we're completely engrossed in one culture. Since we're bicultural, we're not... [hesitates] We don't belong to a single one. I guess you could say that we're not... [hesitates] We lack certain characteristics of one of the cultures we're in, as opposed to a person who is solely Thai culture or is raised in a Thai culture school, who would be complete... They have a solely Thai culture culture or identity, you know?

I think what Ronnie is touching on here relates to what other participants have said about the importance of 'being open': in order to find understanding between Western educators and TCKs of non-Western home cultures, there needs to be a sense of openness, of a desire to understand each other reciprocally, and not based on assumptions about cultural identity.

(Continued)

RESEARCHER: Do you agree with that or do you disagree with that?

PETRIE: I guess I agree with that because... Actually, wait. Yeah.

RESEARCHER: What are your thoughts?

PETRIE: Wait, I'm still a little confused.

RESEARCHER: So something... Can you correct me if I'm wrong?

RONNIE: Yeah.

RESEARCHER: Something that you said is that you feel like you don't fully belong to one single culture. So you are kind of like... You have things from both cultures, but you're lacking some attributes from both cultures. You mentioned that you don't fully belong anywhere, but that sort of in between.

RONNIE: That's what I think. But like you can't really say that we're half of each because the fact that we belong to two cultures doesn't mean that we're only half in. It [belonging] could be more or [it could be] less. Or you could say that we have... We're more Thai culture than Western or more Western than Thai culture. So it doesn't really get the complete split. It's unique for each person.

There can sometimes be a danger of assuming that because a group of students share the same primary culture, for example Thai culture, that they would all experience acquiring and negotiating Western culture in a similar way. As Ronnie suggests, however, it is 'unique for each person'. In fact, through all of the observations, individual interviews, focus group interviews, and participant audio/video journals, no participant expressed the same exact experience negotiating their cultural identities.

(Continued)

RESEARCHER: Yeah. So would a Venn diagram be a good metaphor?

RONNIE: Kind of... Yeah!

RESEARCHER: Do you agree with that?

PETRIE: Mm-hmm [affirmative]. But then I think the overlapping part of the Venn diagram would be larger than the little sides. [implying that there is more overlapping biculturalism].

RESEARCHER: And so for you, when you had talked about an experience that you had [with a teacher asking about Thai culture], which 'took you back a moment', do you feel like it was because the question asked to you was assuming that you belonged to the little sides when really you belonged to the full?

PETRIE: Well-

RESEARCHER: The larger middle part?

PETRIE: Yeah, sure. But there were questions that... I mean... I guess the questions that a lot of the teachers asked me were more, like, ones I don't expect foreigners to know.

RESEARCHER: Like what?

PETRIE: For example, my teacher, he once asked us about Thai culture beliefs, like superstitions and stuff like that. It's understandable why he would ask that.

RESEARCHER: Because he doesn't know?

PETRIE: Yeah. Cause it's very...

RONNIE: ...unique to our culture.

PETRIE: Yeah. Like authentic. Then other stuff... wait... yeah. That's it.

RESEARCHER: So if it was something that was less authentic... like if a teacher asks you a question and it was something they *should* know as a foreigner, then maybe that would come across as condescending?

RONNIE: [affirmative] In a way.

RESEARCHER: [confirms] In a way. [Ronnie nods]. Because it would almost be like, [faking tone] "Tell me about your culture." And you're like, [frustrated tone] "You already know that because everyone knows that."

PETRIE: But then they could actually *really* not know it. They might *not* trying to offend us. So it's really hard to say what they're trying to do.

RESEARCHER: So it sounds like what's important is for both sides not to assume.

PETRIE: [nods] Mhmm.

RONNIE: nods.

As each person's experience in this matter is unique, the experience Petrie and Ronnie have negotiating cultures may not be the experience of other individuals. This can be true even if the cultural backgrounds of others are relatively similar - they still will experience cultural negotiations differently. Alyssa, who lived overseas for multiple years, added to the discussion by talking about how it makes her feel uncomfortable when asked about her Thai culture:

ALYSSA: I want to talk about how when, for example, as Petrie mentioned, how sometimes teachers, they ask you questions about your own, your specific culture and... and sometimes I feel really uncomfortable when I don't know what the answer, because it's, like, I *should* know, because it's my culture. I *am* Thai. I *look* Thai. I was *born* here. But *yeah*, it just makes me sometimes feel really bad. It just seems like I'm neglecting my culture, but then I'm not. It just happens like this.

RESEARCHER: It's kind of interesting because what you're saying is that when they ask about your Thai culture that you're almost like, "All right, I'll tell you this because I know, but why are you asking me this?" I'm also a Western", but when they ask you it's a kind of a different feeling because it's like, "Well you're asking me and I should know, but I can't go into my life history right now to tell you about my years living overseas."

ALYSSA: Yeah, they wouldn't understand. It seems like I should know 'cause I'm Thai. But I don't really know that much about Thai culture as compared to an *actual* Thai cultured person.

RESEARCHER: Your word choice is interesting there. Because you, almost, are saying that you're not an *actual* Thai cultured person.

ALYSSA: I *am*, *but* since I went abroad when I was... I started first grade there. It just seems with other international students, I don't... I wouldn't want to say... I wouldn't want to box myself into a category. Like saying, "I'm Thai culture." It's not as simple as that. Just more complicated. Living like in many countries, I feel like I gained a lot from those countries and the culture there.

RESEARCHER: So when people ask you where you're from, that's a really difficult question to answer.

ALYSSA: I just say, "Oh, I'm from Thailand." Sometimes they're like, "Oh, your English is so good." And I'm like, "Okay, thanks." I wouldn't, like, go into the details or something. It's just tiring to do it.

Alyssa's phrasing of not wanting to 'box herself in' echoes what other participants have said - that when they explain how they identify culturally, or how they perceive their own cultural selves, it is challenging *because* they don't want to box themselves into belonging one place or culture over another.

This section discussed how *acceptance and understanding of culturally negotiated identity* was important to participants. The next section discusses how *cultural stereotyping deters from cultural understanding*, and how this is significant to the experience of participants in this research.

4.5 Cultural Stereotyping Deters from Cultural Understanding

Cultural stereotyping deters from cultural understanding, however, perhaps it is not always apparent when stereotyping is perceived and felt by other people. Understanding how TCK participants negotiate cultures between home and school requires more knowledge about how they experience the effects of cultural stereotyping. It is important, therefore, to share the perspectives participants have on how cultural stereotypes have affected them, personally. A cultural stereotype, or an assumption made about an individual's primary culture, can be defined, in the context of this research, as an idea of culture based on a previously determined perception of that culture (Mullaly, 2010); the perceived cultural conception is one that is influenced by the perception of that cultural field (Bourdieu, 1993; 2003), and it often includes perceptions on the amount of symbolic capital associated with that field. Many times, the most detrimental cultural stereotypes of non-Western cultures are stereotypes that further a hegemonic belief that non-Western cultures automatically hold less symbolic capital than Western cultures. Such beliefs are particularly problematic when those who carry this perception do so because they think that cultural capital has symbolic power because of natural laws as opposed to the laws of the field of power (Bourdieu, 1993).

TCKs who associate with differing cultures, however, may feel polarized, because they belong to more than one cultural field, and the discourses that are associated with symbolic power in one field are not necessarily the same discourses that are associated with power in another. In order to understand the individual, Bourdieu (1993) says that the “individual existence” of a person must be considered within “the microcosm in which his career is realized” (p. 180). Although Bourdieu is specifically referencing cultural products within the fields of art and literature, the same concept applies when considering the microcosm of operation within the cultural field as well. In order to understand the individual cultural belonging of a person, one must understand the cultural microcosm to which this person belongs, while *also* studying the “genesis of the systems of classification” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 180).

To understand a negotiated cultural identity of an individual, one must study the social systems and the hierarchy of fields by which culture is classified. To not place cultural discourses and the products of that discourse within the frame of a microcosm of cultural production is to reduce the cultural discourses as entities acting within their own regard, as opposed to acknowledging divisions and cohesions of fields of production hierarchically interacting to develop forms of discourse which have more power than others. Bourdieu (1993) says,

[i]t is against this form of reduction, which I call the *short circuit* effect, that I developed the theory of the field. Exclusive attention to function... leads one to ignore the question of the internal logic of cultural objects, their structure as *languages*. At a deeper level, however, it leads one to forget the groups that produce these objects (priests, lawyers, intellectuals, writers, poets, artists, mathematicians, etc.), for whom they also fulfill functions. (p. 181)

The groups that produce objects do so for those whom they also fulfill their function, so to reduce understanding of the object to its function is to overlook that the function of the object serves the group that produced said object. Trying to understand the object without looking at the system that gives it purpose within its field will *short circuit* understanding. Cultural stereotyping, therefore, reduces cultural objects (norms, beings, artefacts, languages, modes of operation, etc.) to its function, which short circuits cultural understanding, because it perceives cultural objects in terms of their function instead of in terms of their field in which function is dependent upon. Understanding cultural objects within the field they operate in helps to see the field as a microcosm that has its “own structures and [its] own laws” of operation (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 181). Specifically, in this study language and culture serve as cultural objects within the field of cultural production that the international school establishes. Participants, as agents in international school, exist in the field of cultural production, which is the international school itself, and interact with and possess the cultural objects (language and culture) found in this field. These cultural objects hold differing amounts of symbolic capital and power within the field of the international school (Bourdieu, 2003), but also within a globalized cultural field of production, because the presentation of English and Western culture at the school is intertextual with its hegemonic dominance, globally.

One way that globally hegemonic culture furthers its dominance is through negative stereotypes of non-hegemonic cultures. Stereotypes are often revealed in

the way that descriptive language is used to describe cultures. According to Mullaly (2010),

[w]hatever form it takes, name-calling devalues members of subordinate groups by accentuating differences between the dominant and subordinate groups in a negative way. It reflects the belief that the characteristics of the dominant group (skin colour, eye shape, male body) represent the norm of universal standard and that anything not meeting the standard is open to ridicule and insult. The message to the subordinate group is that they are inferior because they do not meet these standards or norms. (p. 68)

Cultural stereotyping reduces cultural understanding to its function as opposed to understanding its meaning amidst structural microcosms that determine the laws for its operation, meaning that a negative stereotype places value on the function of the non-hegemonic cultural norm through the comparison to hegemonic cultural norm, which often results in the perception of inferiority of non-hegemonic cultural norms and the perception of supremacy of hegemonic norms according to dominant groups. When an individual experiences cultural stereotyping, they experience the short circuit effect (Bourdieu, 1993) that disconnects empowering cultural understanding of the laws for cultural identities, and how the individual negotiates the laws of this field into the cohesion of the cultural laws of a secondary cultural field. I found the stories and ideas from participants as to how cultural stereotyping has affected their ability to negotiate benefits from both of their cultures particularly helpful in understanding how cultural stereotypes are connected with symbolic power within a Western hegemonic cultural field.

A common concept that many participants agreed on was that cultural stereotyping was detrimental to 'feeling understood' by others. Cultural

stereotypes are a large frustration for TCK students of non-Western primary cultures, whose cultures are prone to stereotypes within dominant Western discourse, because their cultures are more globally marginal in a Westernized global society. In their focus group interview, Salem and Ronnie added perspective to the way that they have experienced cultural stereotyping:

RESEARCHER: You've mentioned that it's frustrating if people stereotype your culture.

SALEM: That is frustrating a bit, but then most of the time, I just get used to it. Just sometimes I would ignore it. Sometimes I would explain. If they don't listen, then they don't want to know, so I just let them talk.

RESEARCHER: How often, would you say, I don't know, per week or per month, do you experience a negative stereotype like this? Even like a small moment?

SALEM: I say once or twice a year.

RESEARCHER: Okay.

SALEM: 'Cause it doesn't happen that often in school. Mostly outside school.

RESEARCHER: [Addressing Ronnie now]. So it might be that your experience [of feeling more culturally understood by others] could be dependent upon the fact that your two cultures are the two predominant cultures of the school? [Salem's home culture is not the most predominant culture at the school].

RONNIE: [Nods.] Yeah, that's true.

SALEM: [hesitates, and then jumps in] Well sometimes people are just curious. So I try not to think in a negative side.

RESEARCHER: So that kind of relates to what you [addressing Ronnie and Petrie] were saying a little bit, right? You know, if the stereotype is there, but it seems like their intent is good, like they're just curious, then you're okay with it. Is that correct?

RONNIE: Yeah.

SALEM: [agrees] Mhmm.

Even though the participants share their frustrations experiencing cultural stereotypes, they also indicate how important it is to remain open to others and to assume the best in other people's intentions. The choice to remain positive and open is a key aspect to TCKs who more successfully negotiate cultural identities between home and school, and perhaps this is because being open and positive is what allows them to be receptive to find a sense of belonging to the communities they choose to associate with.

In her individual interview Karla detailed the way in which the cultural and racial stereotyping has affected her perception of self, and how she has chosen to overcome negative cultural stereotypes:

RESEARCHER: So can you talk a little about how you experience other people's perceptions or stereotypes of your culture?

KARLA: I would say it deals with the fact of how people try to represent [music] or represent the movement in dancing, which has such a strong background in [my] culture and has so much history that when I see it being done so light-heartedly and jokingly, it's kind of making mockery of it, but I know that people aren't doing it to be offensive or mean. It's just that, it's just a foreign media that's out there, and people don't properly explain where it comes from, and they market it as something else, as their own, and a lot of that is kind of frustrating to [my] cultures.

Karla continued to talk about how the media has culturally appropriated her primary culture, and that the people she meets in Thailand use the stereotypes of culturally appropriated media to try to understand her culture, and that she finds this offensive.

KARLA: ...they express the social media on culture and here in Thailand, it's like a gimmick kind of idea because I have certain moments where my housekeeper asks me to get her certain things or make her certain things that deal with [my] culture so she can give it to children, so they can

make-believe and play along with it. I felt kind of offended because I felt like she didn't really respect my culture and how we like to express ourselves through clothing or hairstyles. It just made a little joke out of it... because I feel like you wouldn't make a mockery of war and fighting so why would you make a mockery of a part of me.

RESEARCHER: Yeah, so did she ask you for your clothes because you're packing up and stuff like that? Stuff you're giving away?

KARLA: Yeah.

RESEARCHER: She wanted to give it to kids to play dress up?

KARLA: Yeah...

RESEARCHER: Wow...

KARLA: *Yeah.* I have some Culture-D patterned clothing that I have at home and, sometimes my mom likes to buy me [accessories] and I sometimes alter my [hair] to match a certain hairstyle. She [housekeeper] wanted me to give that [cultural accessories] over so that her friend's kids can just play around and pretend that they have [my ethnicity] and pretend they are Culture-D for a moment in time. That's kind of, like, a very odd situation because I understand that she [housekeeper] is old fashion and it's seen as half-hearted, and my Culture-D stigma isn't liked or preferred in this country, so I don't want to be overbearing, but I also want to explain myself and I'm always concerned about the mistranslations that always happen during times like these.

Karla's main frustration is that not only did this experience reveal cultural stereotypes of her culture, but that the encounter also made her feel like her culture was a gimmick. She says that experiences like this mostly happen outside of school, but that she has a hard time in school because she doesn't feel culturally understood by those who don't know the origins of her culture. I asked Karla if she thought that curriculum in school could help 'tackle' the issue of cultural stereotyping, if there was more focus on, for example, stereotyping in media.

Karla responded:

KARLA: I think that is a really good way to help people understand the line between being fair to the culture and being respect[ful] and to being gimmicky and kind of offensive, in a non offensive way. I think it would really help people with learning sensitivity with cultures, ethnicity and how somebody can be both the culture and be more than that. I think that would be very helpful. If you're going to do that then you shouldn't try to push too much on one ethnicity, you should just look at a multitude of them. Because if you try too hard to push your ideals or your thoughts on somebody, I feel that more people are more likely to back away or try to go against it, rebel against it. Which is why I never try to push ideals to hard.

In her individual audio journal, Karla shared her experience trying to 'understand the line' of cultural understanding. Below, she shares her thoughts on how the two cultures, that she is exposed to, have different social expectations for respect and sensitivity, and that she has had to navigate the line between the two. Karla shared:

KARLA: For the question [on] dealing with conflicts between how my culture normally expects me to act, and how [other] culture(s) normally expects [other people] to act... I would say it goes more with jokes and where the sensitivity for certain topics begins and ends. Because, like, [in] Western culture, [there is] more sensitive[ity] towards body issues, body shaming, body positivity things. And at the same time making fun [of people's bodies] is a very weird thing that I came across [in Thai culture]. But it's very common in Thai culture.

In her individual audio journal, Karla continues with another example of how she felt like she had to navigate a cultural line of being herself, culturally speaking, and also being respectful of the cultural practices of her environment, in this case, a time she visited a Thai friend at their family home:

KARLA: Another thing I found was because [I associate with American culture], my ability to connect with people much quicker, and be able to touch them, have like physical interact[ion] with them, is much faster than with Thai people, who are more withdrawn and separate themselves from physical interaction... Asian people separate themselves from physical contact more often [than I do]. So, I find myself in odd situations where I don't know whether I should push further to make physical contact, or do I

try pulling back and moving at a much slower pace, making that very uneven place for me. Because even though my school [has] Western culture ideals, it still has its awkward social moments that are hard to maneuver at times. I have a story of an odd situation where I was meeting a Thai family of one of my friends. I felt very withdrawn and awkward, because I didn't want to come off as pushing my boundaries [off on them], or trying to seem like I'm too comfortable in the situation and making the family feel awkward. So I found myself withdrawing within myself more, and monitoring my actions more frequently, trying to take up as little space as possible, and leave as little mark as possible within the house. Which was very awkward, because I felt like I might have put more pressure on the family in a situation like that, because they wanted to be accommodating, which is the Thai way. But, I also felt that they appreciated the fact that I tried to accommodate their culture into how I interacted, by changing the way I normally would [behave].

A Bourdieusian approach would suggest that in order to understand the line of cultural understanding, one must understand that the way that cultural identity is negotiated is determined by the laws of that cultural field, not by the functionality of the cultural products. Instead of looking towards the outcomes of culture (like cultural customs, attire, food, etc.) to understand culture, look towards the laws of that cultural field. After understanding the laws of the cultural field, the study of how cultural fields are intertextual with one another is essential to understanding the cultural hybridity of participants of this research.

This section discussed how *cultural stereotyping deters from cultural understanding*. The next section discusses how *cultural hybridity* is an aspect to participants' experiences negotiating multiple cultures.

4.6 Cultural Hybridity

A crucial aspect of this research aims to empower successful cultural identity negotiation TCKs of non-Western primary cultures with secondary Western cultures of school by allowing participants to talk about their own

experiences and perspectives negotiating culture. This chapter, chapter 4, has previously discussed how community and belonging are established at school, the importance of relationships with teachers and peers, feelings of being understood and accepted for their cultural identities, and feelings of being misunderstood because of cultural stereotypes and assumptions. This section aims to portray the participants' experience of how it feels to associate with a cultural field of hybridity - what Petrie confirmed is like a "Venn Diagram" center, or what Ronnie suggested is a "buffer zone". How participants experience and perceive the interstitial 'third culture' field is important to this research, because how they navigate that cultural field is what allows them to successfully navigate the challenges they face from their simultaneous association with their multiple cultural fields. In Ronnie's words from his video journal:

RONNIE: Being a Third Culture Kid means that you are being someone who is exposed to more than one culture, and you don't have a distinct cultural identity. In a way, you're kind of in the mix between two worlds and two cultures. You have aspects of one culture and aspects of another. This means that you don't actually have distinct social identity, and you are basically a hybrid, and you can switch between either one quite effectively. However, at the same time, you're also not completely comfortable with one specific culture. If you're exposed to one singular culture for your whole life, you won't be able to completely integrate and assimilate with that culture. You will definitely miss or have aspects of other cultures that you cannot relate with your integrated culture.

Participants voiced that they do feel like they belong to each culture individually, and yet they sometimes feel like they don't belong. I do not think that the participants are saying they have no belonging, but rather that their belonging is not confined (it cannot be "boxed in"). TCKs are not confined by external cultural expectations because it is as if they pluck from each culture the aspects of their

identity and remake their new hybrid culture. When defining *field*, Bourdieu (1986) says that “this autonomous social universe functions somewhat like a prism which *refracts* every external determination: demographic, economic or political events are always retranslated according to the specific logic of the field” (p. 164). Participant cultural identities are not confined to individual cultural codes, rather are determined by the way in which the specific cultural codes that participant identities with is refracted into their interstitial cultural field.

Something in common amongst all participants was the desire to not be confined by one identity, the desire to be understood that they are not culturally confined, as well as the desire to have acceptance from those who do not understand them. I found it freeing to hear from participants this dueling sense of wanting to be understood, wanting to understand others, and also being ‘okay with’, or at peace with the possibility that others may not ‘get them’. In this regard, I think it is highly important that TCKs have access to *some* form of a community or group that they feel like they *do* belong to where they can find understanding.

Lisa, who shared that when she first returned to Thailand felt like she was an outcast when she did not have a group or community that she felt understood her. Lisa had expressed that upon returning to Thailand, she knew that the way she had behaved abroad, culturally, would not work in social groups in Thailand. For a while, she said that she had tried to act in the way people expected her to act, and that she had a hard time because she felt like she was “being fake”, and she felt like people didn’t like the way she acted regardless. She, then, decided it

was better to just be herself, for herself. Lisa, in her individual interview, told me that she had decided to “not care”, and whatever she did was for her own happiness instead of to please others:

RESEARCHER: Okay can you... and I know this is awkward, because I'm asking you to be open... but can you try to think, like, put use adjectives that help explain to teachers, who might not feel that same “outcast” (that you felt when you first came back to Thailand)... what would be some adjectives, or some synonyms, for the feelings that you experienced when you first came back? So other than ‘Outcast’, the other words to help your teachers, or other people who might not have experienced that same thing as you experienced, to really try to feel and experience those emotions of how you felt, before you decided that “I don't care” anymore.

LISA: It felt really cold, empty almost. Like your chest would feel hollow. Watching everyone else around you having fun, while you're sitting alone... it was a cold burning... because I was yearning so hard to have the same happiness everyone else seemed to have. It felt like a picture and you're just a torn piece of it, and no matter how much tape you try to put on, everyone knows you're not with them.

Lisa described that she felt misunderstood by people, and that she was always trying to find a way to fit in. She even said that little things, for example how she held her body posture, where she placed her feet, whether or not she took her shoes off in class, were things she felt that Thai students judged her for doing, as some of these things may seem unladylike in Thai culture. Actually, I observed Lisa take her shoes off in one of her classroom observations before she told me this was one thing she felt was more acceptable in Western culture than in Thai culture. My field notes on this behaviour are as follows:

LISA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Raises hand to ask teacher for confirmation that they are doing the warm up correctly.

Talks with partner to go over the warm up activity together.

Continues to go over the workbook studying for IB exams.

Talks with partner about activity.

Takes notes. Does activity.

Takes off shoes.

[7:52] turns to partner to discuss.

Raises hand to ask teacher question about review activity.

Continues to do classwork and listen to instruction.

Lisa's other classmates did not seem to react to Lisa taking her shoes off, and I would never had thought that this body posture would be an aspect to her cultural hybridity and cultural identity negotiation, but she indicated that it was. Lisa said that, eventually, she gave up trying to meet other people's expectations of how she should culturally act, and that she started to do things for herself. In one of her observations, Lisa consistently asked questions pertaining to the class lesson. While some of her female classmates may be more inclined to quietly ask each other their question, Lisa frequently raised her hand to ask her teacher to clarify. Her initiation in this way is one way that I observed Lisa 'doing something for herself'. While some classmates might perceive her as being too forward in Thai culture, Lisa exercised a more Western way to interact in class, including asking questions for clarification before the teacher was finished the instruction. I asked her how it felt when she made the decision to act in a way that she wanted to, she replied:

LISA: There was a sense of exclusivity but not in the negative way. There was a warmth to being with people who are all different yet all the same. It was like stepping into sunlight for the first time in a long time, but there was also a lot of doubt. Because although I decided to be me, there was still hesitation with everything I did, it was still confusing because of how

long I had pretended to be someone else. Sometimes it's dizzying trying to figure out what I want, because both before and after I had decided to change there were happy moments.

It can be argued that Lisa created what Bourdieu (1993) would call a “symbolic revolution”, where she freed herself from demands and defined herself as her own master while refusing to recognize any other master but herself, thus having the “effect of eliminating the market” in which she previously operated (p. 169).

According to Bourdieu (1993), “[a]s the autonomy of cultural production increases, so does the time-lag that is necessary for works to impose the forms of perceptions they bring along” and this creates a “restricted field of production, a very special economic world in which the producers’ only customers end to be their own competitors” (p. 169). For Lisa, her autonomy is more than a simple statement that ‘she doesn’t care what people think about her’, it’s a more powerful symbolic revolution, in which she decided to align to her chosen cultural norms instead of behaving in a way that she felt was accepted of her if she was to gain more power within the cultural field in which she had moved back into. In a way, by starving the mastery of culturally hegemonic power through producing her own form of cultural identity, she restricted the field of power so that in order to associate with her, individuals were forced to ‘buy’ the only cultural identity she was selling. Her description of being isolated both before and after her decision to act only for herself, autonomously, indicates that she felt isolated both before and after. The isolation she felt post-revolution, however, she described as a good kind of outcast, an empowering kind; I suggest this is because she ‘took back’ her own autonomy.

Salem described her experience of trying to fit in as challenging because of the way she has had to negotiate two home cultures with a third secondary culture at school. Interestingly, she said she feels most proud of his Culture-B while expressing that she most identifies with his Western culture. In her individual interview, I asked Salem how it feels to have to fit into more than one cultures, she replied:

SALEM: Actually, it feels very frustrating, since my parents raised me in Culture-B cultures, but sometimes my mom 'adds in' Thai culture, and at school I'm raised in the Western culture. So it's hard to adapt and it's hard to say which side of the culture I'm more comfortable with... it's just sometimes I'm more prideful of this one specific culture and sometimes I'm... I don't know... I just get confused and I think all of them are a part of my culture, I guess, I can't really choose one. But it feels very pressuring to have to fit into just one culture.

I think Salem raises an important point: sometimes, TCKs feel like they are asked to choose one culture, and this can make them feel culturally isolated, because they see themselves fully belonging to all cultures they associate with. In order to encourage cultural identity negotiation, it is important, therefore, *not* to ask TCKs to choose. Allow TCKs to make their own decisions as to where they belong and which cultures they associate with, and, as educators, provide them with opportunities of community belonging in multiple and various forms.

Another important aspect to supporting cultural identity negotiation is to understand that each TCK youth is different. This research aims to help in this regard by sharing common perspectives *and* differing perspectives of TCK experiences. Alyssa's perspective differs from Salem's experience negotiating cultures. In her individual interview, I asked Alyssa about her experience negotiating her culture at home with that of school:

ALYSSA: For me, I don't think I noticed the transition much, because usually I just keep the two cultures separate. So at home I'm just, like, into the Thai culture, and at school, the Western culture. Yeah, I don't really notice much of a transition.

I asked the same question of Aida, in her individual interview, and this is what she replied:

AIDA: For me, it's different because I think it's more of an even split. Because there are aspects of both cultures that I am more awkward than with like the other one and, like, it's different.

When June discussed her experiences negotiating cultures, in her individual interview, she described her feelings of isolation happening in only 'small pockets':

JUNE: For me, I feel like I belong to both [cultures]. Also I feel like I can belong anywhere. When the parts when I don't belong it's pockets. It's not major big.

RESEARCHER: Yeah. It's just 'small moments'?

JUNE: It's small. It's very small moments. And so it's not that big of a stress for me. Yeah, so I think in both cultures I belong. More than those pockets.

Whereas some participants voice that their belonging is an even split, that they feel simultaneous belonging to both, or that they don't often notice the cultural transitions they make, June describes her experience as belonging to both cultures simultaneously, but with the exception that feelings of isolation occur in small moments, and oftentimes through encounters with individuals in her life who belong only to one culture.

Karla said that because her last name differs from most of those around her, she sometimes feels this separates her from a feeling of belonging, and that in order to find her own sense of community she has to be the one to find her 'own

ground'. I often observed Karla behave in a way that implied her own autonomy, for example, during both her lunchtime and co-curricular activity, Karla did not wait for friends to arrive to the location together. Other students arrived and go places on campus in pairs, whereas Karla seemed more inclined to 'meet them there' in her own time. Deciding how to arrive, or when to arrive, to events is one way that Karla may have tried to "find her own ground", as she discusses, next, in her individual interview. In our growingly culturally diverse world, geographic 'ground' is no longer an indication of one's belonging or one's cultures. Although Karla's experience negotiating cultures is extremely difficult, I was encouraged by her idea to 'find her own ground':

RESEARCHER: Yeah. [Confirming] So you have to find your 'own ground'.

KARLA: [Confirms]. Especially because my mom lived in Country-F for so long, and lived in Country-D for so long, that she is more connected to [those] culture[s], more into the politics, and stuff like that... While me, I feel like an outsider in my own certain area. So I sometimes have trouble feeling like I'm part of anything, because I'm not really part of anything, I'm just a person walking through space. Especially in this situation because my name doesn't really match anybody in my family. So, that adds on to the separation feeling and not really belonging anywhere.

There was a commonality between Karla's 'find your own ground' idea and June's suggestion that she, while trying to negotiate into Thai culture, determined that the outsider has to initiate first. I think the combination of 'find your own ground' and 'initiate first' is an effective strategy for cultural identity negotiation. When, in his focus group interview, I asked about her experience trying to enter into and associate with one of his secondary cultures, through dance, June replied:

JUNE: And so, through my body I'm able to pick it up easily and so, actually it, like... like through my past experience, I haven't been able to

get into the culture, but because of Thai culture dance I felt like I was bonding. I felt like, like... I *understood* now that to get into the Thai culture *you* have to initiate first. If you're from like, if you're ...

RESEARCHER: From a foreign country?

JUNE: Yeah.

Ronnie had a different perspective on how he culturally belongs. Ronnie indicated that it is as though belonging depends on the environment he is in. It is almost as if he could describe this experience of environmental belonging as being cultural chameleon. When asked about his experience of cultural belonging, in his individual interview, this was Ronnie's response:

RONNIE: It depends where I am, really. In the school, since I have a lot of Thai culture friends, I think the Thai culture becomes more predominant because we see each other more, and we use Thai quite a bit, more often than English. However, when I was in Country-G, or when I went on summer camps abroad, when I've been going with people who do use English, then I feel like my Thai culture becomes a bit inhibited. So, in my opinion, I think that, at least for me, I kind of can fit into any culture I need to. And, well, when I have to use different languages, and have different cultural lenses in order for me to be able to communicate with others, I feel like I can change myself in order to fit in.

Later in his video diary, Ronnie added:

RONNIE: I feel like this issue is one that is major, because in order to communicate, you have to be able to understand differences between you and the person you're communicating with. Even though they may view negatively about me, I feel like it doesn't really make a difference to how communication is, because I'm basically just expressing what I say, and however they believe, and however they perceive it, it's up to them. Personally, I wouldn't say that I belong to one culture more than the other. Having both Thai culture and Western cultures, I feel like I use both cultures quite equally, especially in an international school like the one I'm attending. At home, I can speak Thai to my parents, to my grandparents, and to locals. At school, I can also use English as my language to communicate with Western teachers and Western friends. I feel like this isn't really an issue, because being often being exposed to both cultures means that I'm belonging to both of them at the same time. You can't really say which one I belong to more, because my sense of comfort really

differs between the people I spend time with and how their type of culture matches up with mine.

Ronnie discussed how his feelings of cultural belonging were coupled with his ability to speak multiple languages, and other participants also indicated that their ability to connect with culture, whether it be primary or secondary, was connected to their ability to speak the language most frequently used when operating in that culture.

It can be argued that language serves as a form of what Bourdieu (1993) calls symbolic goods, which are traded to create the accumulation of symbolic capital. As a form of symbolic capital, language is one form of a symbolic good that can be traded in for credit. In this way, language can be used to access symbolic power in a given field. When Ronnie says, “at home, I can speak Thai to my parents, to my grandparents, and to locals. At school, I can also use English as my language to communicate with Western teachers and Western friends”, it can be inferred that language gives Ronnie access to two different fields because he has the ability to fluently speak the languages of both fields. In this way, participants, or Bourdieusian agents, are able to gain more capital because they can trade their language credit for capital associated with more power. In his classroom observations, I often observed Ronnie switching back and forth between his two languages when discussing with his peers in class. Participants who express that they have the ability to use both languages (in some cases more) fluently also seem to have a more positive perception of their abilities to negotiate cultures.

Problematically, however, the English language and Anglo-Western culture is often associated with prestige and authority; this becomes difficult for TCKs whose primary culture is not Western, because it creates competition between primary and secondary cultures. Bourdieu (1993) writes,

when the only usable, effective capital is the (mis)recognized, legitimate capital called 'prestige' or 'authority', the economic capital that cultural undertakings generally require cannot secure the specific profits produced by the field - not the 'economic' profits they always imply - unless it is converted into symbolic capital. (p. 75)

Although there are many reasons students are enrolled at Morehouse International School, one of these reasons is so that they can learn English and receive a Western education. Theoretically, through their schooling, such students are gaining the symbolic capital of prestige and authority through acquiring Western language and culture, which they will later be able to convert into economic capital and profit. Bourdieu (1993) writes that:

the only legitimate accumulation consists of making a name for oneself, a known, recognized name, a capital of consecration implying a power to consecrate objects (with a trademark or signature) or persons (through publication, exhibition, etc.) and therefore to give value, and to appropriate the profits from this operation. (p. 75)

If applying Bourdieu's theory in this matter, one can argue that TCKs, of non-Western primary cultures, who acquire Western culture and language as forms of symbolic goods are able to also acquire the symbolic capital, of prestige and authority, associated with the symbolic goods of Western culture and language. Because they gain prestige and authority, they are able to *consecrate* other goods in the field of production, and as a result, become more symbolically powerful, and eventually, more economically powerful, within that field. Due to the

intertextual nature of fields, the gained forms of symbolic power can also transfer into less hegemonic fields: the prestige gained in the more dominant field has the potential to give even more hierarchical prestige in the dominated field. This is a fine line for educators of TCKs and for TCKs to navigate, because TCKs of non-Western primary culture benefit from the gain in symbolic capital associated with their Western cultural field, but at the same time, in order to negotiate their primary culture with their secondary culture successfully, the secondary culture cannot simply replace the primary.

Bourdieu (1993) writes that “one cannot fully comprehend the functioning of the field of restricted production as a site of competition for properly cultural consecration - i.e. legitimacy - and for the power to grant it unless one analyses the relationships between the various instances of consecration” (p. 121). In order to validate the capitals of the primary field, one must understand the systematic way in which the field of the primary culture competes with the field of the secondary. Bourdieu (1993) suggests that institutions, such as the educational system, reproduce agents who further the system that brings capital to certain cultural productions over others. Bourdieu (1993) says that “in the case of the system of reproduction, in particular the educational system, so the field of production and diffusion can only be fully understood if one treats it as a field of competition for the monopoly of the legitimate exercise of symbolic violence” (p. 121). Symbolic violence occurs when a product or symbolic good “gains legitimacy by misrecognizing the underlying power relations which serve, in part, to guarantee the continued reproduction of the legitimacy of those who produce or

define” the symbolic goods (Johnson, 1993). To recognize that symbolic capital has underlying power relations, and that competition for this capital is furthered by these power relations, is to expose what might otherwise be perceived as *natural* or *engrained*; this exposes and therefore decreases symbolic violence. Exposing symbolic violence is one key factor in assisting and empowering cultural identity negotiation. Bourdieu (1993) states that “[a]ll internal and external relations (including relations with their own work) that agents of production, reproduction and diffusion manage to establish are mediated by the structure of relations between the instances or institutions claiming to exercise a specifically cultural authority” (p. 121). So by becoming aware and acknowledging of the power dynamics that influence the structures of relation within fields is to decrease the level of symbolic violence imposed upon the hierarchy of symbolic capital. In this way, helping TCKs and educators of TCKs recognize the power dynamics that shape symbolic capital through the consecration of prestige and authority will help to create what Bourdieu (1993) calls a space of possibles, which is discussed in the next section of this chapter.

This section discussed the concept of *cultural hybridity*, and how it was relative to participants. The next section discusses *language and translation* and the power of bilinguality as the next significant code located in both observation and dialogical data.

4.7 Language and Translation and the Power of Bilinguality

According to Hamers and Blanc (2000), bilinguality is “the psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means

of social communication” (p. 6). Participants indicated that bilinguality is significant to their connections with cultures. I suggest that empowerment of language acquisition, through an intentional recognition of *symbolic violence* associated with language as a form of symbolic capital, is one factor that heightens the success of cultural identity negotiation. In his individual interview, Ronnie reflected on how language and translation is important to his ability to culturally express himself after I had asked him if he has ever found it difficult to translate concepts or words between the languages he speaks:

RONNIE: Of course. There's words where you can't translate, right? I can't think of an example off the top of my head, but I'm sure there's a few instances where a word in English you can't really say it in Thai and some words in Thai can't be translated into English. And then you have different meanings in English, so sometimes when you want to express something, you basically have... Sometimes you speak Thai and just switch to an English word or something like that. So I feel like the two languages are interchangeable in terms of communication, but you have to choose. As a person who speaks both languages, I can choose whichever and when to use, and in what kind of situations.

Ronnie often spoke about how he uses language to position himself in perspective fields - he uses each language where appropriate, and said that he will sometimes code-mix languages where appropriate as well (such as in the interstitial field of the school). I also observed Ronnie switching between his languages during classroom environments as well, which is shown in my field notes, below:

1. RONNIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Talks to teacher and peers.

Laughs with peer.

[In Thai] Talks about technology, and cost for things. Asks peer how much their tech costs.

Gets back to work.

Speaks to other peers.

[Observer Comments: Ronnie seems to be more vocal to the whole class, to the teacher, and to his groups, than in some other observations – perhaps because this class is instructed in Thai?]

Ugh... I'll send it to you [code switches to English].

Works.

[9:12] Leaves room.

Returns.

Works.

Speaks in English.

Speaks in Thai.

Continues to work.

[9:35] class ends.

2. RONNIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Laughs with peer, still talking about laptops. Off task from work at hand, but teacher seems to allow. Types on peer's laptop jokingly. Chuckles.

Goes back to working on assignment.

[12:20] gets phone out, checks phone. Puts phone back in pocket.

Has tablet on desk. Works on Macbook.

Flips through classwork.

[12:33] – Code switches between Thai and English with peer.

Other participant asks, in Thai, about word count and Ronnie responds in English.

Teacher asks about topic not related to work, participant responds and chuckles. Has worked sustained, determined for the class period.

Possible stress of upcoming deadline for the IB assessment is apparent, but is juxtaposed with the relaxing environment the teacher creates through the music playing in the background.

3. RONNIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Turns to right to talk. Turns to left to talk, both times not about the class content, but on a tangent.

Back to work. Peers speak in Thai, participant responds in English.

Chatting with peers about the article as they read, informally.

[8:04] typing what appears to be notes

multi-tasking – typing while listening to teacher.

Light hearted- joking is welcome in the class.

In each of Ronnie's three individual observations, it can be seen that switching between Thai and English is something he did in each classroom observation. It is important to know that Ronnie did not say that he uses English in Thai culture environments as a form to gain more power, but that he uses Thai in Thai culture environments. Through this, Ronnie removes the prestige associated with the English language, and in a way, places that prestige onto Thai culture; through this he places symbolic capital of both fields adjacently, therefore, validates both cultures and negotiates primary and secondary cultures into his identity more successfully.

Ronnie, in his video journal, shared his ideas regarding the value he places on his ability to speak the English language:

RONNIE: Luckily I was born in Country-G [Foreign Western Country], so I was forced to use English when I was a child because I had to communicate with teachers, and my parents could only speak English as a language you can use to communicate in Country-G. I was lucky enough to get exposure to the English language. My parents would read me English books and stuff, and apparently, according to my parents, I learned English before I did learn Thai. But otherwise, I think that at home what should be one of the most important parts of developing a Western identity or learning Western languages is to be exposed to the language

since you were a child. This would include watching TV shows, maybe kids' shows, like Peppa Pig or Einstein stuff like that, that are in English or reading your children books in the English language. And, at the same time, you can always communicate with your child in Thai or other [primary culture] language, of course.

It was clear that Ronnie placed high value on his ability to speak English.

Participants seemed proud of their primary cultures, but that they also felt lucky for learning English. English, as a hegemonic language, does hold symbolic power and capital in a globalized society, which is why I believe it is important for educators and TCK students to recognize the importance of students non-Anglophone primary languages. I observed the legitimizing of languages other than English within the research site, as all participants were enrolled in courses where the instruction language is not English. Non-English courses at the school are instructed in languages which include: Thai, Chinese, Mandarin, Japanese, French, and Spanish. Because legitimizing primary languages is important, offering courses of the language of students (where personnel permits) is important. At times, courses offered in these languages may have smaller class sizes than others, but I believe it is essential to students that these courses are not cut from academic programmes. Although it is sometimes a financial or logistical decision to cut smaller 'modern language' courses, this can hold a greater impact on the hidden curriculum of the school, because it may suggest that courses that are not offered in English are not as legitimate as courses instructed in English. International schools should be wary of unintentionally furthering cultural imperialism through which language programmes are offered (or cut) from academic programmes.

According to Mullaly (2010), “[o]ur social institutions are based on the culture and experiences of the dominant group, and our education system, the media, the entertainment industry, literature, and advertising reinforce this notion of a universal language” (p. 59). English as a hegemonic language is not naturally universal, but, as mentioned in the literature review chapter, has ties to colonialism. Mullaly suggests that “[e]very day, dominant group members see their identity groups, their religion, their social systems, their language, and so on presented as the norm... In effect, they see themselves seamlessly reflected in the ‘official culture’ of society” (p. 98). Offering globally hegemonic languages as languages of instruction are problematic because it may further the oppression of students whose first language is not English. Mullaly (2010) adds that “[i]n contradistinction to the dominant groups, members of subordinate groups discover themselves as symbols of the Other, manipulated in the transmission of the dominant culture” (p. 98). International schools should determine if unequal privileging is present Privileging English at international schools should be met by the privileging of other languages as well, especially if considering courses offered in the home language of students. Mullaly (2010) states that “[c]onsciousness raising helps subordinate groups become aware of the oppressive features of dominant discourses” (p. 243).

Helping educators and TCKs become aware of potential justice issues with learning English, as a globally hegemonic language, as a second language is important. Bourdieu’s (1993; 2003) symbolic violence suggests that systems of power are symbolically violent when they do not recognize that power and capital

are constructed as opposed to natural. I think it is important for international school educators to create awareness that learning English *does* bring more symbolic capital and power (due to global hegemony), but that this capital and power may have conditions of Orientalism (Said, 1994). Raising awareness of these issues can bring more empowerment to TCK students who are more at risk for cultural oppression. Mullaly (2010) suggests to have a “long-term goal of transforming the system by carrying out subtle kinds of education” and to have “consciousness raising or critical education” (p. 254). Two tangible strategies that Mullaly (2010) indicates are to “[p]ush for definitions of problems and solutions that are grounded in people’s lived realities, and to not blame victims” and to see that “[e]very staff meeting or supervisory session is an opportunity to raise questions about traditional assumptions and conventional approaches” (p. 254). Mullaly (2010) also suggests, however, to “[a]void militant confrontations. Searching questions are usually more effective than accusations or attacks” (p. 256). Discussed, below, are participants who perceive their ability to speak English as useful. Educators who intentionally validate less-hegemonic languages, while also providing access to more hegemonic languages (such as English), create culturally empowering classroom environments, and this should be considered for those who choose to teach in the international school circuit.

Considering how participants perceived the role of Western education and the opportunity to speak English, they voiced they felt like Western culture was a part of who they were, and others added that they believe the ability to speak

English will make them more successful in the future. Petrie discussed this concept with me, in her individual interview:

RESEARCHER: Do you think that attending a Western school will open doors for you more than if you attended to a Thailand school?

PETRIE: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Why is that?

PETRIE: Because, definitely I'm able to speak English, which is actually quite useful. For example, when I travel with my family or if my dad is negotiating some deal with a supplier that's not from Thailand, I usually do the whole translating and typing up emails and stuff for him. So I feel like being able to speak English is very, it comes in handy.

RESEARCHER: Do you plan to go to university outside of Thailand or you want to [study] in Thailand?

PETRIE: I'm [studying] in Thailand.

RESEARCHER: If you were to try to predict entering into a Thailand university after having attended Morehouse International School, what would your predictions be in terms of how you'll fit in? Do you think you'll have a difficult time or do you think it will be an easy transition?

PETRIE: I think it would be difficult if I went to a super Thailand university, but I'm lucky enough to get into a programme that they accept international students as well because they want more like diversity, I guess. My Dad did ask me about if I would have a hard time fitting in and he asked me if I'm sure about going to university in Thailand, and a lot of people ask me if I'm okay with having to read Thai and write Thai every day.

Here, Petrie discussed how the ability to speak English as a form of capital has direct implications when converted into economic capital as well. Petrie chose to attend a university in the country of her primary culture, and she seemed confident that she will be able to operate within this cultural field. Perhaps her ability to take advantage of all forms of symbolic capital is influenced by how this conversation is considered at home.

Alyssa, in her individual interview, added an idea that I think is important to remember - that primary language focus at home is equally important to secondary language focus at school. The role that the language of the home culture plays is very significant to an individual's ability to more successfully negotiate cultures, because language gives people access to culture. Individuals who more *successfully* negotiate a secondary culture into their identity are individuals who still manage to preserve their association with primary culture as well as their secondary culture. Data suggests that the primary language is significant to an individual's ability to associate with their primary culture. In this regard, Alyssa shares the following:

ALYSSA: I feel like that's when we are connected to Thai culture more, because my dad always tells me how he's proud of me that I kept my Thai culture and Thai, because, he knows of children of friends, who also moved abroad when they were younger, and they just completely forgot Thai. They can't speak it at all, because at home they don't speak Thai, they speak English instead. And so the culture at home and at school is basically the same for them and they just turned either, like, American, or just turned foreign. And they just completely lose their Thai culture-ness. And so I think speaking the language at home is really important in keeping your Thai culture identity.

Another concept that Alyssa touched on is how TCKs, like her, can sometimes feel self-conscious about their language use. I think this is one thing that is extremely important for international school teachers to be aware of. Alyssa shares her insight on how she sees language connected to self-confidence:

ALYSSA: So I do feel like it's really different at home and at school mainly because of the switching between the languages, and I think that really affects how I behave as well. So for example, when I speak in English, like right now, I don't know why, but I just feel more confident in English and just feel like I can express my ideas more, just let me go out. And while in Thai I feel less confident. I don't know why, but maybe because sometimes in Thai I have more like of a noticeable accent, and I

feel awkward. And the thing is, yeah, when I went abroad, my Thai accent changed. And so once I noticed it... usually I don't because I speak it, too, with my parents [meaning her parents have the same Thai accent]... but when other people commented on it, I felt more, like, conscious of it and so I, kind of, spoke Thai less, and that made it [her perceived accent] kind of worse. And so with Thai I feel more, like, self conscious and not confident in speaking of that at all. And so when I do use Thai it's kind of, like, I don't feel as confident as talking like right now in English. Yeah. Also, the thing is when I'm abroad, or when I'm with foreign people, and I speak English... I also feel self conscious [of speaking English] because I know my English isn't that good and I have an accent. So then I also feel kind of awkward with my English. But the thing is, my English, is, I think a little better than my Thai.

In her classroom observations, I often noticed that Alyssa was more quiet in class than she was with me in her interview sessions; this is shown in my observational field notes written on Alyssa, as shown below:

ALYSSA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Works silently, and sits at a group table with partner, but doing individual work. Working on IB Externally assessed document.

Puts headphones in [assumedly to listen to music]

[11:54]: opens binder of work.

Working independently and quietly, not discussing with others.

[12:04] still working. Music still plays quietly in background of class.

Flips through classwork. Shifts body.

Reads through text, presumably to find quotes.

Still works with headphones in. [does so to focus? To tune others out? Both?].

[Observer comments: I later asked Alyssa what she was listening to, and why she listens to music in class. She said she was listening to a mixture of Western rap songs as well as Thai love songs, and that she listens to music so that she can focus on her work better in class.]

[12:34] Has not spoken during the class period, and has continually worked silently and sustained. Headphones still in.

[12:30] looks at phone. [changes song? Text? Other?]

[12:40] has worked extremely focus, sustained, and determined on this assignment.

In class, Alyssa would often quietly discuss concepts with her seat partner, whereas in her interviews and audio journal, she seemed very confident discussing her ideas about cultural identity negotiation. Alyssa's perspective is extremely important for international school educators, because students like Alyssa might seem quiet in class, which could be a sign that they may feel self-conscious about the way they perceive their accent, and a TCK student who is quiet (or may who not 'participate' in class) may not be an indicator of academic ability, or, their level of engagement in the course (in terms of lack of participation). Understanding this possibility may help educators gain more empathy for the perspective of a TCK student.

Other participants mentioned similar ideas regarding their perception of their language use in regards to their confidence with oral communication (like Salem, discussed previously, who talked about her fear of oral presentations). Alyssa spoke English eloquently, but to her, she felt like she had an accent. Words of encouragement, which help students see that there does not need to be a negative stigma with linguistic accents, can be highly effective when supporting students in negotiating their cultural identities. Exposing negative stigmas associated with non-Anglophone accents, as a form of symbolic capital, will also decrease *symbolic violence* because it acknowledges the power dynamics that give authority to Anglophone accents over non-Anglophone accents. As participants

have indicated that language is something they feel connects them with their cultures, then their perception of their ability in those languages is also something that can affect their perception of their cultural belonging. Negative self-confidence with accents could be rather detrimental to an individual's feelings of cultural belonging, and I propose that educators who help remove negative stigmas and stereotypes of non-Anglophone accents and reveal power dynamics that consecrate Anglophone accents as being more prestigious. I observed course curriculum in participants who took IB courses to do this. During Ronnie's observations, for example, I observed one class that focused on how social schemas were constructed, and then observed another class where Ronnie was asked to complete an assignment discussing the role of social power and hierarchy. These two courses seemed to work together to scaffold critical thinking skills in relation to societal hegemonic norms. Decreasing symbolic violence in this regard could help TCKs more successfully negotiate their cultural identity and further empower their access to both home and school cultures.

Aida, in her audio journal, shared a different perspective on the level that she code-switches between languages, and how language is connected to her cultural identity. In this section of her interview, Aida was specifically talking about how she shows respect to elders (important in Thai culture culture) when speaking in Thai versus when in English:

AIDA: For me, it's none of that because for English... I have both. I consider English and Thai as both my first languages. So it's not like it's an effort to speak in English. It's just second nature. Because I use both languages at home. So that's why it's not something for me, personally, to be respectful to speak with them in English, to be a sign of respect because I just speak it. But then, when I have Thai culture friends and people can

speaking Thai, sometimes you want to talk and then sometimes it's easier just to switch [from English] into Thai because there are words that it's better described in Thai than it is in English. So sometimes we'll try to be mindful of that kind of thing. But not really, it's not really like speaking English to be respectful, but it's just being mindful of it [discussing when it is appropriate to use English].

The school has a policy that students are expected to speak English on campus.

This is primarily because there are many nationalities and English is the 'language of inclusivity'. There is a wide range of opinions and philosophies amongst teachers regarding this subject as it involves limitations of individuals using their home language versus the acquisition of a second language, being English.

I was curious to know more about Aida's interpretation of the 'English only' policy, and wondered how she experienced this in her classroom experiences. In most of her observations, however, I observed Aida primarily speaking English, and she switched to her primary language less consistently than I observed participants, like Ronnie, to do. Most of her observational field notes include information on her speaking English in class, for example:

1. AIDA OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Moves around with different sets of friends to finish physical activity.

Teacher plays music. Aida dances to music as they complete the activity.

Continues to do circuits with friend.

[speaks in English] "It's fun!", "It doesn't feel like school!"

[10:53] class ends.

2. AIDA'S OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Aida is directing peer on making changes, speaking in English. Aida is directing other peers.

Aida gathers group together to help. Aida supports her by reminding them about a second move that they group needs to practice; she discusses this in English.

Aida now moved on to a third group who needs help.

Aida, in her individual interview, discussed the way she uses English and Thai:

RESEARCHER: Do you ever feel, like in a class, that you're supposed to be speaking English but there's a Thai word that you want to use with your teacher, or with a peer, and you just can't because they don't understand? [the teacher or peer doesn't understand the Thai culture language].

AIDA: Its kind of funny because at this school there's a lot of Thai culture people and they all understand Thai so sometimes we have a word, and we're like, "Oh, I don't know how to say it in English." But there's no word to describe it really well in English. So we tell the teacher, warning before hand, and we'll just say it in Thai. So we say it in Thai and then everyone just comes together and try to find a translation in English and it's like, "Is it this one? Is it this one? No, no, no, it might be this one." So it's kind of, it's funny when it happens.

Aida captures something unique about Morehouse International School. One quality that seems to pervade the ethos of the school is the desire for students and faculty to experience community and an identity of togetherness. Aida touches on this when she says that through using their primary language, students are about to “come together” to find the best fit translation.

June, in her individual interview, indicated that the way in which she finds bridges between her multiple cultures is through language:

RESEARCHER: Is there a way you can remember that you've done that in particular, as something that you've picked up that is similar between Culture-C and Western culture. Like ‘this is the same’, ‘it works the same’, ‘I can connect in the same way’.

JUNE: I think it starts with language because actually ... Well in Country-C, I can also learn and can speak multiple languages, and one of them is English, and many of the younger ones can speak in English, so because of that, in my culture I can put myself into Western culture and try to bond with other people who speak the same language.

One class that I observed June was instructed in a language other than her primary or secondary language. I noticed that June had acquired enough of this third language to be able to operate in the cultural norms of the class. My field notes for this observation were as follows:

JUNE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

[Teacher corrects June's performance of the class task]

[In Thai] 'ohhhhhh, okay, khao jai' [oh okay, I understand].

[1:55] June practices the next section of the activity.

High fives Aida at the end of the song practice.

[2:00] Slaps Aida on the back in joking fun.

Teacher makes a joke, and June and Aida exclaim in laughter.

'Khun' [Ms./Mr.] [Teacher Name], khao jai! [I understand!]

Practices activity once more.

Laughs in between practicing activity.

Practices the activity, again, after teacher gives feedback.

"ahhhhahhHhaHaHHHAHA!" [laugh at the teacher and herself trying to learn the new skill]. Jumps beside teacher in endearing way. Something funny happens with teacher. They speak in Thai. Hugs teacher, laughs.
"AHAhAhahAHAHA"

When June told me how language is often a way for her to connect with different cultures, it probes for understanding of how June experiences the *space of possibilities* through an intertextual understanding of his cultural field negotiations. Although not surprising, per se, I found it interesting that there was such a high level of connection between language and culture. It is logical that there would be a connection between how one experiences cultural connection and one's ability to speak the language. As an educator of language, I understand

that fully. I am, however, interested in understanding the significance of an intersection of an individual's ethnicity, culture, and language. Ethnicity was not a main focus for this research, however, participants often raised this as a concept that influenced the way they negotiate cultures. As I was trying to understand the role of ethnicity, I asked the following question in Salem and Alyssa's focus group interview:

RESEARCHER: Do you think that, for you, that language and ethnicity are connected? For example, if I am asked, 'What languages do you speak?', well, I can say, 'I speak English and French'. But then if I am asked, 'What nationality are you?', I say, 'I'm Canadian'. Do you guys think that there's a strong cultural connection for you, between language and ethnicity? Like if you speak Thai and you are Thai culture, or if you speak Language-B and you are a Culture-B. Do you think that there's anything significant with that? Like how the ability to speak a language and the language of being either Thai culture or Culture-B is more strongly or strongly connected to your perception of your cultural belonging, or how you perceive your ability in the language? Is that crazy?

SALEM: No [confirms that my question is legitimate], but It's hard to explain because people ask me, 'What's your mother tongue? I would not know how to answer because in my family we both speak Thai and Language-B often.

RESEARCHER: And English too?

SALEM: English is mostly just me. But then my parents don't really expose me to Thai culture TV since kid, so it's always been English, English, English. So to me, I feel like my mother tongue would be Thai, but then, like, English is stronger than my Language-B and Thai.

RESEARCHER: But culturally really you have strong associations with Culture-B, right?

SALEM: They raised me that way.

RONNIE: Would you argue that when you switch to a certain language, you also switch to its culture as well? Would you say that? What about if you're learning a language in school? Do you actually have to be a part of that culture to speak it or is it just like, you know, you can just speak it?

SALEM: I think just embrace it...

RONNIE: Yeah.

SALEM: [hesitates, tries to explain]. *But*, you don't have to switch cultures, I guess. As long as you understand the basis of their culture.

ALYSSA: [adds] For example, I take French at school, although I can kind of speak it, I don't really... I'm not really able to connect with [that] culture, it's not that I've learned in France or anything, so I'd just be, like... speaking a language doesn't necessarily mean that you're going to understand that culture.

RESEARCHER: So it depends on environment then?

ALYSSA: It depends on the environment, too, yeah.

I found this dialogue interesting because not all participants fully agreed with each other on the significance of language and its ability to create cultural connections. Ronnie indicated that he code switches between cultures by changing his language, which I often observed in his classes where he would frequently switch between languages. Salem indicated that she does not code switch between her cultural identities, but rather remains truer to one culture while still changing the language she uses to associate with another. I often observed Salem only using English in class and to discuss with her friends. Alyssa indicated that there is more to her ability to connect with the culture than just her ability to speak the language of that culture, and she often spoke in the language of instruction for her different courses. If the course was instructed in English, she would only speak English, and if the course was instructed in Thai, I observed her to only speak in Thai; Alyssa did not seem to use language as her tool for associating with culture, unlike June and Ronnie whose language mixing was observed more frequently.

If language serves as a symbolic good (Bourdieu, 1993; 2003) with varying levels of authority, then the credit it holds contributes to the way in which symbolic capital (in the form of authority) takes place. According to Bourdieu (1993), “[t]his authority is nothing other than ‘credit’ with a set of agents who constitute ‘connections’ whose value is proportionate to the credit they themselves command” (p. 78). Language and culture are connected, but what is important to notice is that the way in which they are connected, how they are connected, and the power of their connection is a truly unique concept to each of the participants’ perceptions, experiences, and beliefs on language and culture. It is important to empower TCKs through helping them know that it is okay to connect with their cultures in different ways, and that things like language are influential, but that each individual has the power to decide how language will serve a role in their own negotiation of culture; this essentially means helping TCKs negotiate their own *space* of possibilities as they determine how they will place value on symbolic capital of their cultural fields. It is also important to recognize, however, that the power to decide personal value placed on cultural capital is still influenced by the hegemony of English and globalized Western culture. Bourdieu’s space of possibilities and how this concept serves to benefit the participants’ cultural negotiation between primary and secondary cultures is further expanded in the next section.

This section discussed *language and translation* and the role of bilingualism in cultural identity negotiation of participants. The next section

discusses *cultural norms and traditions* as coded concepts relative to the navigation of multiple cultures.

4.8 Navigating Culture Products through Cultural Norms and Traditions

In addition to the role of language and cultural identity negotiation, cultural norms and/or cultural customs were also experienced differently by participants, and yet were important to many of their experiences. As mentioned before, cultural fields are best understood as prisms that refract the laws of operation from the systematic fields to which connect. The concept of field refraction is furthered through intertextuality between fields. According to Kristeva (2002), who coined the term in the 1960s, later indicated that intertextuality is:

a way of placing us, readers, not only in front of a more or less complicated and interwoven structure (the first meaning of "texture"), but also within an on-going process of signifying that goes all its way back to the semiotic plurality, under several layers of the significant. Intertextuality accesses the semiotic, that trans-verbal reality of the psyche from which all meanings emerge. (p. 9)

Bourdieu (1993) defines intertextuality as “the space of works [that] appears as a field of position-takings which can only be understood relationally”, and argues that it is by understanding all fields, as intertextual fields, that one can understand any singular field. To look at one field singularly would compromise understanding that field, because meaning in one field is intertextual, or “interwoven” according to Kristeva (2002), with meaning in other fields. When fields are understood relationally, as “a homology between the space of creative works, the field of position-takings, and the space of positions in the field of productions” the problem of change can be “at once resolved” (p. 182). The space

in which symbolic power and capital are permitted to shift is what Bourdieu calls the space of possibles, and it is in this space, when fields are seen as intertextual, that agents within the field are able to shift and change the positions that determine symbolic power and capital. Bourdieu (1993) says that “[s]ince each camp exists through opposition, it is unable to perceive the limits that are imposed on it by the very act through which it is constructed” (p. 182); therefore, in order to understand the space in which a field operates, one must exclude the social space of which that space is the expression in order to move past the obstacles that compete with one another and prevent social synthesis for agents in association with competing fields. The space of possibles, as an intertextual space, seeks the homology between fields, thus creates a space of possibles where change of the original field of production can actually occur (Bourdieu, 1993).

It is expected that participants of this research would experience cultural clashes, however, negotiation of the cultural fields which clash, or are in opposition to one another, depends on the way in which an intertextual understanding of the fields through a homologous approach to cultural negotiation. This is reconfirmed in the findings of this research, when all participants indicated, albeit in their own ways and unique experiences, that what was important to their cultural identity negotiation was that they did not believe they had to choose one culture over another, and that they felt more culturally understood by other people when they did not ask participants to choose. What is significant, here, is that participants’ perspectives align with the Bourdieusian theory of field synthesis and homology. Participants serve as agents, or operators

in their habitus and fields (Bourdieu, 1985). To overcome obstacles to changing products of symbolic power and capital, agents belonging to opposing fields must be studied under the notion that these opposing fields are homologous under the condition that the fields are studied intertextually. Such synthesis of cultural fields is reminiscent of Ronnie's comments that he thinks he belongs to both cultures, while also belonging to neither culture - he actually belongs to a synthesis ("buffer zone") of both cultures, by which he is able to enter a space of possibles and overcome obstacles to achieve field synthesis.

Below are participants' experiences of trying to find synthesis of cultural fields. The details of each experience are unique to the participant; however, all participants work to negotiate various forms of capital through the way in which they experience products (in this case cultural traditions and/or norms) of the field of production. Alyssa, in her audio journal, chose to talk about her experience negotiating cultural traditions:

ALYSSA: And lastly, I'll be answering the question, 'Are there any traditions or events you do with your family that you find difficult because of your cultural identity?' So one: my parent's birthdays... they would often go to the temple really early, like at six. They would go to the temple and then they'd buy food and then give the food to the monks but in this very ceremonial process, which, I mean, it's not something that I find difficult to do, but it's just that it's something that I'm not that comfortable doing just because I don't really understand it... It's just that I find it kind of weird. Not weird... I kind of understand that it's for a good cause. It's something [religion of Thai culture], but yeah, I guess, it's because I'm not that religious and, I mean, I wouldn't wanna do it on my birthday. I'd rather do something else, like volunteer work or something like that. ...Yeah, but with this tradition I don't really connect or *feel* with it at all, and so sometimes, I just feel kind of awkward going with them to do this. [Considers]. Yeah.

In her individual audio journal, Karla shared her own experience with cultural differences through her experience with physical contact and with communication styles:

KARLA: So I find myself in odd situations where I don't know whether I should push further to make physical contact, make myself up for interactions, or I do try pulling back and moving at a much slower pace, making that a very “uneven” place for me. Because even though my school has a Western culture ideal, it wants to have... it still has its awkward social moments that are hard to maneuver at times.

For the second question dealing with the idea of school, and the conflicts between how my culture normally expects me to act, and how the other culture normally expects them to act... I would say it goes more with jokes and where the sensitivity for certain topics begins and ends. Because, like, I'm from a Western culture [identifies more with Western culture], I'm more sensitive towards body issues, body shaming, body positivity things - where you are identifying issues with the body. And at the same time making fun and praising it, is a very weird thing that I come across Thai culture. But it's very common in Thai culture culture.

Physical proximity was a cultural custom Petrie found slightly awkward to navigate:

PETRIE: I don't know if it's because I'm Thai culture or because it's a personal thing, but I usually don't like body contact. Growing up here I have... There are handshakes and hugs when you greet people and so a few months ago I met a new friend and he greeted me with a handshake, which was very weird, and he stuck out his hand and I was, like, kind of reluctant to shake it because usually in Thailand we just say hi or if it's elderly people, you just [do cultural gesticulation]. Yeah. So that was like, I hesitated for a moment.

RESEARCHER: Have you ever had that happen with the teacher? Like maybe they've come behind you and touch your shoulder or something like that?

PETRIE: Not really, but I did get a hug as a congratulations.

RESEARCHER: Yeah. Was that odd or was it ...

PETRIE: A little bit it was. Yeah.

RESEARCHER: Or were you like, "Okay." Were you able to move past it or you're like, I just don't want to be hugged by people?

PETRIE: I don't know, but she had her arms stuck out and I was like, "Okay, I think she's coming in for a hug" so I was like, "Okay, I'm just going to do it because I don't want to seem rude."

Ronnie, in his video journal, indicated a different, yet related, stance on the cultural norms regarding physical proximity:

RONNIE: I feel like a lot of subjects are taboo in Thai culture, in a way. I'd say stuff about 'public displays of affection', and stuff like that, I feel like at school with my friends who are not entirely Thai culture, they're more understanding than, or they're more willing to be accepting of, PDA. And I think that's the entire culture at our school, really. You're not afraid to express yourself [at school] which is obviously different to what Thai culture is. In Thai culture culture, you're very concerned of what other people will think of what you do. You're supposed to be very reserved, in a way. But here, the fact that we've been educated in a Western education, a little more liberal, at the same time the fact that we're Thai culture allows us to stay true to our culture and what to do and what not to do, keep ourselves [in that] manner.

Although the perception is of Western culture in general, I might add that the version of Western culture teachers and staff present at Morehouse International School may be more "liberal" version of Western culture than some other versions of Western culture. For example, I often observed some participants to act slightly 'naughty' in class (texting in class, reading Facebook, swearing quietly to their friends in Thai or English) and when this happened, I wondered if the participants had the impression of Western culture that being more 'liberal' than some Asian cultures means that there are less rules. In Thai culture, "proper manners" are important, but, Western cultures, too, have differing ideas about what is considered 'proper manners'. Something that I found curious through the observation phase of the research was the amount that participants perceived

Western culture based on their experience of ‘Westerners’ who present culture to them at Morehouse International School. Many individuals whose primary culture is Western would have an understanding or knowledge of how other primary cultured Westerners might be extremely culturally different than them; however, I am not sure this is communicated clearly within the school context.

Another cultural custom negotiated into identity that the participants discussed is that of classroom engagement expectations. In many Western cultures, it is expected that students raise their hand and initiate questions, answers, and discussion. Culturally speaking, however, many Asian cultures view students initiating a question or comment, especially while the teacher is talking, to be disrespectful. Sometimes this can cause a slight culture clash between Western teachers and non-Western students, as the teacher would prefer questions be asked aloud in front of the class, but the students may prefer to whisper the question to a peer during class, or ask a peer after class. I observed this to, sometimes, be a point of frustration for teachers during my observations, especially if asking if there were any questions regarding material just covered was met by complete silence. In one of Petrie’s observations, I noticed that the teacher wanted students to discuss ideas with their small groups, which they did, and the teacher also wanted them to share their ideas in front of the class as a whole, which they were much more reluctant to do. The field notes for this interaction are provided, here:

PETRIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):
Quietly sitting at group and taking notes.

Stimulus used to provoke thought. Participant seems interested in the content and is engaged in the discussion.

[Observer Comments] There seems to be an atmosphere of discussion, community, fun, and still focus and direction in small groups, however, when the teacher asks for students to share in front of the class, Petrie (and her peers) do not seem like they want to call out the answers.

Petrie discusses in small groups. Petrie takes notes and turns to their small group to discuss the idea. Petrie actively listens.

Listens to teacher give information and simultaneously takes notes.

Continuously is dedicated to notes and recording information from the class.

I asked Aida, June, and Karla, in their focus group interview, about their perception on how students verbally interact in classroom settings:

AIDA: What I feel like is, a lot of the people here have been at Morehouse International School, or at some overseas country or international school, since they were a kid, so the fact that they have to raise their hand and initiate, I think, is kind of second-nature to them at that point so I think that is an issue, but if it's people that came from the Thai culture schools or like other [foreign Asian] schools.

JUNE: They're very quiet.

KARLA: Where, it's like, they're quiet.

JUNE: They wait. They wait.

AIDA: They will wait until you like have to pick them to talk. ...but if they've grown up in an international environment, I think it's easy for them to raise their hand. People here, even the Thai culture kids, are open to, like, 'so-and-so' disruption.

JUNE: Well, for me, it's like, I basically grew up in this school and I observed, that when the teacher says, Any questions?, no one raises their hand up! No one! And everyone starts looking around. Checking. At first, I felt awkward raising my hand but like after a while, I was, like... 'I'll raise my hand up'.

At this moment, I acknowledged June's response, and then asked for a suggestion on how teachers might be able to have students ask them questions in a way that students might respond to. Aida suggested:

AIDA: I guess, when it's, 'Do you have any questions?', all questions you have just kind of go out of your brain. So maybe not 'Are there any questions', but maybe, 'do it first and then if you have anything you are confused about you can just talk to me later'.

JUNE: Yeah, usually it's like that. Like, what Aida said. Like, that seems more, like, preferable because we ask questions later when everyone starts doing what they're supposed to be doing, so we go up later on, privately.

In an observation of Ronnie, I notice that one of the classroom routines he was regularly asked to do was to keep notes within a class-wide online forum. Within this forum, Ronnie and his peers recorded their own thoughts about the lesson, or stimulus used for the class that day, and they also posted questions they had for the teacher. This seemed to be a good strategy provided for Ronnie so he could ask questions and interact, electronically, with classmates about the lesson while the teacher was able to continue instruction. I also think that this strategy would empower students to ask their questions verbally, because they could see that their other classmates have similar questions if posted in their online forum. In this particular class, when the teacher asked questions, Ronnie readily responded. This kind of strategy would provide students the opportunity to ask questions on a platform that is engaging to them. Online forum platforms also store the students' discussions electronically, which is convenient for teachers who prefer paperless classrooms.

Alyssa, in her audio journal, also had ideas on the way in which the cultural norms for classroom engagement unfold:

ALYSSA: I would say that at school, with a Western culture, I think the Western culture expects you to be more expressive. They encourage you to voice your thoughts and if you don't like something you should say it. Meanwhile, for the Thai culture at home, I would be more quiet sometimes because, I don't know... it's just the Thai culture kind of expects you to be considerate of the appropriateness and the consequences of your words. And so sometimes I want to voice my thoughts, because I don't want to offend anyone, especially if I don't really know the culture that well. Yeah, so at school with the teachers, for example, if they said something that I disagree with I'm not afraid to voice my thoughts. I feel comfortable disagreeing with them, but at home it's often a thing where you should always listen to your parents or just *anyone* older than you. Even if you disagree, you shouldn't really say it, because that would make them feel bad. So something about saving face is very important in Thai culture and so you should do whatever you can to not make someone lose their face.

I think Alyssa's description of how she code switches in her communication styles between Western culture and Thai culture should be a consideration for international school teachers. Sometimes, as teachers, we are frustrated when students are not expressive in class discussions or debates, however, I think Alyssa's description of the way she has to navigate these cultural norms can help Western teachers gain insight and empathy for the cultural code switching that students encounter on a daily basis.

When asked about cultural customs they must navigate, some participants discussed that the way they try to 'show respect' (mostly to elders) is often an issue they need to consider. Aida, in her individual interview, share her thoughts on appropriate ways to show respect to teachers:

AIDA: Well Western teachers, it's more, like, common courtesy. You listen when they're talking. You make eye contact. You don't interrupt them when you speak. You don't say rude things. You try to be nice, polite. I don't know how to explain it other than common courtesy. You can kind of be like, "Hey." And it's pretty much okay to just be like, "Hi, how are you doing?" And more casual. But with the Thai culture teachers you have to be, [says formal hello in Thai] and all-respectful with the wai

[Thai gesticulation to greet another person with respect], and all that type of thing.

Another concept that arose often when participants were asked about the way in which they find cultural norms something they must learn to navigate is the way in which they physically hold their body. Lisa shared her experience with this matter in her individual interview:

LISA: Sometimes I do small things that my mother would not deem to be feminine. For example, I would take off my shoes in public or I would sit cross legged and she would chastise me for not acting ladylike, and that our friends will look down on me for not having manners. But I prioritize my comfort over anyone else's which makes her give me a disapproving look. But she no longer says anything because she realized I won't change my mind.

I think something that helps Lisa negotiate her cultures more successfully is that she has made a conscious decision to be the one who decides the parameters of her own cultural norms.

Navigating cultural norms is a consistent experience for TCKs, and *cultural norms and traditions* were frequently coded in the data analysis, as was discussed in this section. The next section provides an overview of findings and summarizes this chapter, chapter 4, the findings.

4.9 Chapter Summary

Each participant has a different perspective on how they feel that they belong, find community, associate with communities, and navigate cultural obstacles effectively. Bourdieu (1993) elaborates that the space of possibles and the way that it allows for change of cultural capital within intertextual fields, is determined by multiple factors:

It is certain that the direction of change depends on the state of the system of possibilities... that is offered by history and that determines what is possible and impossible at a given moment within a particular field. But it is no less certain that it also depends on the interests (often totally disinterested) that orient agents - as a function of their position *vis-à-vis* the dominant pole or the dominated pole of the field - towards the most secure and established possibilities, towards the newest possibilities among those which are already socially constituted, or even towards possibilities that must be created for the first time. (p. 183)

Within a postcolonial frame, one can argue that the dominance of Western culture in a globalized society determines cultural and linguistic capital for participants who acquire Western culture and the English language within their secondary culture. Bourdieu (1993) however, suggests that history is not the only determinant to the possibility of change, but that agents can create new changes which are or are not previously established possibilities. Participants for this research navigate their cultural identities, and as a result navigate cultural capitals and symbolic power determined by the dominant poles within cultural fields, but they also use their own space of possibles to synthesize positions, capital, and symbolic power within and between their intertextual fields. It is because they are able to maintain homologous cultural fields that they are successful in negotiating their cultural identities and benefit from both (or all) cultures.

The ability to decide for themselves who they want to be is strong asset to their cultural negotiation. All participants also indicated that acceptance and understanding of others has been important to their progress and ability to value their own cultural identities and those of others. During one particular observation, a participant was asked to inspect a piece of art, a self portrait, and was prompted to consider the role and importance of self-portraits. The

participant was asked how someone else's portrait of them might differ from their own self-portrait. During the conclusion of this particular lesson, the participant was left with the following words from Chuck Close, an inspiring self-portrait artist: "Never let anyone define what you are capable of by using parameters that don't apply to you". I found this quote particularly resonating and descriptive of my participants' journey to discover who they are and how they, themselves, are the negotiators, of where they belong as they take hold to all and every aspect of their multiple and paradoxical cultural identities. It is their own cultural parameters by which TCKs should be empowered as they are able to define and redefine who they are, to determine their *space of possibles* as agents within the homologous fields they have been able to synthesize successfully.

Chapter 4 reveals that the following codes were significant to the participants' experiences negotiating their cultural identity: community, teacher-student rapport, humour, discussion, speaking English, fun, cultural hybridity, cultural customs, speaking Thai, practicing skills, cultural belonging depends on environment, individual identity expression, dedication, taboo behaviour, cultural belonging, language and identity, respect for cultural practice, respect for others, confidence, empathy, motivation, cultural disconnect, classroom routines and structures, comfort (in school environment), cultural exclusion, primary culture, stimuli (used by teachers during instruction), primary culture present at school (specifically), code switching, language and translation, cultural inclusion, stress (good/productive stress), and misunderstanding of cultural belonging (of others to participants).

I discovered that one of the most important things to the participants' ability to negotiate their cultures is how they experience community. Sometimes I observed community to be intentionally crafted, such as classroom layouts that enabled more natural human interaction, and other times, I observed that the environment at the school felt community orientated and that the participants interacted with their teachers (teacher-student rapport) and with their peers (peer-peer rapport) in ways that revealed human connection. I also noticed that humour was significant to how participants had fun with teachers and peers, and participants also said that humour allowed them to let loose and have fun at school. Participants also discussed that they feel like their teachers are supportive to their learning process and understanding when they mess up. Because participants must constantly negotiate belonging to their cultural communities (of non-Western and Western cultures) the different communities offered at the school permitted participants to create social bonds with teachers who cared about them, and with peers who also negotiate different cultures into their own experience and identity. Salem, in her individual interview shared the following:

SALEM: Do you feel more understood by people who have fit into more than one culture? Yes, those people are, mostly, more open minded and easier to talk to, 'cause we can relate to many things, such as in their own culture and my own culture, too.

When figuring out where they culturally belong, participants seem to have community at school, and this community seemed gave them a space to belong to when they have feelings of disconnection “in pockets” (as June described in her individual interview).

I discovered that when participants feel cultural disconnection, it seems to be only for a time, and then they find ways to negotiate the lines between cultural expectations. Karla, as previously discussed, figures out what is culturally and socially acceptable in the different cultures she interacts with. She mentioned that it can be awkward, but she finds the navigation between cultures interesting. For Salem, when others question her about how she belongs to culture, she also finds a way to balance her cultural identity through her belief that as time changes, what it means to belong to one's own cultures can also change. In her individual audio journal, Salem shared the following ideas on this topic:

Salem: Without naming names, do you feel like there are experiences you have at school in which you have cultural conflicts between how each of your cultures normally expects you to act? Sometimes people would ask me, "Why didn't you act like that, I thought your culture would say no to this, say no to that." I was like, well, yes, but I mean, it's the 21st century! Things change. Culture doesn't always stay, as in... it doesn't always have to be super strict, about one specific thing per culture.

Salem's suggestion that things change in the 21st century and that cultural norms do not have to be 'strict' reflects what other participants have said as well. For example, Aida, Karla, and June have each previously discussed, being open is important to their ability to negotiate cultures. They suggest other people be open to their cultural identity, and this seems to be what Salem also discusses when she says that cultural norms do not necessarily need to strictly confine one's identity. Ronnie also shared that he can belong to many cultures at once. Lisa discussed that she has found a way to culturally belong, in her own way, for her own validation. Alyssa justified that she can value and belong to her primary culture of home while having exposure to a secondary, Western culture.

I discovered that it is when other people expected the participants to be defined by strict cultural boundary lines that they felt culturally misunderstood. When “neither culture feels like home”, the sense of “unhomeliness” (Bressler, 2007, p. 241), discussed in chapter 1.1, may occur when others place strict cultural boundary lines upon participants. If cultural boundary lines are so firm, participants may feel culturally disconnected when they try to cross them, but if boundary lines are more open and more flexible, participants may have a more uplifting experience trying to cross their cultures. This is significant to the way that Petrie described her cultural identity, as a Venn Diagram, but one where the overlapping culture, the interstitial culture, is much larger than the cultures on either side. In this way, what is helpful to participants is when other people do not ask them to choose between their cultures, but rather encourage the perspective that belonging to more than one culture does not diminish the belonging to each culture separately. The paradox of belonging to individual cultures, multiple cultures, and interstitial cultures, all at the same time, was important to how participants understood their own cultural identity negotiation process, and wanted others to perceive their cultural belonging.

Next, in chapter 5, I provide a call for future research, where I also provide a summary of suggestions. I will voice the participants’ suggestions for how educators can best support their cultural identity negotiation; I will also make my own suggestions on how to support cultural identity negotiation, based on observations and inferences made from the data I have collected. I will revisit past

research to elaborate my points made in this research, and I will provide a call for future research to be done within this field.

Chapter 5: Final Suggestions and Call for Future Research

The previous chapter, chapter 4, presented findings of this research study. The ethnographic methodological approach framed the data within qualitative codes that arose throughout the following data collection procedures: observations, individual interviews, focus group interviews, and participatory participant audio/video journals. The research suggested that the following concepts were relevant and important to the participants' experience of negotiating Western culture with non-Western primary cultures: the role of community, community belonging and interaction with peers, community and teacher-student rapport, acceptance and understanding of culturally negotiated identity, cultural stereotyping that deters from cultural understanding, cultural hybridity, language and translation and the power of bilingualism, and navigating culture through norms and traditions. Based on the research findings presented in chapter 4, this chapter, chapter 5, presents final suggestions and a call for future research to better understand how Third Culture Kids (TCKs) of non-Western primary cultures negotiate secondary, Western culture into their identity.

Chapter 4 primarily used Bourdieu's theory of the field of cultural production, habitus, symbolic capital, symbolic power, and symbolic violence. Chapter 5 continues the use of Bourdieusian (1993; 2003) theory, while also adding interpretation with postcolonial theory through Said's (1994) theory of Orientalism. Chapter 5 also continues to employ Pollock and Van Reken's (2009) theory of the TCK, and discusses the significance that cultural and curricular frameworks of international schools have for TCKs of non-Western primary

cultures. In this chapter, I revisit the concepts of the hidden curriculum, the role of the English language and Anglophone phonology, the significance of cultural and curricular frameworks, and question semantics and terminology used to describe TCK youth. Throughout the aforementioned concepts, I highlight Morehouse International School's vision, mission, and collective agreements (Appendix J) to suggest that the mandate of the school empowers a culturally inclusive and socially just learning environment for TCK Youth. I will suggest professional development for educators and their students to further develop understanding and skills in intercultural competency as a means to connect the written mandate of the school with the lived experience of this mandate in classroom environments. I begin, first, with a consideration of the importance of cultural and curricular frameworks of international schools.

5.1 Cultural Framework and Curriculum of International Schools

Pollock and Van Reken (2009) discuss the importance of schools assisting TCKs to culturally transition between their cultures so that negotiation between cultures can occur through the scaffolding provided by the school. Part of their discussion is directed to parents of TCK youth who consider which international school their child should attend. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) say that there are two things that better help TCKs transition cultures, the first being the cultural framework of the school, and the second being the curricular framework of the school. In terms of the cultural framework, "many schools that began with a specific cultural focus have expanded in significant ways to accommodate the changing multinational student population", whereas others "still see themselves

as mainly serving their primary community. They believe if people come to their school, they understand the cultural base and have tacitly agreed to that by enrolling their child in this system” (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 209). The former, more culturally aware framework, which intentionally approaches constructive cultural development, will better scaffold TCKs of non-Western culture to negotiate a secondary culture. Morehouse International School states that it will “engage and support families in partners in the education of each child”, which supports a liaison between the cultural practices of home and school. The school’s Parent Association Committee is instrumental in this liaising between home and school, as the committee often plans cultural events and also holds forums for discussions on cultural norms between home and school culture. Additionally, the school mission states that it “provides an interfaith, inclusive, and academically rigorous education for students to be balanced, successful, and compassionate individuals”. The mission statement suggests a culturally aware and rigorous curriculum. The offering of the IB Curriculum (2013) at the school may assist in connecting this statement of the school to the practice in the classroom, as the IB curriculum also aligns with this mission statement and even uses similar phrasing, such as: “to develop inquiring, knowledgeable, and caring young people”, “through intercultural understanding”, “challenging programmes of international education and rigorous assessment”, and “compassionate and lifelong learners” (p. 3). Additionally, providing options for academic programs, such as the availability of the AP program, coincides with the school’s mission statement to be academically rigorous. The mission of the school to create an

inclusive school community that supports the balance of students' academic rigor and compassion for others is supported by my observational and dialogical data discussed in chapter 4. Concepts of community and social rapport frequented the data as significant to participants' ability to negotiate their multiple cultures. Therefore, the mission statement transfers to the lived experience of the participants in terms of being an inclusive community.

TCKs who negotiate a secondary, Western culture into their identity should still have the opportunity to maintain their primary culture of home, and this should be considered in cultural frameworks of international schools. To deal with cultural norms tacitly, such as in the latter cultural framework mentioned above, is to further symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2003), because it does not recognize the symbolic power dynamics of the game (Bourdieu, 1993). A non-inclusive cultural framework can also make parents of TCKs experience frustrations because "they feel their voices are not being heard" (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 209). If parents, administration, and students are all stakeholders in the learning process and in academic and emotional growth of students, then empowering TCKs *and* their parents is an essential aspect to a school environment that promotes an understanding of cultural identity negotiation. The alignment of Morehouse International School's mission statement with the mission statement of curriculum (such as IB) offered at the school is instrumental to ensuring that the mission statement of the school is a practice that trickles down into the classroom experience for students. If the school mission statement was not explicitly connected to the mission of the curriculum offered in classrooms,

then there would be a disconnect between the mission of the school and the lived experience of students.

Tacit expectations that non-Western TCKs have consented, through enrollment in the school, to acquire Western culture does not recognize the importance of their primary cultures, does not demonstrate intercultural competency within the cultural framework of a school, and, it furthers subtle cultural imperialism that is not socially equitable in a culturally diverse world. One of Morehouse International School's commitments is to "nurture a safe, positive, inclusive learning environment that challenges, engages, and supports ALL community members as individuals and embraces diversity such as ability level, age, faith, gender, nationality, sexuality, or race". This commitment is important to the school's ability to recognize the importance of students' home culture and languages. The school's policy, written in the Student Code of Conduct, states that students are to "intentionally speak English while on campus". The intention of this policy is both to build language proficiency and to create a space for all students and faculty to create a common sense of community by using a common language. This policy, however, is still a 'touchy subject' for many teachers. Although polite, and phrased more justly than an 'English only' policy, is the 'English as the language of inclusion' policy one that still creates Anglophonic dominant linguistics regardless of more socially just intentions? How can teachers create culturally inclusive spaces on campus if they are asking students not to use their language of home? How can teachers best prepare students' English literacy while also promoting the value of literacy in other

languages? Given my observations at Morehouse International School, the answers to these questions remain in the individual hands of classroom teachers, and although there is one common message sent about the concept of ‘language of inclusion’, there is not a common understanding of how best to recognize the important of other languages used on campus.

The intent of the school’s mandate to foster a culturally inclusive school environment is clear, however, the lines are blurred when it comes to the use of English on campus, because there is a disconnect between the socially just intent of the language policy and the semantic implications of the policy itself. The Students’ Rights and Responsibilities section of the student handbook discusses the role of the English language at school, and includes phrasings such as: “increase their language proficiency”, “provide the opportunity to review and practice the basic components of the English language”, “students who attain the designated proficiency level are evaluated to determine placement in the full mainstream learning environment”, and “benefit from [English Language Development] student support classes”. Albeit unintentional, these phrasings have semantic ties to the hegemonic norm that it is an “opportunity” and a “benefit” to learn the English language, and that the ability to do so should be “increased” and “practiced” so students can be “proficient” enough to exit ELD classes and enter into “*mainstream*” classes. The main concern is not that the policy gives access to learning the English language, as access to the English language also gives students ingress to the various forms of capital associated with the English language in globalized hegemony. However, using Bourdieusian theory, the

concern is that, specifically when addressing the English language, the policy's semantics subtly favour the English language through the connotation of word choice in the policy itself. This subtle semantic favouring of English proficiency tacitly accepts that the English language is inherently dominant. Rephrasing the policy so that it is more reflective of its semantic choices would be beneficial. Additionally, an intentional statement about the importance of translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2013), would better align with the school's vision and mission statements. Supporting translanguaging in the wording of the language policy of the school and in student handbook better align with the vision to be "known globally as a hallmark of international education" and be more linguistically "inclusive". To consider how translanguaging may more authentically be the language of inclusion could empower even greater community belonging for TCKs whose culture of home is not Western, and whose language of home is not English. The cultural and curricular frameworks of Morehouse International School provide a culturally inclusive and socially just learning environment for TCK youth, particularly because of the aforementioned vision, mission, and collective commitment statements. Because the leadership team, inclusive of administrators and teachers, at Morehouse International School has recently revised the semantics of the school vision and mission statements, and have written school-wide collective commitments that align with the vision and mission of the school, I would recommend revisiting the semantics of the language policy as well. The semantics of the language policy do not match its intention to be inclusive, and the semantics of the policy also fall short of the

inclusive and intentional semantics recently revised in the vision, mission, and collective commitment statements. The process to revise the semantics of the language policy may also include the consideration of a translingual approach to the language policy to evaluate how it might be more culturally inclusive as well as more effective for a majority student demographic whose language at home is not English. The data of this research clearly suggests that the participants feel their positive experiences at the school are culturally inclusive, which is indicative of the significance of the school's vision and mission, and if the school considers a more translingual approach in its official language policy, it may tighten its systematic approach to furthering this culturally inclusive experience for TCK students.

Research and professional development that furthers understanding of how teachers better align the culturally inclusive vision and mission of the school with a linguistically inclusive language policy for non-Western TCK students, while also giving students the access to capital associated with the English language, is an essential asset for further exploration of the experience of TCKs' negotiation of culture. To hear the first-hand experience of how cultures are negotiated, the struggles and rewards of this process, and how TCKs find ways to negotiate their interstitial lines is a first step to a greater understanding of how international schools can contemplate how their cultural and curricular frameworks align with their language policies.

It has been rewarding to work with participants who have shared their personal experiences with cultures, and the research findings suggest that more

research is needed to extend this exploration to other cultural frameworks of different international school systems. Participants who attended Morehouse International School generally suggested that the school's cultural framework was conducive to their cultural identity negotiation, but more research should be done to understand why this is and how it happens. To couple the perspectives of student participants, research that focused on educator and administrator participants would help uncover the framework designs of the school, and explore pedagogies used by educators that students' cultural negotiation. Because the focus of this research was to empower the voices and perspectives of student TCKs, it did not expand data collection to observations and interviews with educators or administrators, so this would be an ideal next step.

Participants expressed that they felt the strategies used by educators or by Morehouse International School's cultural framework did empower their experience. Salem, in her individual audio journal, shares her thoughts on how the Western education at Morehouse International School has been meaningful to her:

SALEM: I think it's more free. You're more free to do different things, whereas in a lot of Asian cultures, they will force you to do a specific thing. Which it's not bad, they want the best for you, but it's too forceful and you don't have a choice, it's forced. And most of the time I feel like you don't even have the chance to want to do something you like. So I'm glad I was able to be educated in a Western style of education.

Salem views her experience in the Western curriculum offered at Morehouse International school, to enable her to be "more free" to do different things she is interested in, and she feels she is not forced to do things she does not want to. She shared that her mother felt strongly that the school would provide her with the social environment needed to make friends and that the peer rapport at Morehouse

International School was strong and positive. Part of the environment that Salem discussed she feels Morehouse International School promotes is the work-life balance. Salem discussed how some other schools she knows of do not leave students much time for anything else outside of school, because they are asked to do such a high amount of academic work; Salem says she feels Morehouse International school is much more reasonable about the expectations for academic work outside of school hours. Salem also discussed how many teachers at the school have allowed her the extra time and space she needs to master curriculum skills. She shared the belief that teachers at Morehouse International School do not force her to take subjects or to learn content in a way that does not meet her own needs or interests, but feels that her teachers have been open to giving her the time and resources she needs. I observed, in one of Salem's more favourite content area classes, that she seemed excited to respond to his teacher's question with the correct answer. In some of Salem's interview data, she mentioned how she used to be nervous to speak in front of the class, and that some of her teachers helped her do this better. In these field notes, below, Salem is the first student to voluntarily share her answer in front of the class. The field notes for this event record the following:

SALEM OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES (CLASSROOM):

Teacher asks what else students see in the stimulus.

Salem responds in front of class

The teacher nods that the answer is correct.

“So I was right?!”

Salem smiles at getting the correct answer.

June, Aida, and Karla felt it important, however, to share in their focus group interview, that it is significant for the teacher *and* the student to both initiate open mindedness when building rapport with one another. In their focus group Karla shared:

KARLA: I think one thing I would say is that for like getting to know your teachers and being in an open space with all of your teachers that it's important for both the teacher but also for the student to take the first [step] forward to getting to know the teacher and letting them know about you. 'Cause if you always just rely on one side to do everything it's gonna be an uneven balance.

Participants indicate that it is important for individuals, teachers and students, to be nonjudgmental of others, and to base their impressions of other people, who they are, their cultures, on personal experiences with them as opposed to basing impressions of others off of what other people say about them. In her individual interview, I asked Alyssa about her advice for how educators could help their TCK students with their cultural negotiation process, and she shared her own thoughts on how to handle the times she feels like others make judgments about her culture:

ALYSSA: I just try not to care or assume what other people think because like me, myself, I would try not to assume or judge them from what I see or heard of them. So I just hope that other people will do the same and NOT judge me for how they see me. I think speaking the language at home is really important in keeping your Thai identity.

In her individual interview, Karla added the following suggestions when I asked her how teachers can help prepare students to gain more cultural understanding:

KARLA: I think that is a really good way to help people understand the line between being fair to the culture and being respectful, [or] being too gimmicky and kind of offensive.

Given these perspectives of participants, curriculum that promotes nonjudgmental and open-minded understanding of others and their identities may be of assistance to increasing cultural understanding.

The cultural framework at Morehouse International School, which I believe to support inclusive curriculum design, is reflected in one of its commitments to “engage in the education of each child’s heart”, as it states, “we embrace diversity, lead a happy and healthy life, and help others”. Salem’s interview and audio journal data, mentioned above, would suggest that her experience confirms the statement that the school sets as an expectation for its framework of inclusivity. However, as June and Karla indicate, inclusivity is sometimes compromised in subtle encounters when they feel like a teacher or a peer has misjudged their intentions, or, their culture. Although the principals of the school include the value of education catered towards the students ‘heart’, whether or not all teachers ensure this in their classrooms and co-curricular activities is often dependent on each individual teacher. Aida, and Karla wanted teachers to be aware that it is important students feel like their teachers trust them, that they do not prejudge them, and that inclusive environments created outside of the classroom (such as field trips or other activities) are equally important to culturally inclusive classroom spaces. I do not presume that teachers need to teach students to “embrace diversity, lead a happy and healthy life, and help others” in the *same* way, but as Aida and Karla indicate, having this be a *common* practice amongst all teachers is important to their experience.

Salem had emphasized the concept of “being free”, in her individual interview, after I had asked about how she thinks his parents perceive the Western education she receives from Morehouse International School:

SALEM: They like it very much, especially Dad because he's from Country-B and Country-I, and those type of schools are tough and we don't have that type of school in Thailand. So, attending in Western school makes me more open minded and more free. [For] My dad and my mom, especially.

In addition to seeing his education at Morehouse International School help her “be free”, Salem said that the education she receives helps her be “more open-minded”, and this experience is reinforced by the school’s commitment to providing an education that administers to each child’s head, through the statement that “we are creative, critical thinkers, and open minded”. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) suggest that “[t]he second thing to examine [in an international school] is curriculum” (p. 210). Another Morehouse International School collective commitments says, “We will be open-minded and reflective about our practices”; this also seems to be confirmed by Salem’s perspective on her education received from the school. Open-mindedness is also a concept that is encouraged in the IB Diploma curriculum offered on campus as well. According to Pollock and Van Reken (2009), “[w]hatever their historical roots, international schools are now incorporating broader choices in their subject material, including the International Baccalaureate degree” (p. 210). As mentioned in chapter 2, the literature review, the aim of the IB Programme is to “develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world” (IBO, 2013, p.

175). The data suggests that Salem's experience at the school coincides with both the school's claimed collective commitment statement and the IB mission statement (Salem was enrolled in at least one IB course) regarding open mindedness. Within observational data, I observed that participants experienced classroom environments that promoted and scaffolded open mindedness.

The more unified approach on behalf of teachers for creating school environments that foster open mindedness, however, may be one factor as to why there is a less unified approach on how to use a language of inclusion while continuing to promote open mindedness. Because culture and language are correlated, there may be an uncertainty for teachers at the school on how to create cultural open mindedness, and the inclusion of many cultures, without promoting the inclusion of multiple languages. In their classrooms, teachers' IB curriculum asks students to respond to questions like, how does an individual's language ability influence their cultural identity? And, to what extent can language and culture exist independently from one another? These questions promote open mindedness and critical thought, which align with the school's commitment to create "learning experiences that engage and empower every student to be balanced, successful, and compassionate individuals". However, teachers are at a bit of a stand-still when it comes to how best to empower students' linguistic balance of English and home culture. Additionally, another school commitment states that it "supports families and partners in the education of each child's *hands*", and states that "we are effective communicators, collaborative, and resourceful". The lived experience of language use is more dependent on

individual classroom teachers, and this may be because, although the policy is to speak English on campus, it remains unclear how to approach this while promoting open mindedness. Is it truly inclusive if those who do not speak English have to ‘do all the work’ to include those whose English is their first language?

Indeed, the policy of English as the language of inclusion also supports students whose home language is other than Thai or English as well, so that all students can “effectively communicate” and “collaborate” at school with all people. However, when most teachers discuss which language should be used on campus, the first thought most teachers have is the amount of Thai spoken on campus, and the Thai-English dichotomy is stronger due to the majority of students at the school being Thai, who are enrolled in official curricula delivered and assessed in English. The commitment to “engage and support families as partners in the education of each child’s head, hands, and heart” is a positive principle, as it supports education that develops a well-rounded individual through explicitly addressing the importance of knowledge, skills, and values. However, this well-intended system also creates a complicated paradox when it comes to English as the language of inclusion, because the students need the *skill* level in English to show their *knowledge* on the majority of their academic assessments, but, how does English as the language of inclusion while anywhere on campus embrace diversity as one of listed aspects of developing *values*? So, in theory, education that develops heads, hands, and hearts should create well-rounded individuals. Except, head (knowledge) and hands (skills) may be more

straightforward than heart (values) when it comes to an English as the language of inclusion policy at the school. Knowledge and skills can also be addressed in a more unified way across teachers, whereas how to address issues of values and how to be inclusive may depend less on teachers' formal education and more on their personal experience.

Parts of language use are tied to knowledge and skills, such as the ability to perform on assessments, while parts of language use are tied to values, such as valuing differing cultural identity. Teachers at Morehouse International School prepare students to enter into university, and what is interesting is that the knowledge and skills students will need for university, and they will use this knowledge and these skills they learn at the school to transition to successfully continue in their academic worlds after graduating high school. However, it can be argued that the education provided to students to develop their "heart" and value system regarding embracing diversity, leading healthy lives, and helping others may not be the goals of globally hegemonic culture, and therefore, it is less clear how to prepare them in this area (which includes how to approach the nuances of the language policy) because we are preparing students to have a value system that may not yet exist in the hegemonic world, especially in the linguistic hegemonic world, which actually promotes the domination of the English language as a high form of capital. So on a larger systematic scale, students will benefit from the knowledge and skills in the English language, as English holds varying forms of capital around the world within globally hegemonic fields (Bourdieu, 1993; 2003). However, they will also systematically benefit from

school policy that values their multiple languages because the hegemonic global system does not place the same amount of value on more marginalized home languages. Thus is the systematic paradox that schools like Morehouse International Schools are faced with: promoting the use of English will benefit the knowledge and skills students need after graduation, but by promoting English as the language of inclusion, other languages are excluded, and the exclusion of other languages is what systematically gives power to more hegemonic languages, such as English.

Because of this paradox, there is a disconnect between the official language policy and the lived language experience at the school. This disconnection may agitate TCK students' ability to negotiate cultures, because the system the language policy creates sends important and valid, but disjointed, messages regarding the relationship between language, identity, and linguistic capital because the system that the school prepares students for is, itself, disjointed. Thus, we are stuck in a circuit of linguistic paradox: by solving issues of linguistic capital (by giving students access to more linguistic capital), we further the hegemonic capital given to the English language, and therefore, give more power to the original problem we try to solve, being the unequal linguistic capital between English and more marginal languages. So, where does this leave the international school, whose job is to both validate the home languages of students while also preparing them to operate in the globally hegemonic English language? Bourdieu (2003) writes that "[i]t is in the process of state formation that the conditions are created for the constitution of a unified linguistic market,

dominated by the official language” (p. 45). If we imagine the international school as a small scale state, which has to decide upon its policies of operation and the like, the suggestion of the unified linguistic market rings true when one language is the language of the school. Bourdieu (2003) adds, “this state language becomes the theoretical norm against which all linguistic practices are objectively measured” (p. 45). However, as Bourdieu (1993; 2003) would also suggest, we must be critical of the systematic fields of production that give power to some forms of capital over others, rather than the individuals that occupy the positions of those fields. Bourdieu (2003) indicates that

this linguistic law has its body of jurists – the grammarians – and its agents of regulation and imposition – the teachers – who are empowered *universally* to subject the linguistic performance of speaking subjects to examination and to the legal sanction of academic qualification. (p. 45)

Here, Bourdieu does not suggest that we be critical of the teachers, themselves, of regulation, but that we look to how the system we have created gives power to certain forms of linguistic capital within its boundaries. In this way, it is perhaps unproductive for the international school to focus on the individuals who do or do not use the language of “the state”, but rather focus on the system that creates or impairs their ability to use languages. Of course we want students to acquire the linguistic capital that will allow them to academically and professionally operate in globally hegemonic fields, but we also want to validate their ability to overthrow the domination that suppresses the linguistic capital of their home culture.

Throughout my observational data, I noted that some teachers promoted language translation, and this may be one way to give students opportunities to

build language abilities and gain linguistic capital, include others in their communication who do not speak the same languages, and validate their multiple languages in a field (the school campus) associated with globally hegemonic capital (Western culture and the English language). Bourdieu (2003) writes,

Integration into a single ‘linguistic community’, which is a product of the political domination that is endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language, is the condition for the establishment of relations of linguistic domination. (p. 46)

Perhaps it is possible that we do not integrate into a “single linguistic community” in order to be inclusive, but use the field of the international school to re-create a kind of integration into a multi-linguistic community through the intentionality to include others through translation and still gain the practice in the language of secondary acquisition.

Ronnie, who is very fluent in both Thai and English, and who I often observed using both languages simultaneously, spoke of the importance that the official curriculum addressing language and culture concepts. In his individual interview, Ronnie discussed how the IB curriculum delivered at Morehouse International School gave him opportunities to discuss his culture:

RONNIE: In my [Course Name] class, the teacher always asks us about our own cultures. I'm sure he wants to know more about the Thai culture, but it's always... I think culture has a lot of parallels to the IB curriculum, and there's always discussions about culture that we have in class, and it allows us to express our thoughts on the culture clashes that we have and how we have to integrate into a culture and understand others, which is, I think, really important.

For Ronnie, the availability of the IB Curriculum has been influential to the way he is able to consider the negotiation of culture from an academic, curricular, standpoint in order to incorporate into her personal practice of negotiating

cultures. In this way, Ronnie's experience of the IB curriculum offered at school positively reflects Morehouse International School's vision, which is to "nurture intellectual development [and] moral character... while fostering compassion through action and shaping the lives of tomorrow's leaders". It can be inferred that Ronnie's capacity for empathy (both a skill and a value) was heightened through the opportunity to explicitly address cultural differences in his classroom curriculum. The discussion is validated through the curricular assessment, as the IB curriculum officially assesses students' critical thinking about culture, language, and identity. International schools that offer curricula that address cultural clashes and the role of language and culture may more effectively implement school language policies that help TCKs negotiate culture through their negotiation of language as well.

When discussing teachers' ability to assist students in intercultural transitions, Pollock and Van Reken (2009) indicate that, in many international schools, "[a]dministrators, teachers, and counselors also understand the transition experience" (p. 210). I suggest that further studies, done in research sites specific to similar participant identities used for this research, would be beneficial to further describe the strategies used by educators who provide culturally competent, inclusive, and empowering pedagogy that promotes cultural identity negotiation. Salem indicated that his teachers helped her at school by providing her additional time to learn and to figure out his interests. Ronnie said that his teachers provided him with probing questions and stimuli to generate discussion about culture and context. Lisa said that, after having moved back to Thailand, her

teacher noticed she was having a difficult time figuring out how to transition back to Thai culture and asked her whether or not she was okay, and that this was helpful to her ability to negotiate cultures because she felt her teacher cared about her wellbeing. June, Aida, and Karla all indicated that their performing arts teachers, by allowing them the space to be themselves, provided opportunities to explore their own. Karla felt like her teachers accepted her when they gave her permission, or “put up with”, her sense of humour in the classroom. Petrie and Ronnie said that they felt acknowledged when teachers asked them how to better understand Thai customs or beliefs that not all foreigners would understand without cultural context. Based on the perspectives that participants shared, and the observations I made on the high level of student-teacher rapport, teachers at Morehouse International School seem to create culturally empowering learning environments. More understanding of teachers’ philosophy on culturally competent pedagogy would help capture and describe the strategies they use to create culturally inclusive spaces for their students.

Such research would not only be beneficial from the standpoint of curriculum, but also from a desire to incorporate the needs of parents who want their child to obtain the best support on cultural negotiations. Pollock and Van Reken (2009) say that “when parents have to choose between two or more international schools (not an uncommon situation in European and Asian capitals), they might want to factor into their decision which school provides ongoing, institutionalized transition programming” (p. 210). Parents have chosen to enroll their child at Morehouse International School for various reasons, but

one is the diverse curricular programming offered at the school. According to Pollock and Van Reken (2009), “[t]he school that offers transition activities to facilitate the adjustment of arrivals and departures and that integrates intercultural skill building and cultural identity exploration into the academic curriculum is probably the school to choose” (p. 210). As the findings chapter suggests, one thing that is highly significant to the ability for participants to negotiate their cultures is the community established at the school, and the rapport they have with their teachers. It is for this reason that I propose further research in, and school administration support for, professional development programmes for educators, which will provide resources and support needed to reinforce activities and integrated co-curricular programmes that are proactive and intentional in building cultural identity exploration and negotiation.

5.1.2 Significance of Hidden Curriculum

Curriculum that attempts to limit cultural marginalization and aims to empower cultural identity negotiation is one that “legitimize[s] multiple models of excellence” (Noddings, as cited by Greene, 1971, p. 146). Salem, above, discusses how she feels like her Western Education at Morehouse International school allows her to be “more free to do different things”, and this suggests the cultural framework and curriculum offered to her has legitimized multiple standards for success. In order to understand curriculum that empowers TCKs of non-Western primary cultures, further research is needed in regards to both official and hidden curricular agendas, which facilitate the experience of TCKs both in and outside of their classroom settings on international school campuses. Within my

observations, many teachers at Morehouse International School further positive official curriculum regarding cultural identity, however, it is not apparent that all teachers demonstrate an awareness that the concept of a hidden curriculum exists. This conversation is, perhaps, recently initiated by the school commitment statement, which says that “we will assess and report learning based on evidence of learning; we will assess and report behaviours based on evidence of behaviours”, in which tries to separate academics from behaviours. However, understanding and implementation of this commitment would perhaps be strengthened if teachers were made aware of the hidden curriculum that exists in each classroom. An exploration on how teachers can become more aware of the hidden curriculum and benefit, personally and professionally, from reflection on this concept would be worthwhile.

As discussed in the literature review chapter for this research, the hidden curriculum includes political and sociological ideologies present within the everyday of the classroom, often occurring in the smallest, seemingly normal ways. Classroom settings include large groups of people, who are “potential recipients of praise and reproof”, and constantly subject to the power of “institutional authorities” (Jackson, 1990, p. 122). After having conducted the data collection and interpretation for this research, I suggest to consider the hidden curriculum within a postcolonial theoretical frame in order to acknowledge symbolic power (Bourdieu, 2003) of cultural norms within the field of the interstitial culture for TCK youth. As mentioned previously, Bourdieusian theory was used to interpret the data in the findings chapter of this research, and to

further the findings presented, I will now place the concept of hidden curriculum within Said's (1978; 1994) postcolonial frame of Orientalism to consider cultural power-plays of the subtler aspects of curricular frameworks offered at international schools.

Said (1994) reflects on how academic texts produced in the Occident (the West) portray non-Western cultures, the Orient, as exterior – that “Orientalism is premised upon exteriority, that is, on the fact that the Orientalist, poet or scholar, makes the Orient speak, describes the Orient, renders its mysteries plain for and to the West” (p. 21). The data of this study suggests that when participants feel like they are permitted to belong to both their primary and secondary cultures, simultaneously, they feel better understood; I make the claim that, through this, they are also empowered to acquire more successful identity negotiation. Participants communicated that they feel like Morehouse International School offers them a place to negotiate the complexities of their culture, which suggests that cultural framework within the research site may be one that promotes students' ability to include cultural norms from both the primary, non-Western cultures and secondary, Western cultures. Ronnie, in his individual interview, shared his perspective of this:

RONNIE: In my opinion, I think an international school, like here, acts like a neutral ground for cultures to be exchanged, since we have people from different ethnicities, different nationalities. Of course we have interactions between one another, and basically as interactions go on, we have exchanges of our own cultural beliefs and cultural values. So I think that an environment like this one is always open for cultural exchanges in forms of exchanging beliefs in anything really. I think our students are at least very open about it and teachers as well.

Morehouse International School is, in Ronnie's opinion, a location for cultural exchange, and I think this is something that makes this research site unique: because participants express that they feel welcome at the school to be who they are, culturally speaking, the site offers an environment that is rich in cultural identity negotiation. Perhaps an integrated language policy, which develops students' abilities in the English language and validates other forms of languages spoken on campus would further support the cultural identity negotiation of TCK youth. In this way, the line between the cultural Occident and the cultural Orient can be blended, and this merging of Orient and Occident cultures legitimizes both.

The hybridity of Orient and Occident cultures are influenced by the way educators legitimize both cultures within their classroom; this can be an aspect of the official curriculum, such as curricular stimuli and academic topics, but it can also be an aspect of the hidden curriculum as well (which, as I have mentioned, should be further considered by educators at the school). In her individual interview, Petrie suggested ways that teachers can legitimize primary and secondary cultures:

PETRIE: Someone who has been speaking English their whole life and enrolls into a Thai class, I think the teacher could maybe... Or they could find a common area where the teacher could maybe try to communicate in English as well, but switch, kind of like helping the student be able to learn Thai, but do it in English, too.

Both of these suggestions would qualify as belonging to a subtler hidden curriculum, because this is a routine in which is not apart of the official curriculum, but still influential to the development of students. This raises an important point for further research: what distinguishes oppressive hidden

curriculum from empowering hidden curriculum? More understanding of how hidden curriculum is connected to cultural identity negotiation should be further studied, and would be helpful if done through the exploration of an educator perspective.

Said (1994) discusses that in order to understand how “Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” one must have an understanding of the discourses employed within the field of the Occident to position itself in relation to the Orient. Said (1994) writes,

My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage - and even produce - the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period. (3)

The continuation of cultural discourses can be an aspect of the hidden curriculum. When teaching the discourses necessary to function within the hegemonic global cultures, educators in international schools are in a prime location to help TCK students develop a greater sense of cultural saliency; this requires intentionality on behalf of the teacher, and intentionality requires the ability to think reflectively upon the cultural contexts influencing the value of discourses being taught to students. To raise questions about which forms of culture and society are being promoted in the classroom, and for what reason are some forms of culture are promoted, albeit sometimes unintentionally, should be an essential aspect of the international school as the discourses that connect with hegemonic cultural norms tend to designate more power to some cultures over others.

How discourses are handled in the classroom needs to be done with forethought and sensitivity on behalf of educators. Said (1994) indicates that:

because of Orientalism the Orient was not (and is not) a free subject of thought or action. This is not to say that Orientalism unilaterally determines what can be said about the Orient, but that it is the whole network of interests inevitably brought to bear on (and therefore always involved in) any occasion when that particular entity “the Orient” is in question. (p. 3)

When teachers frame questions about non-Western primary culture as juxtaposed with Western, secondary culture, it is essential that questions are framed in terms of comparisons, of similarities, as opposed to contrasting differences. When educator questions are based in an assumption that the student’s primary culture has more differences than similarities, the consequences this hidden curriculum has within the classroom can further marginalize the primary culture of students who, historically, may have been associated with the Orient within Western cultural hegemony. It is, therefore, detrimental to a TCK’s cultural hybridity when a Western teacher emphasizes a separation of cultures for the TCK identity; this is particularly heightened because, “European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self” (Said, 1994, p. 3). Western culture in the international school classroom should not serve as a surrogate to non-Western students’ primary culture through unintentional hidden curriculum. There needs to be understanding of how cultures of the TCK are simultaneously independent of one another, and yet paradoxically, still in intertextual fields (Bourdieu, 1993) that influence cultural hybridity. To understand cultural identity negotiation, educators must be reflective and increasingly aware of the hidden curriculum they reinforce in the classroom.

Said (1994) discusses that “[f]rom the beginning of the nineteenth century until the end of World War II France and Britain dominated the Orient and Orientalism; since World War II America has dominated the Orient, and approaches it as France and Britain once did” (p. 4). Although, generally speaking, educators at Morehouse International School do not align with American nationalism, some of the curriculum presented at the school is rooted in Western curriculum and American assessment practices. Although this research touched on the International Baccalaureate Programme, it did not focus on variables such as the other curriculum used in the research site. Using Said’s (1994) framework for a postcolonial Orientalism suggests more research on official and hidden curricula, of different curriculum, and in different research sites, would deepen the understanding of participants’ experiences with culture at school.

Understanding curriculum design means one must have an understanding of educational frames. Although there are multiple frames of education, two that I discuss below include a Standardized Education frame and a Democratic Citizenship Education frame; these two frames are quite different from one another. According to a Standardized Education frame, learners with outlying knowledges are deficient when evaluated by a standard deviation bell curve, because they do not possess normal, desired ability within society as a whole. This frame implies a factory-style learning environment, where students are compared to the expected and desired standard; they pass inspection if they fit the desired norm, and if not, they are tailored or fixed until they do (Davis et June.,

2015). As opposed to a Standardized frame of education, Democratic Citizenship Education emphasizes the individual as a social being, ever growing and ever changing within their context (Davis et June., 2015). Democratic Citizenship Education educators:

grant that idiosyncratic interpretations may be explained by appealing to unique histories, but they also recognize that a person's interpretations must exist with those of many others in an ecosystem of coherent thought and actions. What may be completely sensible (i.e., "right") on the level of the individual may be untenable and disabling (i.e., "wrong") on the level of the collective. (Davis et June., 2015, p. 153)

Norms and practices in the frame of Democratic Citizenship Education, therefore, are contextual to the individual as well as contextual to the collective social ecosystem to which that individual belongs. Democratic Citizenship Education allows for the contextualization of the individual instead of the standardization of the individual. Participants were enrolled in one or more International Baccalaureate (IB) courses, and these courses are all curricular aligned with the IB mission statement, indicating that it aims to "encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right" (IBO, 2007, p. 175). The IB learner profile is described as having the aim "to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world" (IBO, 2007, p. 175). Both the IB mission statement and the learner profile contextualize education to a collective and contextual frame of education. In his individual interview, Ronnie stated,

RONNIE: I think culture has a lot of parallels to the IB curriculum, and there's always discussions about culture that we have in class, and it allows us to express our thoughts on the culture clashes that we have and how we have to integrate into a culture and understand others, which is, I think, really important. I feel like also in class we get to do that because some parts of [the course] is about culture. There's a lot of discussion about cultural differences and acculturation, how people can become integrated in other cultures and how they can be excluded. So I think that's also an aspect to it.

Here, Ronnie indicated that he sees the IB curriculum as a place to better understand cultural differences and how cultural acculturation occurs. It is important to note that the data suggests that this kind of curriculum, which helps students and teachers understand cultural context, may be one way that the official curriculum can better match the hidden curriculum.

Specifically, if Karla's experience, outside of the classroom, has included social interactions that subtly further cultural acculturation, then Ronnie's comment on how the official curriculum of the IB helps to better understand and negotiate cultural clashes caused by hegemonic acculturation is important for educators in international schools to recognize. I suggest that Democratic Citizenship education, such as the IB curriculum, helps contextualize cultural understanding and has the potential to officially address cultural negotiation in the classroom, which may carry over into their ability to negotiate the subtler social interactions they encounter outside of the classroom. In his individual video journal, Ronnie stated:

RONNIE: Being a third culture kid means that you are being someone who is exposed to more than one cultures, and you don't have a distinct cultural identity. In a way, you're kind of in the mix between two worlds and two cultures. You have aspects of one culture and aspects of another. This means that you don't actually have distinct social identity, and you are basically a hybrid, and you can switch between either one quite

effectively. Being a third culture kid helps with the relationship with other third culture kids as, in my opinion, I think third culture kids are kids who are more likely to have kind of less prejudice and less cultural identity, social identity, meaning that they're more willing to accept differences of others and accept the way other people think.

Ronnie's previous comment about how the IB curriculum has helped him to better understand cultural clashes may also indicate that the way he perceives being a TCK hybrid who can switch between cultures "effectively" may be enhanced because of the kind of culturally contextual curriculum he has experienced through a more Democratic Citizenship Education frame offered within the IB Diploma Programme.

Davis et al (2015) claim that "most of the advice for teachers within a frame of Democratic Citizenship Education is concerned with collective process – or, more accurately, with the simultaneity of enabling individual learning and fostering collective knowledge building" (p. 153-154). This frame allows room for learners to posit a deeper and more multifaceted nature of identity where they can "harness the multiplicity of semiotic systems across diverse cultural locations to challenge and change existing [d]iscourses" (Janks, 2000, p. 177). In Democratic Citizenship Education, learners are not viewed as deficient, because this frame suggests that the multiple discourses, identities, and skills individuals possess contribute to the overall working strength of the community. Davis et al (2015) indicate that

a personal interpretation of collective belief can be simultaneously right *and* wrong, depending on the level of analysis. This possibility of being right-and-wrong reveals a sharp break with earlier moments in education. Within Standardized Education, such a clash would require a correction to the individual's interpretation... but among Democratic Citizenship Educators, it is more likely to be seen as an occasion to negotiate

understandings by collectively interrogating how different assumptions can lead to different conclusions. The goal would not necessarily be to find a way of reconciling conflicting interpretations – although that might figure in. The more encompassing aim is always to enlarge the space of understanding for all. (p. 152-153)

Ronnie's reflections, in his individual video journal, reflect Davis et al's (2015) description the way Democratic Citizenship Education values the collective social experience. Ronnie states:

I feel more understood by third culture kids who have to fit into more than one culture, because they are also quite open to liberal thoughts, because they have an exposure to various cultures, meaning that they know that contrasting perspectives aren't necessarily bad. I feel like this issue is one that is major, because in order to communicate, you have to be able to understand differences between you and the person you're communicating with.

Andreotti (2010) defines global citizenship in the following: “global citizenship is one that privileges reciprocal and transformative encounters with strangers beyond geographical, ideological, linguistic, or other representational boundaries” (p. 239). A Democratic Citizenship Frame of Education is concerned with such parameters of global citizenship and its role in education and in society. In order to better understand the official and the hidden curriculum of international schools, one must seek whether or not the curriculum suppresses variants of cultural norms (Standardized Education) or empowers deviations from the norm as a social individual influenced by contexts (Democratic Citizenship Education). Further research is needed to determine the significance of Educational frames, and to what extent the particular frame of education influences a TCK's ability to negotiate culture more successfully.

As mentioned in the last section, Pollock and Van Reken (2009) indicate that two important factors to consider for TCKs attending international schools are: the cultural framework of the school, and its curriculum offered. These two aspects are influenced by the official curriculum of the school, the hidden, unofficial curriculum of the school, and the educational framework in which all curricula are philosophically placed. Sometimes, official and hidden curricular practices align, while other times, the practices of both curricula may be quite different. For example, as mentioned previously, the official curriculum of Morehouse International School indicates that it values inclusivity, and this is officially taught in classrooms; however, sometimes inclusivity may not always be experienced in some subtle encounters (for example, Karla's experience of cultural stereotyping). Future research should be conducted to better understand the cultural, curricular, and educational frames of international schools.

Sleeter and Stillman (2005) indicate that "researchers came to considerable consensus about the most helpful instructional principles and processes, emphasizing the importance of contextualized rather than skill-driven instruction, and the connections between language, thinking, values, culture, and identity" (p. 255). Contextualized education, as opposed to standardized education, connects with what Giroux shares, in an interview with Brad Evans (2016) for *The New York Times*, regarding his theory of the *Violence of Organized Forgetting*:

I begin with the assumption that education is fundamental to democracy. No democratic society can survive without a formative culture, which includes but is not limited to schools capable of producing citizens who are critical, self-reflective, knowledgeable and willing to make moral

judgments and act in a socially inclusive and responsible way. This is contrary to forms of education that reduce learning to an instrumental logic that too often and too easily can be perverted to violent ends. So we need to remember that education can be both a basis for critical thought and a site for repression, which destroys thinking and leads to violence. Michel Foucault wrote that knowledge and truth not only “belong to the register of order and peace,” but can also be found on the “side of violence, disorder, and war.” What matters is the type of education a person is encouraged to pursue.

If international school curriculum reduces learning to “instrumental logic” then the standardization of learning may extend to the standardization of other things, like cultural identity. This creates the very grounds Giroux’s (2016) violence of organized forgetting to occur. In his interview Giroux (2016) adds:

Education does more than create critically minded, socially responsible citizens. It enables young people and others to challenge authority by connecting individual troubles to wider systemic concerns. This notion of education is especially important given that racialized violence, violence against women and the ongoing assaults on public goods cannot be solved on an individual basis. Violence maims not only the body but also the mind and spirit. As Pierre Bourdieu has argued, it lies “on the side of belief and persuasion.” If we are to counter violence by offering young people ways to think differently about their world and the choices before them, they must be empowered to recognize themselves in any analysis of violence, and in doing so to acknowledge that it speaks to their lives meaningfully. (Evans & Giroux, 2016)

Research in curricular designs offered to TCKs of non-Western primary identities is extremely important to their academic and socio-emotional ability to challenge the authority of hegemonic, dominant cultural. Curriculum that helps TCKs (and their teachers) become more interculturally competent, open minded, and reflective is possibly the same curricula that will empower their analysis of violence, as Giroux (2016) suggests.

Being open and free was discussed multiple times by participants who explained how teachers helped them feel safe to be themselves, which could also

be connected to their ability to question forms of violence. In his individual video journal, Ronnie shared the following:

RONNIE: One thing I like about the Western culture is the liberalness of it. Western culture's usually very open-minded. They're willing to accept new ideas from many individuals. You can't really be necessarily wrong in the Western culture, which I find completely different to the Thai culture, where most things are defined by what the elders, and what the older and more experienced people say. The liberalness of the Western culture is something I really appreciate.

Within the context of this study, when asked about their perceptions of Western education, and the role it played in their lives, participants often responded with answers relative to the curriculum style offered at Morehouse International School. When discussing her experience and perception of Western education at the school, Salem responded:

SALEM: Well it gives ... it does open doors because it makes me see more things that I didn't think of. So I really like how open-minded the western culture in school is.

Aida shared a similar impression of her Western education:

AIDA: I think one of the reasons [my Dad] enrolled me into an international school instead of just going to a normal Thai school is because, like, he thinks that it would be more advantageous to me. That I could grow up speaking English, and grow up in an international school, where like it's from here he says that I can branch out and go to university like all over the world much easier than it would have been for me if I just went to a normal Thai school.

In her individual audio journal, Alyssa shared her own experience and impression of her Western education:

ALYSSA: I would say that at school, with a western culture, I think the western culture expects you to be more expressive. They encourage you to voice your thoughts and if you don't like something you should say it. Meanwhile, for the Thai culture at home, I would be more quiet sometimes because, I don't know, it's just the Thai culture kind of expects

you to be considerate of the appropriateness and the consequences of your words.

Giroux suggests that “we need to remember that education can be both a basis for critical thought and a site for repression, which destroys thinking and leads to violence” (Evans & Giroux, 2016). The data suggests that a more culturally empowering education is what some participants perceive to have received at Morehouse International School, and further research should study how their experience with official and hidden curricula relate to the experience of cultural empowerment within the classroom.

5.1.3 English Language and Anglophone Phonology

Language is a significant aspect of how we construct reality, as humans develop communication with one another through language, be it literal or symbolic. Language establishes the cultural scripts by which hegemonic norms are communicated and operate. As discussed previously, Ronnie shared his ideas regarding the value he places on his ability to speak the English language:

RONNIE: Luckily I was born in Country-G, so I was forced to use English when I was a child because I had to communicate with teachers, and my parents could only speak English as a language you can use to communicate in. I was lucky enough to get exposure to the English language.

As a researcher, I found it difficult to ‘come to terms’ with the word choice of ‘luckily’ when discussing the ability to be Western and speak a Western language. This research focuses on how students can negotiate cultures between home and school, but more research should be done on how students who acquire a secondary, Western cultural discourse perceive the value of that discourse when compared to their primary discourse. I found that participants were proud of their

primary cultures, but that they also felt lucky for learning English and perhaps felt more prestigious for having a Western culture. Western culture is, for some, perceived as having prestige - more understanding of how curriculum furthers this perception would be meaningful.

It is important that TCKs experience an educational frame that promotes their ability to think critically, about the systems and cultural fields to which they belong, and about the varying forms of symbolic capital, such as linguistic capital, that those fields wield (Bourdieu, 1993). Additionally, education that enables students to develop critical thinking could enhance their ability to overcome forms of marginalization sometimes created by hegemonic Western culture.

Giroux (2016) states that

[w]hile there are no guarantees that a critical education will prompt individuals to contest various forms of oppression and violence, it is clear that in the absence of a formative democratic culture, critical thinking will increasingly be trumped by anti-intellectualism, and walls and war will become the only means to resolve global challenges. (Giroux & Evans, 2016)

More consideration should be focused on the impact the hidden curriculum of international schools has on student perception of the prestige of their primary culture.

In her individual audio journal, Salem states the following:

SALEM: [Reading one of the possible prompts] Do you think you are more successful because you have a Western education? A little bit, because Western education is more open minded and more broad ... I mean, more brave to try new things. So I guess I feel I'm more successful because I have a Western education. [Reads another prompt in the same domain] What are your opinions on the extent to which learning English will open doors for a future? English is [one of the] most spoken language[s] in the world, so knowing this [language] makes me kinda proud.

In her individual audio journal, Aida shared the following thoughts on the value of culture and the English language:

AIDA: I feel like maybe some people think it's also a sign of privilege because of the fact that you get to learn English and not just the language of your culture. I don't necessarily think I will be more successful because of a Western education. But I do think that is easier on me to become successful because of a Western education, because of how I grew up and how it's multi-cultural. I have a unique experience of being exposed to many different cultures from a young age.

As was mentioned earlier, but significant to restate, here, in her individual interview, Petrie shared her perception of the value of Western education and her ability to speak English fluently:

PETRIE: Because, definitely, I'm able to speak English, which is actually quite useful. For example, when I travel with my family, or if my Dad is negotiating some deal with a supplier [who is] not from Thailand, I usually do the whole translating and typing up emails and stuff for him. So I feel like being able to speak English is very, it comes in handy. I think it would be difficult if I went to a super Thai university, but I'm lucky enough to get into a programme that they accept international students as well because they want more like diversity, I guess. My Dad did ask me about if I would have a hard time fitting in and he asked me if I'm sure about going to university in Thailand, and a lot of people ask me if I'm okay with having to read Thai, write Thai every day.

A further exploration of how value is placed on acquisition of the English language, how the hidden curriculum of international schools associates this value with symbolic capital, and the level to which symbolic violence is increased or recognized within cultural and curricular frameworks of international schools would prove beneficial.

Another concept to be considered is the way that phonetic accents are perceived by participants, as well as how the educational frames at school influence participants' linguistic confidence to determine possible levels of

correlated cultural identity negotiation based on language perception. Sleeter and Stillman (2005) discuss the role that phonetics and its focus in education serves to further oppress language minority students, stating that when ELD standards “treat phonetic mastery as a gatekeeper for English learners” it may preclude them “from engaging in literary analysis and other intellectual activities that would prepare them for admission to higher education institutions” (p. 260). Pollock and Van Reken (2009) imply that international schools that offer the International Baccalaureate (IB) Programme better support TCKs of non-Western primary cultures, because the curriculum supports a focus on intercultural understanding. In fact, the curriculum for IB English A courses require external examiners *not* to deduct points on assessment criteria based on phonology, pronunciation, or accents (IBO, 2019). The IB program, particularly in the IB English courses, values World Englishes as opposed to more monolingual curriculum.

Kachru (1985) first introduced the concept of World Englishes through the perspective of three circles of the English language, being the Outer, Inner, and Expanding Circles, and these three ranges of the English language categorize what usually constitutes a World English. The three main varieties include:

- (1) those that are used as the primary language of the majority population of a country, such as American and British; (2) varieties that are used as an additional language for *intranational* as well as *international* communication in countries that are multilingual, such as Indian, Nigerian and Singaporean; and (3) varieties that are used almost exclusively for international communications, such as Brazilian, Chinese, and German. (Smith, 2014, What is it?, para. 1)

The concept of World Englishes “argues against a mythical variety of English unmarked for users’ sociocultural background” (Smith, 2014, What is it?, para. 1).

Smith (2014) further defines World Englishes as:

the different forms and varieties of English used in various sociolinguistic contexts in different parts of the world. Today English has a greater spread over the globe than any other language in recorded history, being used as the primary medium of international and intercultural communication. But it isn’t one form or variety of English that is being used. The plural ‘Englishes’ emphasizes that the language belongs to those who use it as their mother tongue or as an additional language, whether in its standard form or in its localized variation. (What is it?, para. 1)

Further research in this area could portray this experience, specifically of TCKs of non-Anglophone home languages and cultures, and especially because “[m]ost of type 2 Englishes developed as a result of colonial imposition of the language in various parts of the world” and that “[p]resently there are more users of type 2 and 3 varieties of English than of the first type and it is primarily they who are instrumental in its further spread” (Smith, 2014, What is it?, para. 1). According to Smith (2014),

[t]here is a need for research studies on how people of diverse regional, cultural, social, economic, and educational backgrounds use English in order to achieve their intended goals. Additional research is needed on studies of comprehensibility and interpretability among users of different varieties” (What work remains?, para. 4)

Morehouse International School holds the premise that English is the language of inclusion on campus (apart from courses whose language of instruction is other than English). The word choice ‘of inclusion’ is chosen intentionally with what seems to be an attempt to try and navigate symbolically violent connotations that English must replace students’ primary language, or that it is more important than their primary language. Although the connotation of the ‘language of inclusion’ is

positive, more research should be done on how TCKs of non-Western primary cultures are affected by the request to speak English on campus, and how their ability to negotiate cultures is influenced by their beliefs, and the school's beliefs, about language use. Smith (2016) emphasizes the importance of being aware of how "English language professionals [may be] unintended agents of a hegemonic system" (p. 14). Smith (2016) suggests to place emphasis on

world Englishes rather than the term *English as an International Language*. English as an International Language, or EIL, can be easily misunderstood to mean that we promote the study and use of English; that we believe English should be THE international language and that there is an English which is the international language. (p. 14)

How to balance the concept of English being the language of inclusion versus "the further privileging of English and use of English proficiency as a gatekeeper... of white English speakers as dominant" (Sleeter & Stillman, 2005, p. 262) is a complicated and fine line to navigate. Smith (2016) suggests encouraging the perspective that values World Englishes to help navigate the lines between linguistic empowerment and hegemony. Smith (2016) indicates that

as professionals we are concerned about the hegemony of any language over another and in our organizations and publications, in our teaching and teacher training we do what we can to inform and educate those around us to the need to be ever on guard to insure that we are not a part of linguistic imperialism. (p. 14)

Moving forward, cultural and educational frameworks of international schools that *intentionally* seek to promote the concept of World Englishes over English as an International Language are essential to more socially just education and language instruction.

I argue that the focus on World Englishes is an essential aspect to the construction of socially just education, especially for international schools who may unintentionally further linguistic imperialism through their English language instruction programmes if language consciousness is not a part of the official (and hidden) curriculum. The role of language is also important in the context of how we use language to describe the cultural identities of TCKs, as semantic descriptions and labels are significant to their experience negotiating culture and determining cultural belonging.

5.1.4 Descriptive Semantics for TCKs

Many participants communicated that it made them feel misunderstood when others did not accept them for their negotiated cultural identity. June, in her individual interview, spoke about her perception of cultural belonging:

JUNE: I feel like I belong to both. Also I feel like I can belong anywhere. When the parts when I don't belong it's pockets. It's not major big. It's small. It's very small moments. And so it's not that big of a stress for me. Yeah so I think in both cultures I belong. More than those pockets.

RESEARCHER: Because it's like they bring it [culture] up like you're half of something. I could imagine maybe the result of that is like, "I'm not half. I'm full. I'm a whole thing. I'm everything."

JUNE: [Confirms. Nods.] *Totally* understand.

In his focus group interview, Ronnie added a similar thought:

RONNIE: Even though we're bi-cultural, I don't think we're completely engrossed in one culture. Since we're bi-cultural we're not... We don't belong to a single one. I guess you could say that we're not... We lack certain characteristics of one of the cultures we're in, as opposed to a person who is solely Thai or is raised in a Thai school, who would be complete... They have, solely, a Thai culture or identity, you know?

RESEARCHER: But something that you said is that you feel like you don't fully belong to one single culture. So you are kind of like... You have

things from both cultures, but you're lacking some attributes from both cultures. You mentioned that you don't fully belong anywhere, but that sort of in between.

RONNIE: That's what I think. But like you can't really say that we're half of each because the fact that we belong to two cultures doesn't mean that we're only half in. It could be more or less. Or you could say that we have ... We're more Thai than western or more Western than Thai. So it really gets the complete split. It's unique for each person.

Linguistically speaking, it is extremely important to be mindful that feeling understood is important to TCKs and this can happen through the way that TCKs use language to describe themselves. It may also make them feel misunderstood if other people's language used to describe them (like the word "half", as in being half-Thai for example) is not compatible with the way they negotiate their cultural identity. It would be meaningful and empowering to offer international school students mentorship on how to use language to describe themselves, and how to respond when others use descriptive language they do not prefer.

Said (1994) indicates that "[t]he relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (p. 5), and if teachers are not reflectively aware of their teaching practices, the subtle hidden curricula they present to students could further the domination of cultural hegemony through the way in which those of Western primary cultures have the authority to label those of non-Western primary cultures. Said (1994) also discusses that,

[a]fter all, any system of ideas that can remain unchanged as teachable wisdom (in academies, books, congresses, universities, foreign-service institutes) from the period of Ernest Renan in the late 1840s until the present in the United States must be something more formidable than a mere collection of lies. Orientalism, therefore, is not an airy European fantasy about the Orient, but a created body of theory and practice in

which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment. (p. 6)

It is important that language is used to describe cultural identity of TCK students in ways that are intentionally inclusive, positive, empowering, and accepting of the multiple cultures they associate with, and that a language of belonging is used when describing and asking about their own perceptions of cultural identity.

Words are powerful. Andreotti (2010) indicates that “our stories of reality, our knowledges, are always situated (they are culturally bound), partial (what one sees may not be what another sees), contingent (context-dependent) and provisional (they change)” (p. 241). Words can help situate the stories of more marginalized TCKs in positions of power through the discourses used to identity the value of their cultures, and the nature of cultural belonging that they perceive themselves to have.

5.1.5 Terminology of TCK

Before collecting the data, I felt slightly uneasy about the term *Third Culture Kid* because the colloquial term *kid* is a Western term. Fanning and Burns (2017) suggest that the term Third Culture Kid is “framed in the vernacular of mid-twentieth century binaries of West vs Rest” (p. 148). The potential for participants in this research to be further marginalized because of the Amerocentric colloquialism “kids” used to describe them is a point of reflection for me. Throughout the process, I felt at a loss for better terminology, because *who* qualifies as a TCK may still be misunderstood by some international school teachers. I was, therefore, cautious of using different, or creating new, terminology to describe participants’ cultural identity, and I chose to continue the

use of the TCK term for the sake of clarity throughout the research process. As is briefly discussed in the literature review chapter, Fanning and Burns (2017) suggest that even interstitial is too limiting for a truer portrayal of the TCK, and they suggest the term “liminal”, as the connotation implies occupation of both sides of the polar fields as opposed to “interstitial” which implies occupation of a middle ground.

Because participants voiced their experience of cultural grounds as being a middle buffer zone, and Morehouse International School as a place of cultural exchange, I chose to continue with the terminology of the interstitial culture. With this said, more understanding is needed in order to determine which term TCKs prefer themselves. In order to do this, however, a baseline understanding of their perspective is first needed, which is one goal for this particular research. A next step is to develop terminology of cultural identity so that TCKs can find language that they feel best represents their cultural belonging.

In the findings chapter of this research, chapter 4, I discussed how cultural stereotypes influence participants’ feelings of cultural disconnect. Here is an additional example that Karla shared, in her individual interview:

KARLA: I remember a moment in [Course Name] where we were looking at [discussion stimulus], and we were looking at Culture-E and [my teacher] tried to bring in like the theory of how Culture-E people had to fight for their rights and how's there's still a division... When I do eventually go to Country-E, there's gonna be challenges during this phase and I know that whoever I am, I'm always gonna be looked upon differently because of what my outer exterior shows and not who I am. So, yeah, I think that was very interesting. I also felt a weird disconnect because a lot of people in my [my] school here like to keep the ideal of Country-E, and don't all really understand it, and just, like, kinda act cool in expressing it [it's culture]. So I felt like they weren't genuine when we

were talking about it [the stimulus] just like talking about it because we had to talk about it.

The cultural stereotypes Karla has experienced heavily influence the way she perceives her cultural belonging. One thing educators can do is to continue using stimulus, like the teacher Karla describes, to further young people's perception of not only their own culture, but that of others as well. Educational programmes that contain the intentional inclusion of intercultural understanding are significant contributors to the ability of TCK students to find welcoming spaces to question and negotiate cultures. Additionally, curricula for students, and professional development for educators that further skills in intercultural competence would be an asset.

5.2 Professional Development in Intercultural Competency

TCK identities for this research include traditional TCKs ("with high mobility patterns"), bicultural TCKs ("two cultures within family"), domestic TCKs ("invisible cross-cultural experience"), TCK children of minorities ("prejudice from majority culture"), TCK children of immigrants ("permanent change"), and educational TCK ("change of cultures daily"), and each one of the participants hold with them unique power to negotiate cultures, to adapt, and to empower themselves and others (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 35). The unique perspectives of each participant have been enhanced by the level of intercultural competency that each individual participant has gained through experience. Interculturalism is one of the participants' strengths, and is in and of itself a form of capital within an ever increasing intercultural world. When international schools intentionally help TCK youth negotiate their cultures, and provide the

necessary resources for them to do so, they are developing one strength that TCK youth possess. Further research on how international school educators can develop ability in intercultural competency is needed. One of the benefits of attending an international school is to acquire the ability to function and code switch between cultural fields. Understanding how to best facilitate this is an ongoing process that deserves continued attention within this field of research.

Cushner and Mahon (2009) convey that “[d]eveloping the intercultural competence of young people, both in the domestic context as well as in the international sphere, requires a core of teachers and teacher educators who have not only attained this sensitivity and skill themselves but are also able to transmit this to the young people in their charge” (p. 305). The ability for teachers, first gain, and then, to transmit their own understanding of intercultural competency is important. Professional development for international school teachers in intercultural competency is needed. When discussing curriculum that promotes intercultural understanding, Cushner and Mahone (2009) claim that “because most teacher education programmes in the United States also lack such interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary structure, teachers are often ill-prepared to adequately address intercultural concepts” (p. 306). Participants indicated that they felt that their teachers were aware of the importance of culture and constructed classroom environments that valued their cultures. Therefore, teachers at Morehouse International School *do* seem prepared to address intercultural concepts, however, educators who model and teach intercultural competency within their classes and transfer these skills to their students may do this on their

own accord as opposed to learning how to do this through school-wide professional development opportunities. Further research, however, should be done to best understand the most effective ways to provide such professional development so that it is tangible, practical, and worthwhile to the everyday practices educators experience with their students.

5.3 Chapter Summary

Chapter 5 examined the data in relation to the idea of the hidden curriculum through Said's (1994) theory of Orientalism. Although a predominant theory within the findings of this research, Bourdieusian theory was also subtly continued, particularly when considering further understanding of the impact of the English language and Anglo-phonetic accents on TCKs of non-Western primary cultures. There are three main conclusions regarding the final suggestions regarding the support of TCK cultural identity negotiation. The first conclusion is that cultural and curricular frameworks of international schools that support interstitial cultural identity negotiation, and also promote an understanding that cultural identity is negotiated with hybridity, are beneficial to the experience of TCKs. Educational frames, such as Democratic Citizenship Education, or curricular programs, such as the International Baccalaureate, are examples of conscientious cultural and curricular frameworks that international schools can adopt. The second conclusion is reveals the importance of ensuring that language policies of international schools have a direct connection the the school vision and mission statements, and it is encouraged that the language policy of the school integrates an awareness of Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) symbolic violence through

the recognition that the dominance of globally hegemonic languages, such as English, is not inherently or naturally dominant, but that the dominance of language is constructed. The third conclusion, is that language policies that either recognize world Englishes (Kachru, 1985; Smith, 2016) and/or translanguality (Canagarajah, 2013) are one way that international schools can help create linguistically emancipatory systems and school environments for TCK students. With these three conclusions in mind, chapter 6 will suggest an approach to change that is Bourdieusian in terms of being critical of the systems of dominance rather than individuals who hold positions of dominance.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The purpose of the research is to explore how third culture kids experience cultural identity negotiation through their exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school. Furthering an understanding of the TCK experience is relevant to both TCKs and educators of TCKs in international schools, and an exploration of the TCK experience has the potential to enable more cultural identity negotiation for TCKs. Student primary identities, including cultural discourses, are continuously impacted by exposure to secondary cultures at school. Home culture of students who attend international schools may differ from the culture present at school and this carries implications for students' cultural identity negotiation process. In the section below, I provide a summary of the research.

6.1 Research Summary

Conflicts with culture and identity surface a number of important questions within education, including: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the negotiation of cultural identity? How might hegemonic educational practices influence cultural identity negotiation? How can educators help TCKs maintain a strong sense of their family culture (primary culture) through the exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school?

The intention of this research was to discover possible factors that influence the experience of third culture identity negotiation of TCK youth. Said's (1978; 1994) theories on Orientalism and Othering were discussed throughout the

research, and are important theories to consider for international schools whose vision is to create inclusive learning environments for students of diverse cultural identities and linguistic backgrounds. The research posits that it is possible to enable the value of non-Western primary cultures while also giving access to the cultural and linguistic capitals associated with more globally dominant Western cultures, and in order to do so, Bourdieusian (1993; 2003) theory on the cultural field of production is helpful in trying to explore how and where to start.

Bourdieu's (1993; 2003) theories of the habitus, field of cultural production, symbolic capital, symbolic power, and symbolic violence are helpful in describing the experience of more cultural marginalized TCKs in a way that is critical of a system of hierarchy between primary and secondary cultures. This is important for schools who want to simultaneously empower the value of more marginalized students' home cultures and languages while also giving them access to differing forms of symbolic capital associated with globally hegemonic languages.

Bourdieu (2003) suggests that it is more effective to be critical of the systems of dominance rather than individuals who hold positions of dominance. Investigating cultural frameworks and curricular frameworks (specifically relating to language and literacy) is a more effective way to unpack cultural dominance and capital than placing blame on or being critical of educators and students who act as agents within the international school cultural field of production. This research encourages educators and TCKs to initiate symbolic revolutions (Bourdieu, 1993) to provide the space to intentionally reconstruct the way that culture and language are associated with dominance within the school

environment. Morehouse International School provides a model for how an environment that initiates symbolic revolutions can occur through the safe space created through community. With this in mind, schools like Morehouse International School can enhance the support they give to the TCK cultural identity negotiation process through continued reflection and revision of policies. For approximately the past five years, Morehouse International School has undergone reflections and revisions of school statements to create systems that better create empowering communities and cultural inclusivity. The next stage is to continue refinement of the school language policy so that it best aligns with the the interculturally inclusive community environment and culturally empowering framework of the school.

Investigating curricular frameworks, such as the alignment of school vision and mission statements with language policies, as well as the semantics used in language policies (whether or not the language subtly furthers the dominance of one language over another) are central to reinforcing an inclusive community and social rapport that the participants of this study so positively experienced. Language can become a “product of political domination” and is “endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language”, and so by rejecting an “integration into a single linguistic community” (Bourdieu, 2003, p. 45-46), international schools can strengthen their communities of cultural and linguistic emancipation through the empowerment of interculturalism.

6.2 Validity of Claims

I have used Carspecken's (1996) *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research* as my methodological guide, and Carspecken (1996) claims that "meanings are always experienced as possibilities within a field of other possibilities" (p. 96), and this needs to be considered when completing preliminary and final reconstructive analysis of data. For this reason, I have provided thick description of both observation field notes and dialogical data while using theoretical frameworks of this research to direct meaning fields and horizon analyses. Carspecken indicates that "[v]alidity reconstruction is an analytic technique closest to the critical epistemological framework" (p. 120). What this means for my research is that I have created meaning associated with the fields of my theoretical frameworks used, and placed this meaning within larger horizon analysis to ensure validity. The horizon analysis is how I have constructed "initial meaning reconstructions [aligned with my meaning fields] and perform[ed] validity reconstructions both horizontally (by placing validity claims within [different] ontological categories) and vertically (by noting the level of foregrounding and backgrounding of a particular claim)" (p. 120). In this way, the meaning fields and the horizon analysis almost create a scope where the interpretation of the data has then been placed within the crosshairs of my theoretical frames. To understand human behaviour and the meaning that it holds within the immediate foreground of my data collection procedures, I have juxtaposed and calibrated the data analysis through backgrounding the horizon of theoretical frames. I have presented data in a way that aligns with Carspecken's (1996) suggested meaning fields, first reconstructed with low inference level

codes, and then later reconstructed through high level inference codes to align data with the theories mentioned above. Low inference codes are codes where I made low level inferences – these codes have more objectivity than high level inference codes. High level inference codes were compiled after the preliminary reconstructive analysis phase, during stage two, when initial meaning fields were constructed.

Meaning was constructed through four stages: first, initial meaning reconstructions were done to articulate “tacit realms”; second, the data was “calibrated” through participant debriefers who altered or verified interpretations; third, thick description was used to insert “selected meaning constructions” into the final reporting of this research; and fourth, these meaning reconstructions lay the “groundwork” for validity reconstructions as framed within the “horizon analysis” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 102) of Bourdieusian theory (1993; 2003) and Said’s (1978) Orientalism.

Interviews were conducted on campus and were conversational in register, so that the participants felt comfortable to share their ideas freely. When participants communicated an idea vaguely, I asked follow up questions for clarity, and later, in their focus group interview, asked further follow up questions for confirmation. Participant audio/video journals were requested so that participants had the opportunity to share ideas about the research topic that they felt important, and this participatory nature of the research data collection phrase was highly important to the validity of the research as participants were active members in the data collection. The participatory data collection was combined,

as discussed previously, with the participant calibration and member checking of the observation and interviewing stages in order to ensure consistency and validity of data interpretations.

Participants were interviewed two different times: in their individual interview and in their focus group interview. There is one exception, Lisa, who consented to the research much later than the other seven participants and, because of this, was not able to schedule a focus group interview after her individual interview took place and before the data collection time frame, as indicated on the letter of consent, had ended. After data was collected from participants, I completed consistency checks between the observed activities with participants and their interviews, and I phrased semi-structured questions interview questions to create the space for participants to share their perspectives freely. For example, I phrased questions such as: “In your observation I observed..., can you tell me more about...”, “can you tell me a story about...”, etc. I aimed for non-leading questions so that participants were able to share their genuine perspectives on interview topic domains. If for any reason I found a research question to be too leading, I removed the data from analysis and asked about the interview topic domain in a different interview. I consistently asked participants to explain their terms or what they meant by certain concepts they discussed that were subjective to their experience, and I prioritized participant narratives and perspectives over my own. Carspecken (1996) indicates that “[g]ood interviewing must be aimed at facilitating good self-expression, self-expression that the subject feels is in match with her preconceptual, intuitive

experiences” (p. 168). Throughout the data collection phase, my primary goal was to create a system of data collection that would empower participants to express their own stories and perspectives in a way that would verbalize their thoughts on the things that often remain unsaid. This research aimed to provide a space for participants to say the unsaid perspectives on their own experiences negotiating cultures, and self-expression was of high importance when framing research questions and topic domains.

Low inference codes were initially identified within thirty-eight research documents, through four stages of data collection: observations with coded field notes, individual interviews with each participant (with coded transcriptions), focus group interviews with seven out of eight participants (with coded transcriptions), and five (out of eight participants) completed independent audio/video journals (with coded transcriptions). Each participant was asked to keep, add, change, or remove data from their observations, individual interview, focus group interview, and independent journal before I coded the transcriptions. Thick descriptions were used for approximately twenty-one field notes (and less thick used for the remaining five field notes) to generate as much detail and interpretative data as possible. Twenty-one of the field notes were constructed in real-time, meaning I did them live during the observation, and directly after the observation I fleshed out the description. The five field notes that were less thick are from observations where I did not record my notes live, but recorded less thick notes from memory after the observation finished. The less thick observational notes occurred because of the logistics of my presence in the

research site. For example, one of Karla's observations was done during lunchtime, where Karla led me to seven different locations on campus that she usually goes during this time. Carrying my field notes for this more mobile observation would have been difficult, so I later wrote my notes from memory. Other observations were done of live performances in the school's performance hall. It would have been inappropriate in the context of the performance if I, sitting in the audience, wrote notes throughout. To not distract from the live performance, I chose to record my field notes for these observations directly after the observation ended.

Although the data collection phase was conducted over an eight-week period, as an educator at Morehouse International School, I have come to know the environment of the school for the past seven years and believe that because of this time frame that I was able to make ethnographic inferences based on years of experience at the research site. My long-term experience at the school also assisted in my ability to construct meaning fields and horizon analysis, and to feel confident that I chose applicable theoretical frameworks that would best match its context.

As I was a teacher at the research site, approval from the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR) was contingent upon not using my own students as participants, and having a mitigation of power in place for participant recruitment and for access to classroom observations. I followed these conditions set for my research by the ICEHR. My aim for this research is to understand how participants negotiate non-Western cultures of home with

Western and/or dominant cultures at school, and so I wanted participants who were enrolled in a curriculum that I knew addressed issues of cultural context. I inferred that a participant who was exposed to an official curriculum that addressed cultural context would have a higher potential for understanding research that explores cultural context. Students enrolled in the International Baccalaureate (IB) Programme experience courses that are aligned with the IB mission statement, which includes the further understanding of interculturalism, therefore, participants who experienced this curriculum were considered ideal.

As the ideal participant for this research was a student enrolled in at least one IB course, the IB Diploma Coordinator and IB teachers assisted in the recruitment process so that participants were not coerced due to my teaching position or my Head of English Language Arts title I hold at the school. The Diploma Coordinator shared my participant recruitment email transcripts (appendices C, D, and E) with IB students and parents, which asked them to express their interest. Interested candidates obtained the letter of consent, which they and their parents sign before returning the consent directly to me. The IB Coordinator did not collect consent letters, as this would have compromised the anonymity of the participant who volunteered.

Additionally, the principal of the High School mitigated power dynamics with other faculty members for my entry into classrooms for participant observations. After having gained participant consent, I located the participants' course and co-curricular schedules to determine teachers and advisors in supervisory roles of possible observation locations. I shared this list of teacher

and advisor names with the High School principal, who emailed my classroom teacher permission request script (appendix F) to classroom teachers and advisors; these individuals responded to inform whether or not they would allow me to observe a participant in their class, club, or activity. Some individuals preferred to contact me directly, while others informed me of their request regarding my entry through the High School principal. These measures were taken so that participation and access to observation locations could be based on voluntary participation. Further ethical considerations have been discussed in the methodology section, in chapter 3, of this research.

Carspecken (1996) advises that “the researcher will have to be open to feeling threatened by what she learns. If she is not open in this way, power may act through her privileged position as the one who writes about others, as the professor of the professional, to distort the representation of what is there at the expense of those studied” (p. 169). Through the research process, I have intentionally chosen to remain open, to listen first to participants before placing judgment, and to use theories and research as my guide as I permitted myself to exist in threatened spaces of research. In my past experience working in a different international school, as well as through many friendships I have built with adult TCKs in the past fifteen years, I noticed that many students and friends seemed to feel torn between their cultures. I, myself, having not lived in Canada for fourteen years, and having moved around to various countries and locations around the world also often feel culturally torn. Even still, landing in the Toronto airport after being overseas for a year dumbfounds me. I cannot even order a Tim

Horton's coffee at Pearson without mumbling my words as I figure out cultural norms for things like, how close I should stand to others in the queue? My participants seem to be able to negotiate even these small cultural transitions much more flawlessly, and I want to learn more from them on how they do this.

I wanted to understand how TCK students at my current teaching position experience this kind of cultural displacement. However, when I asked participants how they experienced cultural disconnections, they did not tell me that they felt entirely displaced. I found myself thinking, "but, are you *sure*?", and I even wondered if they did feel culturally displaced but did not want to tell me, or did not want to even admit to their self, and so, I continued to ask about this kind of experience, but it was only three out of the eight who seemed to indicate that they felt culturally displaced.

It was Alyssa, Karla, and Lisa who shared that they felt higher levels of cultural displacement. Even so, Alyssa indicated that this was really only through the context of her language use. She discusses this in the example from this portion of her individual interview, where I am trying to understand her experience feeling uncomfortable using Thai and/or English in certain contexts:

ALYSSA: I'm trying 'not to be Thai', which is really like... that makes me feel really bad, because it's not my fault that my accent came out this way. It's just how I grew up, not speaking Thai [with individuals besides family and close friends]. And the thing is I really like Thai culture. I don't want to lose it like [some other people in my position]. And so it just, yeah, I'm just really scared of people thinking that way [that she doesn't want to associate with Thai culture] while I'm, like, trying my best to speak Thai and know the Thai culture because I *am* Thai, after all.

Language and cultural displacement were connected for Karla as well. For Karla, feelings of cultural displacement were most predominant when she felt like she was not given the opportunity to learn the Thai language well:

KARLA: I'm not sure if it's really a cultural clash, but I found when I first came here to Morehouse International School, I found it was, that the Thai learning environment, wasn't very suitable for international students, because once they, like, put you in the class and then they constantly make you learn the exact same things. They never push you to learn more little things, and just give you a few little pick-me-ups like, like 'Oh that's amazing', [sarcastically speaking] you know how to say 'Hello', like it's gonna be helpful – even though the language is so difficult. So I found myself distancing myself more from Thai culture and Thai language because I felt like they didn't even want me to be a part of it, 'cause they didn't even try to include me into learning Thai.

I asked Lisa, in her individual interview, about her experience navigating her cultures and she responded:

LISA: It was very difficult when I first moved back [to Thailand], because my family and friends expected me to act a certain way that I did not feel like was me at all. However, as the years passed, and I became more exposed to Thai culture, I began adapting. It has allowed me to get along with both Thai people and foreigners, but at times it can get difficult when I do something slightly out of the norm. This has often left me as an outcast in both the classroom and in friend groups as well.

I originally thought that the majority of participants would feel similarly, or have other ways that cultural displacement was a strong feeling for them. So when the data did not support this original question I had about cultural displacement, I felt threatened in the ideas I originally assumed. I had to exist in this space of being 'intellectually threatened', which was a good thing, because it pushed me to understand the participants experience and helped control my bias. Other participants described their cultural identity negotiation in ways I did not expect.

For example, June told me that she feels cultural displacement, but only in “small pockets”, and this helped me realize that youth like these participants actually negotiate their cultures without feeling completely displaced. After I asked Aida about cultural conflicts, I thought I would hear an answer about an experience with cultural displacement, however, Aida told me of a time she experienced a translation issue, which seems less challenging than being culturally displaced. As discussed in chapter 4, when I asked a similar question to Petrie, in her individual interview, she said that it is weird when Westerners think she does not understand Western culture:

RESEARCHER: You might not have thought about this before, but when your teacher asked you about how you would experience Western culture, like as being Thai, how did that make you feel? Did it make you feel like you were recognized or important, or, did it matter to you?

PETRIE: It was at first... I felt a little weird, that he kind of emphasized being Thai, but I kind of understand as well because the whole different culture thing. I guess it's because I've been here in an international school since very young, so I guess I was kind of used to being considered western. So, since he emphasized it, I was like, "Oh wait, I'm still Thai and there are still these cultural values that I still have to consider."

Salem indicated that she felt like it is hard to fit into one culture, but did not explicitly say she felt culturally displaced. In her individual audio journal, Salem shares the following:

SALEM: Actually, it feels very frustrating since my parents raised me in [different] cultures, but sometimes my mom adds in Thai culture, and at school I'm raised in the Western culture. So it's hard to adapt and it's hard to say which side of the culture I'm more comfortable at, it's just sometimes I'm more prideful of this one specific culture and sometimes I'm ... I don't know. I just get confused and I think all of them are a part of my culture, I guess, I can't really choose one. But it feels very pressuring to have to fit into just one culture.

Ronnie did not tell me that he felt a high degree of cultural displacement, rather often focused on the positives of having multiple cultures. As was shared in chapter 5, Ronnie, in his audio journal indicated the following:

RONNIE: Even though they may view negatively about me, I feel like it doesn't really make a difference to how communication is, because I'm basically just expressing what I say, and however they believe, and however they perceive it, it's up to them. I feel like this isn't really an issue, because being often being exposed to both cultures means that I'm belonging to both of them at the same time.

When only three out of eight participants expressed strong feelings of what might be considered cultural displacement, it made me wonder if my past experiences of TCKs who felt high degrees of cultural displacement was relative to whether or not their culture of home is Western. Perhaps the cultural privileging of Western hegemonic cultures actually does Western primary cultured individuals a disservice, because Western culture is not hegemonic-based in the idea that it must give in, budge, or accommodate for other cultures. I think this is why the perspectives of participants of this study are so important: they do well at figuring out how to negotiate cultures and how to make their cultural norms budge so they can best align with norms they choose to. The participants are talented in the skill of giving and taking, culturally speaking. Those who are raised with culturally hegemonic privilege have much to learn from individuals like participants of this study. I am glad to have had the opportunity for my assumptions to be threatened, and I am thankful to have learned more from the stories and perspectives that participants so openly shared with me.

6.3 Limitations

This research is heavily dependent upon hermeneutic inferencing, and therefore is limited to the way that my own inferences occurred and was readjusted through member checking, interview questioning, and participatory data collection. According to Carspecken (1996), “[s]ubjective references carried by the acts of others must be recognized as subjective states one could feel oneself” (p. 167), and throughout the research process, I have tried to place myself within the perspective of participants to better understand their unique experiences, from their point of view. Through the presentation of the findings of this research, I have intentionally used personal pronouns to indicate my own subjectivity so to make my subjective thoughts transparent; this was done to maintain validity of claims so not to claim subjective interpretations are objective truths. Perspectives shared within this study are limited to the particular experiences that participants describe, and are limited to the way in which I, the researcher, have hermeneutically made claims throughout the findings. The research, itself, is relative to my own initial interests, or as Carspecken (1996) would call my orientation, within this field, including the fact that I have approached this topic, initially, from the perspective of socially just international education. For this reason, I have introduced this research, in chapter 1, in a way that includes my own subjectivity and personal narrative as a researcher so that the limitations and subjectivity of the research are made clear.

Carspecken (1996) discusses that “[t]ruth claims, even about the most mundane ‘objective’ sorts of things, are always made within complex social contexts and carry identity claims pertinent to such contexts” (p. 170). This

research, and the claims that are presented, are limited to the subjectivity of the context in which they arise. The research site, the participants, the researcher - all of these things influence limitations of the claims' capability to be extended to other contexts with other complex social factors. Although I think there are factors and points made in this research that can be connected to other, similar, international school contexts, it is important to recognize that the findings of this research is not entirely transferable to other international school contexts.

In addition to the subjective limitations of this research, logistical limitations also exist, and in the following, I will list limitations of this kind. The research is limited to perspectives of the specific participants who volunteered (and from whom I could obtain signed participant and parental/guardianship consent); the research also is limited to the classroom teachers and co-curricular supervisors who permitted my access to and entrance within observation sites. Research recruitment was extended to over one-hundred students, and is limited to the eight participants who volunteered. I was able to observe within every content area department within the high school campus, however, was not able to observe some courses due to two logistical limitations. The first being whether teachers would allow me to enter into their classroom for observation of my participants, the second being whether or not my own full-time teaching load would allow me to observe participants at certain times (I was not able to observe courses that were scheduled at the same time as the courses I was scheduled to teach, myself). Observation of participants' co-curricular activities was limited to the activities they were involved in at the time of the data collection, and was also

limited to the information provided to me by co-curricular advisors regarding *ad hoc* meeting times scheduled for committees and clubs.

Data collection was also limited to the time frame described in the letter of consent. The parameters of consent also identified that participants could participate in some, all, or none of the data collection procedures. Petrie, June, and Lisa declined participation in the independent audio/video journal and chose only to participate in an observation and individual interview. All other participants, including Ronnie, Alyssa, Karla, Aida, and Salem, participated in all phases of the data collection process. Participant member checking occurred for all research components, including observation field notes, individual interview transcriptions, focus group interview transcriptions, and individual, independent audio/video journal transcriptions. This, however, was dependent upon the choice of the participant, therefore, the participatory nature of this research is limited to the level and amount of participation each participant chose to do.

As a member of faculty at the research site, I was aware of issues of advocacy my position as an educator-researcher held. The context of Morehouse International School promotes a safe space for educators to share their critical perspectives, so I did not feel like I had to change my presentation of data to satisfy administration, and I feel they had given me their support throughout the research process. I have a relationship of trust with my administration and with my colleagues, and felt this was an asset to the way in which I could candidly present interpretation of data and the findings for this research. The relationships I have established at the research site furthered the possibility of this study as

opposed to limiting it, because administration and faculty at the school to trust me, and this was likely one of the conditions that granted me access to conduct this research in the first place.

This research makes no claims that the findings are an objective certainty for all TCK students of non-Western primary cultures, but rather aims to explore how perspectives of the participants who volunteered for this research might help expand on the ways that educators can scaffold contexts and strategies to further cultural emancipation of TCKs. It is my hope that the stories and perspectives of the diverse participant identities for this research will promote deeper understanding of TCKs of non-Western primary cultures, and will also encourage further research on the exploration of TCK cultural identity negotiation and the navigation of cultural capital and symbolic power. I hope this research adds a small step forward towards a merge of cultural borderlines between the Occident and the Orient as it encourages the search for continued understanding of cultural power dynamics pertinent to individuals of non-Western primary cultures.

6.4 Findings Summary

The following codes were significant concepts that arose in the data: community, teacher-student rapport, humour, discussion, speaking English, fun, cultural hybridity, cultural customs, speaking Thai, practicing skills, cultural belonging depends on environment, individual identity expression, dedication, taboo behaviour, cultural belonging, language and identity, respect for cultural practice, respect for others, confidence, empathy, motivation, cultural disconnect, classroom routines and structures, comfort (in school environment), cultural

exclusion, primary culture, stimuli (used by teachers during instruction), code switching, language and translation, cultural inclusion, and misunderstanding of cultural belonging (of others to participants).

Within the field of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993) where the participants exist at school, these codes often overlapped – this research has presented the meaning of these codes through their interconnectivity. Throughout the research, I have tried to reiterate that how participants experience their cultural identity negotiation process is influenced by the overlapping of cultural fields. These codes, presented in chapter 4 and restated above, serve as small layers of the TCK participant experience, which I have tried to peel apart while still maintaining their interconnected meaning within the context of the participant and their data.

Participants belong to all of their cultures. Paradoxically. Their belonging to one culture does not discount their belonging to another. Where one cultural norm is not contextual, or is even inappropriate, in their other culture, participants find ways to code switch between cultural norms. It is as though they have compiled an extensive cultural toolbox, from which they possess a plethora of tools that they use to both fit into and redefine their cultural fields of production. Below, I use the coding system (listed above) to provide a compendium of the participant cultural identity negotiation toolbox.

To negotiate their cultural fields well, participants need a sense of community to which they can belong. Without community, they cannot have a safe place to ‘test out’ how to use their different cultural tools and associate with

their cultures. Community belonging is a space where participants negotiated forms of Western and non-Western cultures, and where all cultures are validated. Validation comes in various forms through official and hidden curricula, but another significant way that participants have experienced validation (of identity, of cultures, of cultural negotiation) is through the rapport they build with both their teachers and peers. Discussion and thought provoking classroom stimuli create opportunities to build rapport as participants were able to share their personal thoughts and opinions in relation to course material.

Community belonging and rapport are heightened by the ability to have fun, to laugh, and to let loose through expressing participants' own sense of humour. The data suggested that the permission for humour can lead to the availability to express oneself freely, and that humour and pushing cultural boundaries may be associated. Teachers who gave participants the space to push boundaries through what some might consider to be taboo behaviour, such as obstreperous laughter, texting in class, speaking languages the teacher may not understand, or even nodding off during instruction also seemed to create opportunities for participants to be themselves and to experiment with social and cultural norms. Creating spaces where students can experiment with social norms at school *may* scaffold their ability to experiment with cultural norms, too, because pushing boundaries gives them a chance to figure out how they can negotiate social expectations placed upon them by their exterior communities and cultures.

As is discussed in the theoretical framework in chapter 2.1, Canagarajah (2013) warns against a monolingual orientation to language. Within this research, individual identity expression was also demonstrated through language, sometimes shown through codemeshing: the “pluralizing [of] discourse with sensitivity to the dual claims of voice and norms” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 109-110). For example, Aida discussed her experience when she and her classmates use both Thai and English in class to better understand concepts:

AIDA: At this school there's a lot of Thai people, and they all understand Thai, so sometimes we have a word and we're like, "Oh, I don't know how to say it in English." But there's no word to describe it really well in English. So we tell the teacher, warning [them] beforehand, [and] we'll just say it in Thai. So we say it in Thai and then everyone just comes together and try to find a translation in English and it's like, "Is it this one?", "Is it this one?", "No, no, no, it might be this one!"

Individual identity expression was shown through the ability to use the language of home, or through one of Kachru's (1985) circle varieties of World Englishes (Smith, 2014). For example, I observed Ronnie in one of his classes instructed in Thai, as shown in the following observational field notes, to code switch between his languages:

RONNIE OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTES:

Talks to teacher and peers.

Laughs with peer.

[speaks in Thai] Talks about technology, and cost for things. Asks peer how much their tech gadget costs.

Speaks to other peers.

[code switches to English, discusses classwork, tells partner she will send the assignment to them]: “Ugh... I'll send it to you.”

Participants indicated that, in addition to cultural customs, they use their various forms of languages in order to belong to different cultural norms and environments.

Acceptance of cultural belonging, that one can belong to more than one culture simultaneously, is important to participants, and when they did not feel accepted, they felt culturally misunderstood. In these moments of cultural disconnection, however, participants used the network of tools within their cultural toolbox to find acceptance of self and of others, and to use this place of acceptance they create to continue their belonging to and negotiation of cultures. Through their experience of determining where they belong, of negotiating their cultures, and of finding self acceptance, participants seemed to establish greater confidence in themselves, and this was independent of how others perceived them or their cultural identities. Through their self-determined confidence, participants created a larger space to accept others, to respect them, and to develop empathy for other humans, their identities, and their cultures.

6.5 Recommendations

As I conclude my exploration of cultural identity negotiation, I suggest that further research be done on curricular and cultural frameworks, both official and hidden, which impact the space in school where TCK students negotiate cultural identity. In their focus group interview, June and Aida discussed that they had a different experience with an international conference they once attended for one of their courses; they discussed how young people in this different context expressed community belonging, and it reconfirmed, for me, the desire to

understand how community is built for TCKs at other international schools. June and Aida shared:

AIDA: We recently went to the [Name of festival conference], and that was like...

JUNE: Everyone raises their hand! And usually, here, when people say, “And does anyone want to volunteer to do something?” No. No one really raises their hand. But when I went there, it was like, “Does anyone want to do something?” And boom! Everyone's, like, hand is going up. It was like... dhun, dhun, dhun! [gesticulating hands raising]. And it was so different than here.

I want to further explore how community is built at other schools, or at international school events, like the one that June and Aida attended. I would also like to compare the hidden curriculum, between different international schools, regarding cultural identity negotiation.

This research has explored the experience of TCK youth, from their perspective, on cultural identity negotiation, but, how schools, themselves, prepare students of non-Western home cultures to negotiate Western culture is still a remaining question for me. How do interculturally competent and conscious-minded international school educators create balance between validating both non-Western and Western cultures? How do we, as educators in a globalized world, provide education that enables young people to see the value in their home culture *and* operate in spaces where students acquire globally hegemonic cultures at school? How can we create counter narratives for linguistic and cultural imperialism? How do we prepare educators in international schools to be aware of hidden curricula that could cause damage to the validation of non-Western cultures as we simultaneously deliver official curricula from Western

cultures? These are all questions that I, passionately, believe should be considered not only by international school educators, but by future researchers as well.

It would be worthwhile to study how teacher classroom pedagogy creates the environments where participants for this research said they felt they had a place to belong. Community was clearly built by classroom teachers, and participants said they felt accepted by their teachers. After observing what I think is a symptom of constructive teacher pedagogy unfold through participants' experiences, my remaining question is, how did this happen? This research was limited to participants' experiences and perspectives, and aimed to tell and focus on *their* stories. A next step would be to do the same for classroom teachers, to understand and tell their stories and the strategies they use to support cultural identity negotiation.

Pedagogies in classrooms may also operate under official and hidden curricula expected from school administration. Curricular policy should be considered by international school administration and leadership teams who make decisions regarding the official curriculum to be offered at schools. Official curriculum is often a point of discussion for school leadership teams, but curricular policy should also intentionally consider how official curriculum has consequences for the hidden curriculum as well. Pedagogy that may have been culturally responsive in teachers' home countries may not be culturally responsive within the context of the international school. Both official and hidden curricula of the international school should be culturally responsive, and this should be considered in schools' policy on curricular frameworks. Culturally responsive

curricular policies should also make teachers aware of the existence of hidden curriculum, as this may not be something all teachers have previously considered.

In private international schools, parents also have expectations of, and to varying degrees have influence over, the curriculum – particularly that of the hidden curriculum if children are sent to a school parents believe will provide hegemonic enculturation of what they think will ‘open doors’ for their children in the future (the belief that English and Western education will opening door for participants’ future has been discussed in the findings in chapter 4). Pedagogy may have ties to one particular form of Western culture presented to students in international schools. More understanding is needed on the Western culture existing in international schools, and whether there is significance that students, who are exposed to Western culture at school, acquire any one particular Western country’s form of cultural norms. It can be suggested that the student experience in the classroom is contextualized within a triangular relationship between the pedagogical expectations of teachers, administration, and parents; therefore, understanding these perspectives could enhance the portrayals of participants’ experiences presented in this research.

I think this research only touched the surface of what needs to be explored in terms of the relationship between language and cultural identity negotiation of TCK youth. Participants mainly described language and cultural belonging to coexist, however, some participants, like June and Karla indicated that they would like more focus on language learning and less focus on learning about cultural customs. In their focus group interview, they shared the following:

KARLA: To be able to express myself in the language environment in school would be better where, you know, [when Language] classes would actually help you to learn [the language] in classes, [instead of] mak[ing] you do all these artwork projects.

JUNE: It's the same for me. Like, through my experience in, like, a [Language] course, we were doing more cultural stuff than language and so it was hard for me to pick up the language because we were too focused on, like, doing presentations and, for me, personally, I have to get physically morphed in [to the culture] to understand and I didn't feel like, like Karla, I didn't feel included.

Karla and June recognize that the focus on learning about cultures in the classroom is important, but they indicate that focusing, first, on language is one way that they would feel included in culture, too.

Another recommendation is that the term Third Culture Kid may have semantically negative connotations. The phrasing 'third' culture may imply that the individual does not belong to the origins of their cultures, when in fact, participants feel that they do. Third may also carry a connotation of otherness, that those who are third cultured are somehow alien to those who are not. The wording of 'kid' is not only an American colloquialism, but it could also be perceived as condescending and may belittle the cultural identity of individuals; "kid" may also trivialize the extremely complex process that those who qualify as TCK must continually undergo. Care should be taken to discuss cultural identity negotiation in ways that reflect its complicated nature instead of trivializing the experience of negotiating cultures.

Additionally, international schools, whose aim is to empower students' linguistic abilities, should adopt socially just cultural frameworks for schools to use when considering language policies of the school. Is an 'English only' policy

one that creates a campus-wide language of inclusion, or is it just the language that includes all teachers? Does this kind of policy subtly suggest to students that teachers are in a position of authority, and through association, so is the English language? In my personal experience, most educators and administrators want to validate the languages of home. However, English as the language of inclusion may, as an unintended result, suggest that language is a barrier. More focus on World Englishes and the valuing of codemeshing may still be inclusive. In this regard, I would recommend a perspective where language does not need to be a barrier. Human connection and community, through language differences, can be embraced to validate intercultural identities.

6.6 Final Reflections

Below, I give my ending thoughts and reflections after completing the research process and data analysis for this study. I conclude this research with slightly more understanding of the perspective of TCK students, and am faced with more questions about how to best support TCK students. The growing predominance of intercultural international schools presents educators with the question of how best to structure official and hidden curricula in a way that empowers our students to initiate symbolic revolutions, while also providing them access to symbolic capital that will further their power to negotiate the cultural fields of their habitus. TCKs are some of the most powerful superhero individuals I have had the opportunity to encounter: their ability to code switch creates in them an enormous capacity for empathy in a world that growingly needs empathy and care. I believe it is my vocation to support TCKs in their endeavors to create

interculturally compassionate spaces. It is only by entering into the long, painful, complex, and highly convoluted path that we are to find an interstitial field where symbolic revolution can occur and intertextual fields can be transversed. I hope that this research serves to brighten the steps of that pathway just a little more.

I hope this research encourages the belief that it is ‘okay’ to live outside the box and that TCKs have the right to choose where they culturally belong, and they also have the right not to be forced to choose as well. Perhaps looking to the TCK as a model will inspire an understanding that connection and belonging do not need to be confined by external powers, but can be refracted and redefined by those who negotiate positions within the fields they intertextual exist within. I hope that it is freeing to hear stories of young people who promote the belief that no one person has to be only one thing. That who one is is dependent upon many factors, and that it is ‘okay’ to live within the conflicting paradox that this creates for our identities. I would like to end with words from one of my favourite writers (although I am a researcher, I am still a Literature teacher, after all). For years, Margaret Atwood has inspired me to walk the line between two-sided things, which I feel like TCKs to exceptionally well. When determining *truth* of one’s identity, remember that truth is subjective to the multiple paths and explorations that one sets out upon. I propose that cultural identity can only be further understood when one carries the perspective that the truth of who we are is multiple and conflicting. In the context of this research, the cultural truths that construct one’s identity are multiple and sometimes at odds - and that is okay. Atwood (1987) writes,

The true story lies
among other stories,

a mess of colors,
like jumbled clothing
thrown off or away,

like hearts on marble, like syllables, like
butchers' discards.

The true story is vicious
and multiple and untrue

after all. Why do you
need it? Don't ever

ask for the true story. (57-58)

May international school educators see the importance in supporting TCKs quest to define the *multiple* stories that make them who they are, and may TCKs feel empowered to be the multiple versions of stories that lie among other stories, no matter how vicious the experience of cultural negotiation along the way. Cultural identity and belonging is, after all, negotiated.

References

- Andreotti, V. 2010. "Glimpses of a Postcolonial and Postcritical Global Citizenship Education." In *Education and Social Change: Connecting local and global perspectives*, edited by G. Elliott, C. Fourali, and S. Issler, 238–250. London: Continuum.
- Achebe, C. (1997). English and the African Writer. *Transition*, 7(75/76), 342-349.
- Appiah, K. A. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* [Kindle DX version]. Retrieved from Amazon.ca
- Atwood, M. (1987). *Selected Poems II: Poems Selected and New 1976-1986*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Birman, D., & Tran, N. (2017). When worlds collide: Academic adjustment of Somali Bantu students with limited formal education in a U.S. elementary school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations: IJIR*, 60, 132.
- Boldt, G. (2006). Resistance, Loss and Love in Learning to Read: A Psychoanalytic Inquiry. *Research into the Teaching of English*, 40(3), 272-309. PDF.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The genesis of the concepts of habitus and field. *Sociocriticism, Theories and Perspectives*, 2(2), 11-24. PDF.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. USA: Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Language and Symbolic Power*. USA: Polity Press.
- Bressler, C. (2007). *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. USA: Longman.

- Bryson, K. (2012). The Literacy Myth in the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives. *Computers and Composition*, 29(3), 254-268.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. Translingual Practice. Taylor and Francis. Kindle Edition.
- Carrington, V. (2001). Literacy instruction: A Bourdieuan Perspective. In P. Freebody, S. Muspratt, & B. Dwyer (Eds.), *Difference, Silence and Textual Practice: Studies in Critical Literacy* (pp. 265-286). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Carspecken, P.F. (1996). *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Chan, E. (2006). Teacher experiences of culture in the curriculum. In D.J. Flinders & S.J. Thornton (Eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (4th ed.) (pp. 32-40). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Collette, F. (2016). Intercultural understanding in the IB curriculum. *The Morning Watch: Educational and Social Analysis* 44(1-2), 1-8.
- Corbett, M. (2010). Backing the right horse: Teacher education, sociocultural analysis and literacy in rural education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 82-86. PDF.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Cushner, K. and Mahone, J. (2009). *Developing the Intercultural Competence of Educators and their Students*. In handbook to intercultural competence (from Cat).

- Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2015). *Engaging Minds: Cultures of Education and Practices of Teaching* [Kindle DX version]. Retrieved from Amazon.ca
- de Castell, S., & Luke, A. (1986). Models of literacy in North American schools: Social and Historical Conditions and Consequences. In S. de Castell, A. Luke, and K. Egan (Eds.), *Literacy, Society and Schooling: A reader* (pp. 87-109). New York, N.Y: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/>
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). The politics of teaching literate discourse. In L. Delpit, *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom* (pp.152-166)). New York: The New Press. PDF.
- Derrida, J. (1978) Structure, sign, and play in the discourse of the human sciences. In *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Deveney, B. (2005). An investigation into aspects of Thai culture and its impact on Thai students in an international school in Thailand. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4(2), 153-171.
- D'warte, J. (2015). Building Knowledge About and With Students: Linguistic Ethnography in Two Secondary School Classrooms. *English In Australia* (0155-2147), 50(1), 39-48.
- Easterly, W. (2006). *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*. USA: Penguin Group.

- Emonds, V., & Van Tubergen, F. (2015). Mixed parents, mixed results: Testing the effects of cross-nativity partnership on children's educational attainment. *Sociological Perspectives*, 58(2), 145-167.
- Evans, B. (Interviewer) & Giroux, H. (Interviewee). (2016). *The Violence of Forgetting* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from *The New York Times*: https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/20/opinion/the-violence-of-forgetting.html?_r=0.
- Fanning, S., & Burns, E. (2017). How an Antipodean Perspective of International Schooling Challenges Third Culture Kid (TCK) Conceptualisation. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 16(2), 147-163.
- Frail, H. (1995). *Some of the Outcomes of International Schooling* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Oxford Brookes University.
- Fryer, Timothy. (2009). Stakeholder Experiences of a Dual-Language International School: A Qualitative Case Study of a Private International School in Hong Kong. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 8(2), 210-222.
- Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2001). Questions of (re)production and legitimation: a second screening of three films on teacher-student relations. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 33(5), 601-619.
- Gee, J.P. (1986). Orality and Literacy: From the savage mind to ways with words. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(4), 719-746.
- Gee, J.P. (1989). What is literacy? *Journal of Education*, 17(1), 18-25. Retrieved from

<http://www.ed.psu.edu/englishpds/Articles/CriticalLiteracy/What%20is%20Literacy.htm>

Gee J.P. (2001). Literacy, discourse and linguistics: Introduction. In E. Cushman, M. Rose, B. Kroll, & E.R. Kintgen (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 525-544). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Giampapa, F. (2010). Multiliteracies, Pedagogy and Identities: Teacher and student voices from a Toronto elementary school. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(2), 407-431.

Graff, H. (1991). *The Literacy myth: Cultural integration and social structure in the nineteenth century*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Graff, H., & Duffy, J. (2007). Literacy myths. In B. Street (Ed.). *Literacy, encyclopedia of language and education*. (pp. 41-52). Berlin and New York: Springer.

Graff, H. (2010). THE LITERACY MYTH AT THIRTY. *Journal of Social History*, 43(3), 635-661,806.

Greene, M. (1971). Curriculum and consciousness. In D.J. Flinders & S.J. Thornton (Eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (4th ed.) (pp. 339-352). New York, NY: Routledge.

Greene, M. (1993). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. *Educational Researcher*, 22(1), 13-18. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/stable/1177301?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

- Greene, M. (2011). Releasing the imagination. *Drama Australia Journal*, 34(1), 61-70.
- Gregory, M. (2007). Real teaching and real learning vs narrative myths about education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*. 6(1), 7-27.
- Hamers, J., & Blanc, M. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Handsfield, L.J. (2006). Being and becoming American: Triangulating habitus, field, and literacy instruction in a multilingual classroom. *Language and Literacy, A Canadian Educational e-journal*, 8(2), 1-27.
- Hoersting, R.C., & Jenkins, S.R. (2011). No place to call home: Cultural homelessness, self-esteem, and cross-cultural identities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 17-30.
- Hopkins, J. (2015). Coming "Home": An Autoethnographic Exploration of Third Culture Kid Transition. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(9), 812.
- Hutchison, K. (2011). Homework through the eyes of children: What does visual ethnography invite us to see? *European Educational Research Journal*, 10(4), 545-558.
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2013). *Language A: language and literature guide* [PDF]. Cardiff, Wales: Peterson House. Retrieved from <http://occ.ibo.org/ibis/occ/home/subjectHome.cfm?subject=ayeng>.
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2013). *What is an IB education?* [PDF]. Cardiff, Wales: Peterson House. Retrieved from

- <http://www.ibo.org/globalassets/publications/become-an-ib-school/whatisanibeducation-en.pdf>
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2019). *Examiner Instructions 2019*. [PDF]. Cardiff, Wales. Retrieved from https://ibpublishing.ibo.org/exinst/apps/exinst/index.html?doc=EX_instructions_2019_e&part=9&chapter=2.
- Imoto, Yuki. (2011). Producing the "International" Child: Negotiations of Language in an International Preschool in Japan. *Ethnography and Education*, 6(3), 281-292.
- Jackson, P. W. (1990). The daily grind. In D.J. Flinders & S.J. Thornton (Eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (4th ed.) (pp. 117-126). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, 52(2), 175-186.
- Johnson, R. (1993). Editor's Introduction Pierre Bourdieu on Art, Literature, and Culture. In P. Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (pp. 1-25). USA: Columbia University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1985). *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle*. R. Quirk, H.G. Widdowson, & Y. Cantù (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (2002). "NOUS DEUX" OR A (HI)STORY OF INTERTEXTUALITY. *Romanic Review*, 93(1), 7-13. Retrieved from

<https://search-proquest-com.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/docview/196424396?accountid=12378s>

- LeCompte, M. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Liu, Shuning. (2018). Neoliberal Global Assemblages: The Emergence of "Public" International High-School Curriculum Programs in China. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 48(2), 203-219.
- Luke, A., & Carrington, V. (2004). Globalisation, literacy, curriculum practice. In T. Grainger (Ed.), *The routledgefalmer reader in language and literacy* (pp.52-65). London: RoutledgeFalmer. PDF.
- Makhdoom, M., & Awan, S. M. (2014). Education and neo-colonization: A critique of english literature curriculum in pakistan. *South Asian Studies*, 29(2), 411-421.
- Magdolen, A. (Producer). (2010). *Les passagers: A tck story* [motion picture]. Retrieved from <http://www.tckidnow.com/whats-a-tckid/>
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Maurette, M. T. (1948). *Educational techniques for peace. Do they exist?* United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization: Paris, France. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001582/158270eb.pdf>.
- McKenzie, M. (2006). Three portraits of resistance: The (un)making of Canadian students. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(1), 199-222. Retrieved from

[http://uopx.summon.serialssolutions.com.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/search?s.q=Three+portraits+of+resistance%3a+The+\(un\)making+of+Canadian+students](http://uopx.summon.serialssolutions.com.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/search?s.q=Three+portraits+of+resistance%3a+The+(un)making+of+Canadian+students)

McKernan, J. (1996). *Curriculum action research: A handbook of methods and resources for the reflective practitioner* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Mullaly, B. (2010). *Challenging Oppression and Confronting Privilege*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Páez, M. (2009). Predictors of English-language proficiency among immigrant youth. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(2), 168-187.

Pollock, D. and Van Reken, R.E. (2009). *Third Culture Kids: Growing Up Among Worlds*. USA: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism* [Kindle DX Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.ca

Said, E. (1994). *Orientalism* (1st Vintage Books Edition). New York: Vintage Books.

Sargant, E.B. Educational problems of the empire. In A.J. Herbertson and O.J. R. Howarth, eds., *The Oxford survey of the British Empire* (pp. 230-65). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schaetti, B. (2015). Third-culture kids/global nomads. In *The sage encyclopedia of intercultural competence*. Retrieved from <http://sk.sagepub.com.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/reference/download/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-intercultural-competence/i7646.pdf>

- Séror, J., Chen, L., & Gunderson, L. (2005). Multiple perspectives on educationally resilient immigrant students. *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 55-74.
- Sleeter, C., & Stillman, J. (2005). In D.J. Flinders & S.J. Thornton (Eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (4th ed.) (pp. 253-268). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith, L.E. (2014). World englishes. *Key Concepts in Intercultural Dialogue*, 34.
- Smith, L.E. (2016). FAMILIAR ISSUES FROM A WORLD ENGLISHES PERSPECTIVE. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, (1), 14-18.
- Solano-Campos, Ana. (2017). Language ideologies in a U.S. state-funded international school: the invisible linguistic repertoires of bilingual refugee students. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 16(1), 36-54.
- Tate, N. (2012). Challenges and pitfalls facing international education in a post-international world. *Journal of Research in International Education*. 11(3) pp. 205-217. Retrieved from <http://jri.sagepub.com.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/content/11/3/205.full.pdf+html>
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2015). Identity negotiation theory. In *The sage encyclopedia of intercultural competence*. Retrieved from <http://sk.sagepub.com.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/reference/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-intercultural-competence/i4364.xml>
- Ungar, M., Brown, M., Liebenberg, L., Othman, R., Man Kwong, W., Armstrong, M., & Gilgun, J. (2007). Unique pathways to resilience across cultures. *Adolescence*, 42(166), 287-310.

- Useem, R. (1993). *Third culture kids: Focus of major study – tck “mother” pens history of field*. Retrieved from <http://www.tckworld.com/useem/art1.html>.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). In D.J. Flinders & S.J. Thornton (Eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (4th ed.) (pp. 289-300). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Verdoodt, I., Rutten, K., Soetaert, R., & Mottart, A. (2010). Film choices for screening literacy: The "Pygmalion" template in the curriculum as contact zone. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42(4), 519-38. PDF.
- von Diether, B. (n.d.). Writing chapter 3: The methodology. Retrieved from <http://dissertationwriting.com/write-dissertation-methodology-help.shtml>
- Wacquant, L. (1993). From Ruling Class to Field of Power: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu on La Noblesse d'État. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 10(3), 19-44.
- Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. (1986). *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. USA: Heinemann
- Williams, B.T. (2006). Home and away: The tensions of community, literacy, and identity. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 42(4), 342-347.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form in English

Title: Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand

Researcher: Farrah Collette, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Graduate studies within the Department of Education, graduate email contact: fcc837@mun.ca, farrahc@rism.ac.th, R308.

235/9 Soi 13G, Ramkhamhaeng 110, Saphan Sung, Bangkok, Thailand 10240

(+66) 098-075-7537; RIST Room # 308

Supervisor: Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's NL, A1B 3X8

Email contact: eyeoman@mun.ca

(709) 864-3411

You are invited to take part in a research project entitled "Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand".

This form is part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. It also describes your right to withdraw from the study. In order to decide whether you wish to participate in this research study, you should understand enough about its risks and benefits to be able to make an informed decision. This is the informed consent process. Take time to read this carefully and to understand the information given to you. Please contact the researcher, Farrah Collette, if you have any questions about the study or would like more information before you consent.

It is entirely up to you to decide whether to take part in this research. If you choose not to take part in this research or if you decide to withdraw from the research once it has started, there will be no negative consequences for you, now or in the future.

Introduction:

I am a master's student within the Faculty of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada. I am also a high school International Baccalaureate English A teacher and Head of the English Language Arts department at Morehouse International School. As a part of my master's thesis in Education (Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies), I am conducting research under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman.

Purpose of Study:

The purpose of this study is to explore how Third Culture Kids (TCKs) experience the different cultures they are exposed to, and to help educators of TCKs develop strategies for TCK students to maintain their family culture while also benefiting from exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school. At this stage of the research, a third culture kid is defined as a youth whose life experience has required them to negotiate more than one culture into their personal identity. Student identities are influenced by the cultures found in school; for international school students, home culture can be different from the cultures at school. School environments are often where different cultural practices meet, so this study aims to help students and teachers find and reaffirm ways for TCK students to benefit from more than one culture that they belong to and encounter. The intention is to strengthen the connection between students' home and school cultures and identities, to empower students, and to support students, educators, and parents in a TCK student's acquisition of interculturalism and cultural competency.

What You Will Do in this Study:

This study explores the details of how participants successfully benefit from home culture and Anglo-Western culture at school. Many students at Morehouse International School identify with more than one culture between their home and school experiences, and sometimes can feel as though they do not fully belong to either culture(s). This study aims to assist by providing insight into the challenges participants face, and possible strategies students, and those who care for students, can use in order to negotiate their cultures into their identity and sense of self. Given my experience as an employee of Morehouse International School, I, personally, have observed many teachers who have meaningful strategies in place to empower cultural balance and connection in students. Many students at Morehouse International School also seem to have good strategies to negotiate their home and school cultures. I, therefore, wish to further research these strategies and record them in my report, so that individuals who learn and work in culturally diverse schools can identify with participants' perspectives and benefit from the research.

In this study, I plan to: observe participants in at least one of their classes with the permission of their teacher, have participants record video diaries to record ideas they think are important to the topic of this research, and conduct short follow-up individual and focus group interviews with all participants. In all of these methods, I will collect data that relates to helpful strategies students and teachers use to empower successful cultural identity negotiation, and it is important to me to focus on positive strategies that work and not on strategies that do not work. This research is subjective to the belief that students and teachers hold powerful ideas on how to support cultural negotiations and transitions for the betterment of the individuals in the school community at Morehouse International School, and it is important that all participants know that their stories and perspectives will

benefit not only themselves, but also hopefully benefit others in similar cultural situations to them as well.

Length of Time:

The collection of data will take approximately 6-8 weeks. The anticipated start of data collection from participants is from February to March, 2018. Data will first be collected from participants in one or more of their regular classes, and so this will not require anything “extra” from participants. Basically, I will attend your class and observe you in this environment to look for key things related to my research. For each student participant, I plan to observe approximately two classes (each class is 65 minutes). During the observation, students are not required to do any extra work or special experiments. I will take notes as I observe, and sometimes I may participate in the class, myself, with the classroom teacher’s permission.

After I observe the selected content area class, I will conduct one or two follow-up interviews, which will take approximately 30-45 minutes. Interview(s) will be at the convenience of the student’s schedule, and may take place either during or after school on school campus. I will then conduct one or two focus group interviews with participants, which will take approximately 30-45 minutes per group.

Participants will be given approximately 3 weeks to simultaneously record video about their thoughts on anything they think relates to how they interact with their multiple cultures, and can format this video in any way they choose. The video should be recorded on the regular things the participant does within their lives and can refer to activities from both home and school. Video diaries are completely in the hands of participants and are intended for participants to record their own thoughts on experiences that relate to this topic in a natural way. It is important that participants do not record any interactions between themselves and other people, because others have not given their consent to be involved in the study. Video diary logs of individual thoughts on culture and identity, and video of locations and objects relating to a participant’s culture is acceptable.

Withdrawal from the Study:

Participation in the study is voluntary, and participants may withdraw from the study at any time, either electronically via email, or through written withdrawal request printed and given in person during regular work hours. Withdrawal is permitted after any classroom observation session, as well as during, or after the individual interview. During the interview process, participants are not required to answer all questions should they not wish to, and so have the choice to remain in the study but decline answering any questions. Should a participant wish to withdraw from the study, any data collected from the participant will not be used in the report and will immediately be destroyed.

Participants are also permitted to withdraw consent from the study after data has been collected from them, and still during the data collection period. Withdrawal and removal of data may occur *up until* the data is aggregated (put together for final analysis). Data aggregation will begin after the individual and group interviews are finished; therefore, if a participant wishes to remove their data from the report, they need to make the request during data collection. Data collection will begin February 15th and final data aggregation will begin on April 13th; therefore, a participant can withdraw from the study on or before April 12th, 2019.

Personally identifiable information (like physical features, birth dates, addresses, photographs, videos, etc) of *all* participants, including *withdrawn* participants, will not be included in the report. No information from participants withdrawn during the data collection period will be included in the report. Participants who remain in the study will be given pseudonyms within the report, so that those who read the report will not read any participant's actual name and the data will remain anonymous.

Possible Benefits:

Participants have the opportunity to gain knowledge of graduate-level research, which will help with university prep and personal research knowledge. Student participants who are involved in the study may experience personal gain by having an opportunity to voice their experiences on having to navigate two or more cultures. It may feel empowering to have cultural challenges and strategies for how this feels to “be heard” by other culturally diverse students and educators. Educators of observed content area classes may feel a sense of affirmation that the teaching strategies they use to help culturally diverse students are recognized.

Because the study will benefit other culturally diverse school environments, benefits of the study include the contribution of cultural perspective towards both the scholarly community and society as a whole. Although other learning environments may differ, strategies found to empower culturally diverse students may be helpful for other culturally diverse schools or societies. Because most of the existing research in this area focuses on younger, elementary school aged students, on TCKs whose home culture is primarily Western, or on TCK students in other parts of the world, this research will add significant insight into this topic and provide information on this particular geographic location.

Possible Risks:

Participants will be asked interview questions about personal strategies they use in order to find balance or negotiate between the multiple cultures of home and school that they identify with. Although potential risks with these questions are limited, a participant could possibly find it difficult or uncomfortable to talk about challenges he or she experiences as a culturally diverse individual. The interview questions are designed so that participants feel comfortable to answer and have the choice on what to share, and participants will not be required to answer

questions if they feel uncomfortable to do so. If discomfort does occur, appropriate school resources are available for participants' assistance: a participant may contact either the High School section head (Mr. Jason Deveau in H111A) or the Head of School (Mr. John Callaghan in AD206) if they need assistance, and a participant may also contact the Student Services Office (located in AD309) in person to seek professional counselling.

Confidentiality:

The ethical duty of confidentiality includes safeguarding participants' identities, personal information, and data from unauthorized access, use, or disclosure. Safeguarding participants' identities and personal data means that the final report will not reveal the identity or personal identifiable information which would reveal the identity of a participant, and it means pseudonyms will be used for both participants and the school name. Information like course load or, club registrations, or university acceptances, etcetera, which would indicate the identity of a participant will not be included or will use a pseudonym. Direct quotes from participants will be used, but every reasonable effort will be made to eliminate quotes that reveal personal semantics and word choice that would reveal the identity of a participant. Records and recordings will not be shared with individuals who are not principal investigators or stakeholders in the data collection process. All hard copies of records and recordings will be kept in a locked room, and electronic copies will be kept on private, password protected hard drives.

Although it is highly unforeseeable for the nature of this research, if for any reason a participant's safety is at a physical or an emotional risk, I have a duty to report and complete an incident report filed with the administration of the school to ensure the safety of the participant. If the data collected from the participant contains information as to why the child would be at risk, this information would need to be shared with the appropriate support administration.

Anonymity:

Anonymity refers to protecting participants' identifying characteristics, such as name or description of physical appearance.

Within the final data report, all participant names and the school name will remain anonymous in through the use of pseudonyms. As mentioned in the study withdrawal section, personally identifiable characteristics will not be disclosed.

Limitations to anonymity:

During classroom or extracurricular observations, there is a potential for the identities of participants to be known by other individuals location in the environment of the observation; however, all reasonable efforts to ensure anonymity will be made. At the beginning of observations, I will announce to the class, club, or group of students why I am present and inform them that the identities of the participants in the observation location are confidential, and, I

will request that the students in the class or location assist in adhering to this confidentiality. I will also state that participants of the study must not reveal their identities to those not in the study in order to protect their anonymity. I will position myself in the observation location so that there is no obvious transparency as to which students are participants in the study. If I observe a participant in a student lounge or at a cafeteria location, I will give extra attention to my position while observing and I will not position myself in a way that is obvious as to who I am observing; additionally, I will not observe the participant in a location where his or her identity would be obvious to others not in the study. Even with these efforts made, there is still a possibility that a non-participant in the observation location could guess at or determine the identity of a participant, therefore, anonymity in the observation location is limited to the efforts listed above.

In the focus group interview, anonymity of participants will be revealed to other participants in the study, because more than one, or all, participants will attend a focus group interview at the same time. Participants are not permitted to reveal the identities of other participants outside of the focus group – this includes during the data collection process or after the final report has been completed and shared. In either the individual or the focus group interview, participants must not identify peers or siblings not in the study, and they must not reveal the identities of their parents or teachers in any way, as they have not consented to participate in the study and this identification could also lead to a revealing of a participants' own identity. Anonymity of participants during or after focus group interviews is limited to all participants complying to the efforts towards anonymity listed above, therefore, it is extremely important that your compliance towards this anonymity are a requirement to your participation in the study.

Every reasonable effort will be made to ensure your anonymity. You will not be identified in publications without your explicit permission.

Recording of Data:

Observation follow-up interviews will be documented through audio recordings, and subsequent audio recording transcripts will be created. During observations, handwritten or typed note taking will occur. During some observations, audio recordings will be taken where applicable. If applicable, copies of participant notes or class documents may be requested if the information these extra documents contain provides insight into the research. Video recording and/or photographs of participants will not be recorded by the researcher; however, video diary recordings will be recorded by the participants themselves.

All data will be aggregated for analysis, following coding procedures for a qualitative narrative study, which uses an ethnographic research approach.

Use, Access, Ownership, and Storage of Data:

Data collected from observations, follow-up interviews, and research location (environmental documents) will be stored as electronic copies. Original hard copies will be scanned and saved, and the hard copies shredded as soon as possible. Storage of all electronic copies will be saved in the researcher's personal, password-protected laptop hard drive, as well as on a password-protected hard drive as backup storage.

While unattended, both laptop and hard drive will be stored in a locked room at the researcher's home, or in a locked filing cabinet while on the grounds of the research site. Consent forms will be stored, in hard copy, in a separate locked cabinet at the research site; electronic scans of signed consent forms will be stored in a separate, password-protected electronic folder. I, the researcher will have access to the stored data, as well as potentially, my Memorial University research supervisor, Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman. The data collected will not be contained in a public archive, and will not be made accessible to individuals other than those mentioned above.

Data will be kept for a minimum of five years, as required by Memorial University's policy on Integrity in Scholarly Research.

Third-Party Data Collection and/or Storage:

Third-Party Data Collection and/or Storage will not be used for the data collection of this research: a password-protected laptop hard drive and a password-protected external hard drive, and locked cabinet folders for any appropriate hard copies will be the only storage devices for data and/or consent letter records.

I will use an online transcription service, Rev, to assist in transcriptions of anonymized data from observation audio recordings. I will not submit sections of audio recordings that contain any participant names and will not include names or personally identifiable audio recorded information.

Reporting of Results:

Transcripts from interviews and focus groups will be shared with participants from whom the data was collected after dialogical data collection and before data aggregation so they can adjust any misrepresentative data or information they wish to change or remove from transcripts. Participants will be given a copy of their transcript from the individual interview(s) and the focus group interview(s), and given the opportunity to make adjustments to their portion of the focus group transcript, should they disagree with their response after having time to reflect. Participants will also be given the opportunity to make changes or remove information from their video diary transcriptions.

After the research is completed, and the report is finalized, the research report in graduate thesis form will be shared with participants and the research site Head of School and High School Section Head Principal, electronically, via school email.

Upon completion, my thesis will be available at Memorial University's Queen Elizabeth II library, and can be accessed online at:
<http://collections.mun.ca/cdm/search/collection/theses>.

The results of the research *may* also be published in future academic journal articles, shared with online academic databases and/or the researcher's professional, academic portfolio. The results will also be shared with administration and educators employed within the research site.

Data will be reported through direct quotations as well as aggregated and/or summarized, or in narrated form.

Sharing of Results with Participants and Parent(s)/Guardian(s):

After the completion of the study, the resultant thesis will be shared, electronically, with participants and their parent(s) or guardian(s).

Questions:

You are welcome to ask questions before, during, or after your participation in this research. If you would like more information about this study, please contact:

Researcher:
Farrah Collette
fcc837@mun.ca
+66-97-078-7537 (TH)
1-902-742-4457 (CAN)

Supervisor:
Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman
eyeoman@mun.ca
(709) 864-3411 (CAN)

Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR)

Approval:

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as the way you have been treated or your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr@mun.ca or by telephone at 1-709-864-2861.

Consent:

Your signature on this form means that:

- You have read the information about the research.
- You have been able to ask questions about this study.
- You are satisfied with the answers to all your questions.
- You understand what the study is about and what you will be doing.
- You understand that you are free to withdraw participation in the study without having to give a reason, and that doing so will not affect you now or in the future.

- You understand that you must follow the procedural efforts listed and described in the confidentiality and anonymity sections for your own identity, other participants' identities, and all non-participant identities.
- You understand that if you choose to end participation **during** data collection, any data collected from you up to that **point will be destroyed**.
- You understand that if you choose to withdraw **after** data collection has ended, your data can be removed from the study up to 8 weeks after the data collection process has begun. Data collection will begin February 15th and final data aggregation will begin on April 13th; therefore, a participant can withdraw from the study on or before April 12th, 2019. After this time frame, data will be anonymized.

I agree to be audio-recorded.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
I agree to submit self-recorded video diary logs of myself.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
I agree to not include video of non-participants in my video diary log.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
I allow my class work to be scanned or photographed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
I agree to the use of direct quotations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

By signing this form, you do not give up your legal rights and do not release the researcher from their professional responsibilities.

Your Participant Signature Confirms:

- ☐ I have read what this study is about and understood the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.
- ☐ I agree to participate in the research project understanding the risks and contributions of my participation, that my participation is voluntary, and that I may end my participation.
- ☐ A copy of this Informed Consent Form has been given to me for my records.

Signature of Participant

Date

Your Parental or Guardianship Signature Confirms:

- ☐ I have read what this study is about and understood the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.
- ☐ I agree to allow my child to participate in the research project understanding the risks and contributions of their participation, that their participation is voluntary, and that I, or my child, may end participation.

☐ A copy of this Informed Consent Form has been given to me for my records.

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Date

Your School Administration Signature Confirms:

You have read what this study is about and understood the risks and benefits. You have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. You agree to allow the research project to be conducted on school campus. A copy of this Informed Consent Form has been given to you for your records.

Signature of Head of School

Date

Signature of Deputy Head of School

Date

Signature of Section Head of High School

Date

Researcher's Signature:

I have explained this study to the best of my ability. I invited questions and gave answers. I believe that the participant fully understands what is involved in being in the study, any potential risks of the study and that he or she has freely chosen to be in the study.

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Appendix B: Informed Consent Form in Thai

แบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมโดยได้รับข้อมูล

ชื่อโครงการ: เด็กวัฒนธรรมที่สามที่ปรับเรื่องของอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนในโรงเรียนนานาชาติในประเทศไทย

ผู้วิจัย: ฟาร์ราห์ คอลเล็คต์ มหาวิทยาลัยเมมโมเรียลแห่งนิวฟันด์แลนด์

การศึกษาวิจัยระดับบัณฑิตวิทยาลัยในคณะศึกษาศาสตร์ อีเมลที่ใช้ติดต่อสำหรับบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย:

fcc837@mun.ca, farrahc@rism.ac.th

235/9 ซอย 13 จี งามคำแหง 110 สะพานสูง กรุงเทพฯ 10240

(+66) 098-075-7537 RIST ห้อง 308

อาจารย์ผู้ควบคุม: ดร. เอลิซาเบธ อีโอแมน คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเมมโมเรียลแห่งนิวฟันด์แลนด์ เซนต์จอห์นส์ รัฐนิวฟันด์แลนด์ A1B 3X8

อีเมลที่ใช้ติดต่อ: eyeoman@mun.ca

(709) 864-3411

คุณได้รับเชิญให้เข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยเรื่อง

“เด็กวัฒนธรรมที่สามที่ปรับเรื่องของอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนในโรงเรียนนานาชาติในประเทศไทย”

แบบฟอร์มนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของกระบวนการแสดงเจตนายินยอมเข้าร่วมการวิจัยโดยได้รับข้อมูล

แบบฟอร์มนี้จะช่วยให้คุณมีข้อมูลเบื้องต้นเกี่ยวกับการศึกษาวิจัยนี้

รวมทั้งช่วยให้คุณได้ทราบว่าการเข้ามามีส่วนร่วมของคุณนั้นจะเกี่ยวข้องกับอะไรบ้าง

แบบฟอร์มนี้ยังอธิบายถึงสิทธิของคุณที่จะถอนตัวจากการวิจัยอีกด้วย

เพื่อที่จะตัดสินใจว่าคุณอยากที่จะเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้หรือไม่

คุณควรทำความเข้าใจให้ดีพอเกี่ยวกับความเสี่ยงและผลประโยชน์ที่จะได้ของโครงการวิจัยนี้

เพื่อที่จะสามารถตัดสินใจได้โดยมีข้อมูลที่เพียงพอ นี่คือการแสดงเจตนายินยอมเข้าร่วมการวิจัยโดยได้รับข้อมูล

ขอให้ใช้เวลาอ่านแบบฟอร์มนี้อย่างระมัดระวังและทำความเข้าใจในข้อมูลที่คุณได้รับ โปรดติดต่อผู้วิจัย ฟาร์ราห์ คอลเล็คต์

หากคุณมีคำถามใดๆ เกี่ยวกับการวิจัยหรืออยากทราบข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมก่อนที่คุณจะแสดงเจตนายินยอม

การตัดสินใจที่จะเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้หรือไม่นั้นขึ้นอยู่กับคุณอย่างแท้จริง

หากคุณเลือกที่จะไม่เข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้หรือหากคุณตัดสินใจที่จะถอนตัวจากโครงการวิจัยนี้หลังจากที่เริ่มโครงการไปแล้ว

จะไม่มีผลที่เกิดขึ้นตามมาในเชิงลบสำหรับคุณ ในขณะนี้หรือในอนาคต

บทนำ:

ข้าพเจ้าเป็นนักศึกษาปริญญาโทที่คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเมมโมเรียลแห่งนิวฟันด์แลนด์ แคนาดา

ข้าพเจ้ายังเป็นครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษหลักสูตรนานาชาติ (IB English A)

ระดับมัธยมปลายและหัวหน้าภาควิชาศิลปะภาษาอังกฤษที่ โรงเรียนนานาชาติร่วมฤดี (Morehouse International

School) อีกด้วย ข้าพเจ้ากำลังดำเนินการวิจัยภายใต้การกำกับดูแลของ ดร. เอลิซาเบธ ยีโอแมน โดยเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของวิทยานิพนธ์ปริญญาโทของข้าพเจ้าในคณะศึกษาศาสตร์ (การศึกษาเรื่องการสอน การเรียนรู้ และหลักสูตรการศึกษา)

วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย:

วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัยนี้คือการสำรวจว่าเด็กวัฒนธรรมที่สาม (TCK)

ได้รับประสบการณ์ในวัฒนธรรมที่ต่างออกไปที่พวกเขาได้สัมผัสอย่างไร และเพื่อช่วยให้นักการศึกษาเรื่อง TCK

พัฒนากลยุทธ์เพื่อที่นักเรียนในกลุ่ม TCK จะยังคงวัฒนธรรมของครอบครัวตนเองไว้ได้

ในขณะที่ยังได้รับประโยชน์จากการได้สัมผัสกับวัฒนธรรมในท้องถิ่นที่โดดเด่นกว่าและเป็นโลกาภิวัตน์ที่โรงเรียน ณ

ขั้นตอนนี้ของการวิจัย

เด็กวัฒนธรรมที่สามนั้นนิยามได้ว่าเป็นเยาวชนซึ่งมีประสบการณ์ในชีวิตที่กำหนดให้ต้องปรับตัววัฒนธรรมมากกว่าหนึ่งวัฒนธรรม

ให้เป็นอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนส่วนบุคคล อัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของนักเรียนนั้นได้รับอิทธิพลจากวัฒนธรรมที่พบได้ในโรงเรียน

สำหรับนักเรียนในโรงเรียนนานาชาติแล้ว วัฒนธรรมที่บ้านอาจแตกต่างจากวัฒนธรรมที่โรงเรียน

สภาวะแวดล้อมในโรงเรียนมักจะเป็นที่ที่พบแนวทางปฏิบัติทางวัฒนธรรมที่แตกต่างกัน

ดังนั้นการวิจัยนี้จึงมีเป้าหมายเพื่อช่วยให้นักเรียนและครูค้นหาและชี้แจงแนวทางที่นักเรียนในกลุ่ม TCK

จะได้ประโยชน์จากวัฒนธรรมมากกว่าหนึ่งวัฒนธรรมที่พวกเขาเป็นสมาชิกและได้สัมผัส

ความมุ่งหมายนั้นก็คือการกระชับความเชื่อมโยงระหว่างวัฒนธรรมและอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนที่บ้านและที่โรงเรียนของนักเรียน

เพื่อให้นักเรียนเป็นตัวของตัวเอง และเพื่อสนับสนุนนักเรียน นักการศึกษา

และผู้ปกครองในการเรียนรู้การยอมรับในความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรมและทักษะความสามารถทางวัฒนธรรมของนักเรียน

ในกลุ่ม TCK

คุณจะต้องทำอะไรในการวิจัยนี้:

การวิจัยนี้จะสำรวจรายละเอียดว่า

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยได้รับประโยชน์โดยเป็นผลสำเร็จจากวัฒนธรรมที่บ้านและวัฒนธรรมที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษและเป็นแบบตะวันตก

กในโรงเรียนอย่างไร นักเรียนหลายคนที่นี่ Morehouse International School

แสดงอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนด้วยวัฒนธรรมมากกว่าหนึ่งวัฒนธรรมระหว่างประสบการณ์ที่บ้านของคนและที่โรงเรียน

และบางครั้งก็อาจรู้สึกว่าคุณเหล่านั้นไม่ได้เป็นสมาชิกอย่างเต็มตัวไม่ว่าจะในวัฒนธรรมใด

การวิจัยนี้มีเป้าหมายเพื่อช่วยในการแสดงข้อมูลเชิงลึกในเรื่องของความท้าทายที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยเผชิญหน้า

และกลยุทธ์ที่เป็นไปได้ที่นักเรียน และผู้ที่ดูแลนักเรียน

สามารถใช้ได้เพื่อที่จะปรับตัววัฒนธรรมของคนให้เป็นอัตลักษณ์และความรู้สึกเกี่ยวกับตนเอง

เมื่อพิจารณาถึงประสบการณ์ของข้าพเจ้าในฐานะพนักงานของ Morehouse International School

โดยส่วนตัวแล้วข้าพเจ้าได้สังเกตเห็นว่ามีคุณครูหลายท่านที่มีกลยุทธ์ที่มีความหมายอยู่แล้วที่จะทำให้เกิดความสมดุลทางวัฒนธรรมและความเชื่อมโยงในค่านักเรียน นักเรียนหลายต่อหลายคนที่นี่ Morehouse International School

ยังดูเหมือนว่าจะมีกลยุทธ์ที่ดีในการปรับตัววัฒนธรรมที่บ้านและที่โรงเรียนอยู่แล้วด้วยเช่นกัน ดังนั้น

ข้าพเจ้าจึงปรารถนาที่จะวิจัยกลยุทธ์เหล่านี้เพิ่มเติมและบันทึกกลยุทธ์เหล่านี้ไว้ในรายงานของข้าพเจ้า

เพื่อที่บุคคลที่เรียนรู้และทำงานในโรงเรียนที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรม

จะสามารถเข้าถึงมุมมองของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและได้ประโยชน์จากการวิจัยนี้

ในการวิจัยนี้

ข้าพเจ้าวางแผนที่จะสังเกตการณ์ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในห้องเรียนอย่างน้อยหนึ่งวิชาโดยได้รับการอนุญาตจากคุณครูผู้สอนของพ

พวกเขา

จัดการให้ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทำบันทึกประจำวันทางวิดีโอเพื่อบันทึกความคิดที่พวกเขาคิดว่ามีความสำคัญต่อหัวข้อของการวิจัยนี้ และดำเนินการสัมภาษณ์ทั้งรายบุคคลและเป็นกลุ่มซึ่งเป็นการติดตามผลและเกิดขึ้นช่วงเวลาสั้นๆ

กับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทุกคน ในวิธีการทั้งหมดเหล่านี้

ข้าพเจ้าจะรวบรวมข้อมูลที่เกี่ยวข้องกับกลยุทธ์ที่เป็นประโยชน์ที่นักเรียนและคุณครูใช้ในการปรับอัตลักษณ์ทางวัฒนธรรมอย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ

และเป็นเรื่องสำคัญสำหรับข้าพเจ้าที่จะต้องมุ่งความสนใจไปที่กลยุทธ์เชิงบวกที่ใช้ได้ผลและไม่มุ่งความสนใจไปที่กลยุทธ์ที่ไม่ได้ผล

การวิจัยนี้ขึ้นอยู่กับความเชื่อที่นักเรียนและคุณครูยึดถือเป็นความคิดที่มีอำนาจว่าด้วยวิธีการที่จะสนับสนุนการปรับตัวและการเปลี่ยนผ่านทางวัฒนธรรมเพื่อสิ่งที่ดีขึ้นสำหรับแต่ละบุคคลในสังคมโรงเรียนที่ Morehouse International School และเป็นเรื่องสำคัญที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทุกคนจะต้องรู้ว่า

เรื่องราวและมุมมองของคนนั้นจะเป็นประโยชน์ไม่เฉพาะต่อตัวพวกเขาเองเท่านั้น

แต่หวังกันว่ายังเป็นประโยชน์ต่อผู้อื่นในสถานการณ์ทางวัฒนธรรมที่คล้ายๆ กันกับพวกเขาด้วยเช่นกัน

ระยะเวลา:

การรวบรวมข้อมูลจะใช้เวลาประมาณ 6-8 สัปดาห์

การเริ่มต้นการรวบรวมข้อมูลจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยที่คาดการณ์ไว้คือตั้งแต่เดือนกุมภาพันธ์ไปจนถึงเดือนมีนาคม พ.ศ. 2561

ข้อมูลนั้นลำดับแรกจะรวบรวมจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในชั้นเรียนตามปกติหนึ่งชั้นหรือมากกว่านั้น

และเมื่อเป็นดังนี้แล้วการดำเนินการนี้จึงไม่ต้องการอะไรที่ “พิเศษ” จากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย โดยพื้นฐานแล้ว

ข้าพเจ้าจะเข้าไปอยู่ในชั้นเรียนของคุณและสังเกตการณ์คุณในสภาวะแวดล้อมนี้เพื่อมองหาสิ่งสำคัญที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการวิจัยของ

ข้าพเจ้า สำหรับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยซึ่งเป็นนักเรียนแต่ละท่าน ข้าพเจ้าวางแผนที่จะสังเกตการณ์ประมาณสองชั้นเรียน

(แต่ละชั้นเรียนใช้เวลา 65 นาที) ระหว่างการสังเกตการณ์นี้ นักเรียนจะไม่ต้องทำงานเพิ่มเติมหรือการทดลองพิเศษใดๆ

ข้าพเจ้าจะจดบันทึกระหว่างที่สังเกตการณ์ และบางครั้งข้าพเจ้าก็อาจมีส่วนร่วมในชั้นเรียนนั้น ด้วยตัวของข้าพเจ้าเอง

โดยที่ได้รับการอนุญาตจากคุณครูของชั้นเรียนนั้น

หลังจากที่ข้าพเจ้าสังเกตการณ์ชั้นเรียนตามเนื้อหาที่เลือกไว้แล้ว ข้าพเจ้าจะทำการสัมภาษณ์เพื่อติดตามผลหนึ่งหรือสองครั้ง

ซึ่งจะใช้เวลาประมาณ 30-45 นาที การสัมภาษณ์จะเป็นไปตามตารางเวลาที่สะดวกของนักเรียน

และอาจเกิดขึ้นระหว่างหรือหลังโรงเรียนเลิกแล้วในพื้นที่ของโรงเรียน

จากนั้นข้าพเจ้าจะดำเนินการสัมภาษณ์เป็นกลุ่มหนึ่งหรือสองครั้งกับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย ซึ่งจะใช้เวลาประมาณ 30-45

นาทีต่อกลุ่ม

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะมีเวลาประมาณ 3

สัปดาห์เพื่อบันทึกวิดีโอควบคู่กันไปเกี่ยวกับความคิดของตนว่าด้วยอะไรก็ตามที่พวกเขาคิดว่าเกี่ยวข้องกับวิธีที่พวกเขามีปฏิสัมพันธ์กับวัฒนธรรมที่หลากหลายของตน และสามารถผลิตวิดีโอในรูปแบบใดก็ได้ตามที่ตนเองเลือก

การบันทึกวิดีโอควรเป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับเรื่องปกติที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทำในชีวิตประจำวัน

และอาจอ้างอิงถึงกิจกรรมจากทั้งที่บ้านและโรงเรียนได้

บันทึกประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอจะอยู่ในความควบคุมของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยโดยสิ้นเชิง

และมีไว้เพื่อที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะได้บันทึกความคิดของตนเองเกี่ยวกับประสบการณ์ที่เกี่ยวข้องกับหัวข้อนี้เป็นธรรมชาติ

เป็นเรื่องสำคัญที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะต้องไม่บันทึกปฏิสัมพันธ์ใดๆ ระหว่างตัวพวกเขาเองกับบุคคลอื่นๆ

เนื่องจากบุคคลอื่นๆ นั้น ไม่ได้ให้คำยินยอมที่จะมีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องกับการวิจัยนี้

บันทึกประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอที่เป็นเรื่องของความคิดส่วนบุคคลว่าด้วยวัฒนธรรมและอัตลักษณ์ตัวตน และวิดีโอที่แสดงถึงสถานที่และวัตถุสิ่งของที่เกี่ยวเนื่องกับวัฒนธรรมของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยนั้นเป็นสิ่งที่ยอมรับได้

การถอนตัวจากการวิจัย:

การเข้าร่วมการวิจัยนี้เป็นความสมัครใจ และผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยอาจถอนตัวจากการวิจัยนี้เมื่อใดก็ได้

ไม่ว่าจะทางอิเล็กทรอนิกส์ผ่านอีเมล

หรือผ่านคำร้องถอนตัวเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษรฉบับตีพิมพ์และมอบด้วยตัวเองระหว่างชั่วโมงทำงานปกติ

การถอนตัวนั้นจะได้รับอนุญาตหลังจากช่วงเวลาของการสังเกตการณ์ในชั้นเรียนใดๆ รวมทั้งระหว่าง

หรือหลังจากการสัมภาษณ์รายบุคคล ระหว่างกระบวนการในการสัมภาษณ์

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยไม่จำเป็นต้องตอบคำถามทั้งหมดหากพวกเขาไม่ต้องการทำเช่นนั้น

และดังนั้นแล้วจึงมีทางเลือกที่จะยังคงอยู่ในการวิจัยนี้ต่อไปแต่ปฏิเสธที่จะตอบคำถามใดๆ ได้

หากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยต้องการถอนตัวจากการวิจัยนี้ ข้อมูลใดๆ

ที่รวบรวมจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะไม่ถูกนำไปใช้ในรายงานและจะถูกทำลายทันที

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยยังได้รับอนุญาตให้ถอนคำยินยอมจากการวิจัยนี้หลังจากที่ได้รวบรวมข้อมูลจากพวกเขาแล้ว

และระหว่างช่วงระยะเวลาในการรวบรวมข้อมูลอีกด้วย

การถอนตัวและการลบข้อมูลอาจเกิดขึ้นจนกระทั่งถึงช่วงเวลาที่ได้รวมข้อมูลนั้นแล้ว

(รวมเข้าด้วยกันเพื่อการวิเคราะห์ขั้นสุดท้าย)

การรวมข้อมูลจะเริ่มขึ้นหลังจากที่สิ้นสุดการสัมภาษณ์เป็นรายบุคคลและการสัมภาษณ์เป็นกลุ่มแล้ว ดังนั้น

หากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยต้องการลบข้อมูลของตนจากรายงาน ก็จำเป็นต้องยื่นคำร้องขอระหว่างรวบรวมข้อมูล

การรวบรวมข้อมูลจะเริ่มขึ้นในวันที่ 15 กุมภาพันธ์ และการรวมข้อมูลขั้นสุดท้ายจะเริ่มขึ้นในวันที่ 13 เมษายน ดังนั้น

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจึงสามารถถอนตัวจากการวิจัยได้ในหรือก่อนวันที่ 12 เมษายน พ.ศ. 2562

ข้อมูลระบุตัวตนเป็นการส่วนบุคคล (เช่น คุณลักษณะทางกายภาพ วันเกิด ที่อยู่ รูปถ่าย วิดีโอ ฯลฯ)

ของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทุกคน รวมถึงผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยที่ถอนตัวแล้ว จะไม่รวมเข้าไว้ในรายงานนี้

เราจะไม่รวมข้อมูลจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยที่ถอนตัวแล้วระหว่างช่วงระยะเวลาในการรวบรวมข้อมูลเข้าไว้ในรายงานนี้

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยที่ยังคงอยู่ในการวิจัยนี้จะได้รับนามแฝงที่ใช้ภายในรายงานนี้

ดังนั้นผู้ที่อ่านรายงานนี้จะไม่ได้อ่านชื่อจริงของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยคนใดเลย และข้อมูลนี้ก็จะยังคงไม่ปรากฏชื่อบุคคล

ประโยชน์ที่เป็นไปได้:

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยมีโอกาสดังนี้ที่จะได้รับความรู้ในการวิจัยระดับปริญญาโท

ซึ่งจะช่วยในเรื่องของการเตรียมตัวสอบเข้ามหาวิทยาลัยและความรู้ในการวิจัยส่วนบุคคล

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยที่เป็นนักเรียนซึ่งเกี่ยวข้องกับการวิจัยนี้อาจได้รับประโยชน์ส่วนบุคคล

จากการที่มีโอกาสได้พูดถึงประสบการณ์ของตนกับการที่ต้องจัดการกับวัฒนธรรมสองวัฒนธรรมหรือมากกว่านั้น

อาจว่าเป็นการทำให้ถูกต้องมากขึ้นก็เป็นได้กับการมีความท้าทายทางวัฒนธรรมและกลยุทธ์สำหรับวิธีการที่นักเรียนและนักศึกษา

รึกษาที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรมคนอื่นๆ จะได้ "รับฟัง" ความรู้สึกนี้

นักการศึกษาจากชั้นเรียนตามเนื้อหาที่สังเกตการณ์อาจรับรู้ถึงการตอบที่ยืนยันว่า

กลยุทธ์ในการสอนที่พวกเขาใช้เพื่อช่วยเหลือนักเรียนที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรมนั้นเป็นที่ยอมรับ

เนื่องจากการวิจัยนี้เป็นประโยชน์ต่อสภาวะแวดล้อมในโรงเรียนที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรมอื่นๆ
ประโยชน์ของการวิจัยนี้จึงครอบคลุมถึงการมีส่วนร่วมต่อมุมมองทางวัฒนธรรมที่มีต่อทั้งชุมชนวิชาการและสังคมโดยรวม
แม้ว่าสภาวะแวดล้อมในการเรียนรู้อื่นๆ อาจแตกต่างกันไป
กลยุทธ์ที่พบในการทำให้นักเรียนที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรมประสบความสำเร็จนั้น
อาจเป็นประโยชน์สำหรับโรงเรียนหรือสังคมที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรมอื่นๆ
เนื่องจากการวิจัยที่มีอยู่ในปัจจุบันส่วนใหญ่ในเรื่องนี้มุ่งความสนใจไปที่นักเรียนที่เด็กกว่า และมีอายุในช่วงโรงเรียนประถม
มุ่งความสนใจไปที่ TCK ซึ่งวัฒนธรรมบ้านเกิดของคนนั้นคือวัฒนธรรมตะวันตกมาแต่ดั้งเดิม
หรือมุ่งความสนใจไปที่นักเรียนในกลุ่ม TCK ในพื้นที่ส่วนอื่นๆ ของโลก
การวิจัยนี้จะเพิ่มข้อมูลเชิงลึกอย่างมีนัยสำคัญให้กับหัวข้อการวิจัยนี้และเป็นข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับสถานที่ตั้งทางภูมิศาสตร์เฉพาะที่แห่ง
นี้

ความเสี่ยงที่เป็นไปได้:

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะได้รับคำถามระหว่างการสัมภาษณ์เกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์ส่วนบุคคลที่พวกเขาใช้เพื่อที่จะหาความสมดุลหรือจัด
การระหว่างวัฒนธรรมที่หลากหลายที่บ้านและวัฒนธรรมที่โรงเรียนที่พวกเขาแสดงอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนออกมา
แม้ว่าความเสี่ยงที่เป็นไปได้กับคำถามเหล่านี้จะมีจำกัด
เป็นไปได้ว่าผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยอาจพบว่าเป็นการยากหรือไม่สะดวกใจที่จะพูดถึงความท้าทายต่างๆ
ที่เขาหรือเธอได้พบในฐานะบุคคลที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรม
คำถามระหว่างการสัมภาษณ์นั้นออกแบบมาเพื่อที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะรู้สึกสะดวกใจที่จะตอบและมีทางเลือกในสิ่งที่จะแบ่งป
น และผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะไม่จำเป็นต้องตอบคำถามหากพวกเขารู้สึกไม่สะดวกใจที่จะตอบ หากเกิดความไม่สบายใจขึ้น
เรามีทรัพยากรของโรงเรียนที่เหมาะสมเพื่อให้ความช่วยเหลือแก่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย
ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยอาจติดต่อหัวหน้าส่วน โรงเรียนมัธยม (Mr. Jason Deveau in H111A)
หรือหัวหน้าฝ่ายบริหารของโรงเรียน (Mr. John Callaghan in AD206) หากพวกเขาต้องการความช่วยเหลือ
ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยยังอาจติดต่อสำนักงานบริการนักเรียน (ตั้งอยู่ใน AD309)
ด้วยตัวเองเพื่อขอคำปรึกษาทางวิชาชีพได้ด้วยเช่นกัน

การรักษาความลับ:

หน้าที่ทางจริยธรรมในการรักษาความลับครอบคลุมถึงการรักษอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย ข้อมูลส่วนบุคคล
และข้อมูลจากการเข้าถึง การใช้ และการเปิดเผยโดยที่ไม่ได้รับการอนุญาต
การรักษาอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและข้อมูลส่วนบุคคลหมายถึงว่า
รายงานขั้นสุดท้ายจะไม่เปิดเผยอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนหรือข้อมูลที่ระบุตัวตนส่วนบุคคลได้ซึ่งจะเป็นการเปิดเผยอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของ
ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย และนั่นหมายถึงว่านามแฝงจะถูกนำมาใช้สำหรับทั้งชื่อของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและชื่อโรงเรียน ข้อมูล เช่น
จำนวนหลักสูตร หรือการลงทะเบียนเป็นสมาชิกของสโมสร หรือการตอบรับเข้าเรียนจากมหาวิทยาลัย ฯลฯ
ซึ่งจะบ่งบอกถึงอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย จะไม่นำเข้ามารวมไว้หรือจะใช้นามแฝง
คำพูดโดยตรงจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะถูกนำมาใช้
แต่เราจะใช้ความพยายามอย่างสมเหตุสมผลที่จะกำจัดคำพูดที่เปิดเผยถึงการตีความทางความหมายส่วนบุคคลและการเลือกใช้
คำที่อาจเปิดเผยอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย
เราจะไม่ใช้เอกสารและบันทึกร่วมกันกับบุคคลที่ไม่ใช่ผู้วิจัยหลักหรือผู้มีส่วนได้เสียในกระบวนการรวบรวมข้อมูล
สำเนาฉบับตีพิมพ์ทั้งหมดของเอกสารและบันทึกจะเก็บไว้ในห้องที่มีกุญแจล็อก
และสำเนาอิเล็กทรอนิกส์จะเก็บไว้บนฮาร์ดแวร์ที่เป็นความลับและป้องกันด้วยรหัสผ่าน

แม้ว่าจะไม่อาจคาดหมายได้เป็นอย่างยิ่งเนื่องจากธรรมชาติของการวิจัยนี้ หากด้วยเหตุผลใดก็ตามความปลอดภัยของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยตกอยู่ในความเสี่ยงทางกายภาพหรือความเสี่ยงทางภาวะอารมณ์ ข้าพเจ้ามีหน้าที่ต้องรายงานและกรอกแบบฟอร์มรายงานเหตุการณ์ขึ้นต่อฝ่ายบริหารของโรงเรียนเพื่อให้มั่นใจได้ถึงความปลอดภัยของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย หากข้อมูลที่รวบรวมจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยมีข้อมูลในเรื่องของสาเหตุที่เด็กคนนั้นจะตกอยู่ในความเสี่ยง จำเป็นที่จะต้องแจ้งให้ฝ่ายบริหารความช่วยเหลือที่เหมาะสมทราบข้อมูลนี้

การปิดบังชื่อ:

การปิดบังชื่อหมายถึงการปกป้องคุณลักษณะในการระบุตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย เช่น ชื่อหรือคำอธิบายถึงรูปลักษณ์ทางกายภาพ

ภายในรายงานข้อมูลขั้นสุดท้าย ชื่อของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและชื่อของโรงเรียนทั้งหมดจะยังคงปิดบังไว้ผ่านการใช้นามแฝง ตามที่ได้กล่าวไว้ในส่วนของการถอนตัวจากการวิจัย เราจะเปิดเผยคุณลักษณะในการระบุตัวตนส่วนบุคคล

ข้อจำกัดของการปิดบังชื่อ:

ระหว่างการศึกษาเหตุการณ์ในชั้นเรียนหรือการสังเกตการณ์นอกหลักสูตร มีความเป็นไปได้ที่บุคคลอื่นๆ ที่อยู่ในสถานะแวดล้อมของผู้สังเกตการณ์จะรู้ตัวลักษณะตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย อย่างไรก็ตาม เราจะใช้ความพยายามอย่างสมเหตุสมผลทุกอย่างเพื่อให้มั่นใจว่ามีการปิดบังชื่อ เมื่อเริ่มต้นการสังเกตการณ์ ข้าพเจ้าจะประกาศต่อชั้นเรียน สโมสร หรือกลุ่มนักเรียนถึงสาเหตุที่ข้าพเจ้าอยู่ในที่แห่งนั้นด้วย และแจ้งให้พวกเขาทราบว่าลักษณะตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในสถานที่สังเกตการณ์นั้นเป็นข้อมูลที่เป็นความลับ และข้าพเจ้าจะร้องขอให้นักเรียนในชั้นเรียนหรือสถานที่แห่งนั้นช่วยในการยึดถือหลักการรักษาความลับนี้ ข้าพเจ้าจะยังระบุอีกด้วยว่าผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในการวิจัยนี้จะต้องไม่เปิดเผยข้อมูลลักษณะตัวตนของตนต่อผู้ที่ไม่ได้ใช้ในการวิจัยนี้ เพื่อที่จะปกป้องการปิดบังชื่อของพวกเขา ข้าพเจ้าจะอยู่ในตำแหน่งของข้าพเจ้าเองในสถานที่สังเกตการณ์เพื่อที่จะได้ไม่มีผู้ใดเห็นได้อย่างชัดเจนว่านักเรียนคนไหนคือผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในการวิจัยนี้ หากข้าพเจ้าสังเกตเห็นผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในห้องนั่งเล่นของนักเรียนหรือในโรงอาหาร ข้าพเจ้าจะระมัดระวังในตำแหน่งของข้าพเจ้าเป็นพิเศษในขณะที่สังเกตการณ์อยู่ และข้าพเจ้าจะไม่อยู่ในตำแหน่งที่เห็นได้ชัดเจนว่าข้าพเจ้าสังเกตการณ์ใครอยู่ นอกจากนั้นแล้ว ข้าพเจ้าจะไม่สังเกตการณ์ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยในสถานที่ที่บุคคลอื่นๆ ที่ไม่ได้ใช้ในการวิจัยนี้จะรับรู้ลักษณะตัวตนของเขาหรือเธอได้อย่างชัดเจน แม้ว่าจะพยายามแล้วก็ตาม ก็ยังมีความเป็นไปได้ที่ผู้ที่ไม่ได้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยที่อยู่ในตำแหน่งสังเกตการณ์ อาจเดาหรือระบุข้อมูลลักษณะตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยได้ ดังนั้น การปิดบังชื่อในตำแหน่งสังเกตการณ์จึงมีข้อจำกัดอยู่ที่ความพยายามที่ระบุไว้แล้วข้างต้น

ในการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่ม สภาวณิรนามของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะถูกเปิดเผยต่อผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยคนอื่นๆ ในการวิจัย เนื่องจากผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยมากกว่าหนึ่งคนหรือทั้งหมดจะเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่มในเวลาเดียวกัน ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยไม่ได้รับอนุญาตให้เปิดเผยข้อมูลลักษณะตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยคนอื่นๆ นอกเหนือการสนทนากลุ่ม นี้ครอบคลุมถึงช่วงระหว่างกระบวนการรวบรวมข้อมูลหรือหลังจากที่รายงานขั้นสุดท้ายเสร็จสมบูรณ์และแบ่งปันกันแล้ว แม้ว่าจะในการสัมภาษณ์เป็นรายบุคคลหรือการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่ม ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะต้องไม่ระบุตัวตนเพื่อนๆ หรือพี่น้องในการวิจัยนี้ และพวกเขาจะต้องไม่เปิดเผยข้อมูลลักษณะตัวตนของผู้ปกครองหรือคุณครูของตนไม่ว่าในทางใดก็ตาม เนื่องจากบุคคลเหล่านั้น ไม่ได้ให้คำยินยอมที่จะเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยนี้

และการระบุตัวตนนี้ยังอาจนำไปสู่การเปิดเผยอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของตัวเองของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยอีกด้วย การปิดบังชื่อของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยระหว่างหรือหลังการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่มนั้น จำกัได้ไว้สำหรับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทุกคนที่ปฏิบัติตามความพยายามที่จะรักษาการปิดบังชื่อที่ระบุไว้ข้างต้น ดังนั้น จึงเป็นเรื่องที่สำคัญอย่างยิ่งที่การปฏิบัติตามของคุณกับความพยายามในการปิดบังชื่อเหล่านี้เป็นข้อกำหนดของการมีส่วนร่วมของคุณในการวิจัยนี้

เราจะใช้ความพยายามอย่างสมเหตุสมผลทุกอย่างเพื่อให้มั่นใจว่ามีการปิดบังชื่อของคุณ
เราจะไม่ระบุตัวตนของคุณในสิ่งตีพิมพ์โดยที่ไม่ได้รับการอนุญาตอย่างชัดเจนจากคุณ

การบันทึกข้อมูล:

เราจะบันทึกการสัมภาษณ์เพื่อติดตามผลการสังเกตการณ์ผ่านสื่อบันทึกเสียง และเราจะจัดทำบันทึกเสียงตามมา ระหว่างการสังเกตการณ์ จะไม่มีการจดบันทึกด้วยลายมือหรือด้วยการพิมพ์เกิดขึ้น ระหว่างการสังเกตการณ์บางครั้ง จะมีการบันทึกเสียงเมื่อเหมาะสม หากเหมาะสม
เราอาจร้องขอสำเนาของบันทึกของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยหรือเอกสารในชั้นเรียนถ้าข้อมูลที่เอกสารพิเศษเหล่านี้มีอยู่นั้นแสดงข้อมูลเชิงลึกให้กับการวิจัยนี้ ผู้วิจัยจะไม่ทำการการบันทึกวิดีโอและ/หรือรูปถ่ายของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย อย่างไรก็ตาม จะมีการทำบันทึกประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอโดยตัวผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยเอง

ข้อมูลทั้งหมดจะรวมกันเข้าเพื่อการวิเคราะห์ หลังขั้นตอนการถอดรหัสสำหรับการวิจัยเชิงคุณภาพเชิงบรรยาย ซึ่งใช้แนวทางการวิจัยเชิงชาติพันธุ์วรรณา

การใช้ การเข้าถึง ความเป็นเจ้าของ และการจัดเก็บข้อมูล:

ข้อมูลที่รวบรวมจากการสังเกตการณ์ การสัมภาษณ์เพื่อติดตามผล และสถานที่ในการวิจัย (เอกสารเกี่ยวกับสภาวะแวดล้อม) จะจัดเก็บเป็นสำเนาอิเล็กทรอนิกส์ สำเนาเอกสารฉบับดั้งเดิมจะถูกสแกนและบันทึกไว้ และสำเนาดั้งเดิมเอกสารจะถูกฉีกทำลายทิ้งโดยเร็วที่สุดเท่าที่จะเป็นไปได้
พื้นที่จัดเก็บสำเนาอิเล็กทรอนิกส์ทั้งหมดจะถูกบันทึกไว้ในฮาร์ดไดรฟ์ของแล็ปท็อปส่วนตัวของผู้วิจัยซึ่งปกป้องด้วยรหัสผ่าน รวมทั้งบนฮาร์ดไดรฟ์ซึ่งปกป้องด้วยรหัสผ่านเป็นพื้นที่จัดเก็บสำรอง

ในขณะที่ไม่ได้ใช้งาน ทั้งแล็ปท็อปและฮาร์ดไดรฟ์จะถูกจัดเก็บไว้ในห้องที่มีกุญแจล็อกในบ้านพักของผู้วิจัย หรือในตู้เก็บแฟ้มที่มีกุญแจล็อกในขณะที่อยู่ในพื้นที่ของสถานที่ทำการวิจัย แบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมจะถูกเก็บไว้เป็นสำเนาเอกสาร ในตู้เก็บแฟ้มที่มีกุญแจล็อกแยกต่างหาก ณ สถานที่ทำการวิจัย
แบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมที่ลงนามแล้วซึ่งเป็นฉบับสแกนด้วยระบบอิเล็กทรอนิกส์จะถูกเก็บไว้ในโฟลเดอร์อิเล็กทรอนิกส์ซึ่งปกป้องด้วยรหัสผ่าน ข้าพเจ้า ผู้วิจัย จะมีสิทธิเข้าถึงข้อมูลที่จัดเก็บไว้ รวมทั้งอาจารย์ผู้ควบคุมการวิจัยของข้าพเจ้า ณ มหาวิทยาลัยแมมโมเรียล ดร. เอลิซาเบธ ยีโอแมน ข้อมูลที่รวบรวมไว้นั้นจะไม่มีอยู่ในห้องเก็บเอกสารสาธารณะ และบุคคลที่นอกเหนือจากผู้ที่กล่าวถึงข้างต้นจะไม่สามารถเข้าถึงได้

ข้อมูลจะถูกเก็บไว้ขั้นต่ำเป็นเวลาห้าปี

ตามที่กำหนดไว้โดยนโยบายของมหาวิทยาลัยแมมโมเรียลว่าด้วยความถูกต้องในการวิจัยเชิงวิชาการ

การรวบรวมและการจัดเก็บข้อมูลโดยบุคคลที่สาม:

การรวบรวมและ/หรือการจัดเก็บข้อมูลโดยบุคคลที่สามจะไม่นำมาใช้ในการรวบรวมข้อมูลในการวิจัยนี้
ฮาร์ดแวร์ของแล็ปท็อปซึ่งปกป้องด้วยรหัสผ่านและฮาร์ดแวร์ภายนอกซึ่งปกป้องด้วยรหัสผ่าน
และแฟ้มเอกสารที่มีกุญแจล็อกสำหรับสำเนาฉบับเอกสารที่เหมาะสม
จะเป็นอุปกรณ์จัดเก็บสำหรับข้อมูลและ/หรือบันทึกจดหมายการให้ความยินยอมอย่างเดียวนั้น

ข้าพเจ้าจะใช้บริการการถอดความออนไลน์ Rev

เพื่อช่วยในการถอดความข้อมูลที่ไม่เปิดเผยจากบันทึกเสียงในการสังเกตการณ์

ข้าพเจ้าจะไม่ส่งส่วนของบันทึกเสียงที่มีชื่อของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยใดๆ

และจะไม่ใส่ชื่อหรือข้อมูลที่บันทึกไว้ด้วยเสียงซึ่งระบุตัวตนส่วนบุคคลได้

การรายงานผลของการวิจัย:

เราจะแบ่งปันข้อมูลถอดความจากการสัมภาษณ์และการสนทนากลุ่มกับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย

ซึ่งข้อมูลที่รวบรวมได้มาจากบุคคลเหล่านี้หลังการรวบรวมข้อมูลบทสนทนาและก่อนการรวมข้อมูล

เพื่อที่พวกเขาจะได้ปรับแก้ข้อมูลที่บิดเบือนจากความเป็นจริงใดๆ

หรือข้อมูลที่พวกเขาต้องการเปลี่ยนหรือลบทิ้งจากข้อมูลถอดความ

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะได้รับสำเนาของข้อมูลถอดความจากการสัมภาษณ์รายบุคคลและการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่ม

และได้รับโอกาสที่จะปรับแก้ข้อมูลถอดความของการสนทนากลุ่มในส่วนของตนเอง

หากพวกเขาไม่เห็นด้วยกับคำตอบหลังจากที่ได้ใช้เวลาทบทวนแล้ว

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะยังได้รับโอกาสที่จะปรับแก้หรือลบข้อมูลจากข้อมูลถอดความบันทึกประจำวันด้วยเสียงอีกด้วย

หลังจากที่การวิจัยเสร็จสิ้นแล้ว และสรุปรายงานขั้นสุดท้ายแล้ว

เราจะแบ่งปันรายงานการวิจัยในรูปแบบฟอร์มของวิทยานิพนธ์ระดับปริญญาโทให้ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและหัวหน้าฝ่ายบริหารของโรงเรียนและหัวหน้าส่วนโรงเรียนมัธยมได้รับทราบ ด้วยระบบอิเล็กทรอนิกส์ ผ่านอีเมลของโรงเรียน

เมื่อแล้วเสร็จ วิทยานิพนธ์ของฉันจะมีพร้อมบริการในห้องสมุดสมเด็จพระราชินีนาถเอลิซาเบธที่ 2

ของมหาวิทยาลัยแมนโมเรียล และสามารถเข้าถึงทางออนไลน์ได้ที่

<http://collections.mun.ca/cdm/search/collection/theses>

ผลของการวิจัยนี้ยังอาจได้รับการตีพิมพ์ในบทความวารสารทางวิชาการในอนาคต

แบ่งปันกับฐานข้อมูลทางวิชาการออนไลน์และ/หรือพอร์ตโฟลิโอทางวิชาชีพและทางวิชาการของผู้วิจัย

เราอาจแบ่งปันผลของการวิจัยนี้กับฝ่ายบริหารและนักการศึกษาที่ทำงานภายในสถานที่ทำการวิจัยด้วยเช่นกัน

การรายงานข้อมูลนั้นจะดำเนินการผ่านการยกยอคำมาโดยตรง รวมทั้งรูปแบบรวมและ/หรือสรุป หรือบรรยาย

การแบ่งปันผลของการวิจัยกับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและบิดามารดา/ผู้ปกครอง:

หลังการวิจัยนี้เสร็จสิ้น เราจะแบ่งปันวิทยานิพนธ์ที่แสดงผลลัพธ์นั้น ด้วยระบบอิเล็กทรอนิกส์

กับผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยและบิดามารดาหรือผู้ปกครอง

คำถาม:

คุณสามารถถามคำถามได้ก่อน ระหว่าง หรือหลังการเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยนี้ของคุณ

หากคุณต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยนี้ โปรดติดต่อ:

ผู้วิจัย:

ฟาร์ราห์ คอลเล็คต์

fcc837@mun.ca

+66-97-078-7537 (ประเทศไทย)

1-902-742-4457 (แคนาดา)

อาจารย์ผู้ควบคุม:

ดร. เอลิซาเบธ ยีโอแมน

eyeoman@mun.ca

(709) 864-3411 (แคนาดา)

คณะกรรมการมหาวิทยาลัยว่าด้วยจริยธรรมในการอนุมัติการวิจัยมนุษย์ (ICEHR):

ข้อเสนอสำหรับการวิจัยนี้ได้รับการทบทวนจากคณะกรรมการมหาวิทยาลัยว่าด้วยจริยธรรมในการอนุมัติการวิจัยมนุษย์และพบว่า เป็นไปตามนโยบายจริยธรรมของมหาวิทยาลัยแมมโมเรียล หากคุณมีข้อกังวลด้านจริยธรรมเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยนี้ เช่น แนวทางที่คุณได้รับการปฏิบัติ หรือสิทธิของคุณในฐานะผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย คุณอาจติดต่อประธานของ ICEHR ได้ที่ icehr@mun.ca หรือทางโทรศัพท์ที่ 1-709-864-2861

คำยินยอม:

ลายมือชื่อของคุณบนแบบฟอร์มนี้หมายความว่า:

- คุณได้อ่านข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยนี้แล้ว
- คุณสามารถถามคำถามเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยนี้ได้
- คุณพึงพอใจกับคำตอบต่อคำถามของคุณทั้งหมด
- คุณเข้าใจว่าการวิจัยนี้เป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับอะไรและคุณจะต้องทำอะไร
- คุณเข้าใจว่าคุณมีอิสระที่จะถอนการมีส่วนร่วมในการวิจัยนี้ได้โดยไม่จำเป็นต้องให้เหตุผล

และเข้าใจว่าการทำเช่นนั้นจะไม่ส่งผลกระทบต่อคุณในขณะนี้หรือในอนาคต

- คุณเข้าใจว่าคุณจะต้องปฏิบัติตามความพยายามตามขั้นตอนที่ระบุไว้และอธิบายไว้ในส่วนที่ว่าด้วยการรักษาความลับและการปิดบังชื่อสำหรับอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของคุณเอง อัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยคนอื่นๆ

และอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนของผู้ที่ไม่ได้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยทุกคน

- คุณเข้าใจว่าหากคุณเลือกที่จะยุติการมีส่วนร่วมระหว่างการรวบรวมข้อมูล ข้อมูลใดๆ

ที่รวบรวมจากคุณจนถึงขณะนั้นจะถูกทำลายทิ้ง

- คุณเข้าใจว่าหากคุณเลือกที่จะถอนตัวหลังจากการรวบรวมข้อมูลสิ้นสุดลง

สามารถลบข้อมูลของคุณจากการวิจัยนี้ได้เป็นเวลานานถึง 8 สัปดาห์หลังจากที่กระบวนการรวบรวมข้อมูลเริ่มต้นขึ้น

การรวบรวมข้อมูลจะเริ่มขึ้นในวันที่ 15 กุมภาพันธ์ และการรวมข้อมูลขั้นสุดท้ายจะเริ่มขึ้นในวันที่ 13 เมษายน ดังนั้น

ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจึงสามารถถอนตัวจากการวิจัยได้ในหรือก่อนวันที่ 12 เมษายน พ.ศ. 2562 หลังจากกรอบเวลานี้แล้ว

เราจะปิดบังชื่อในข้อมูล

ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับที่จะถูกบันทึกเสียง

☐ ใช่ ☐ ไม่ใช่

ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับที่จะส่งบันทึกประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอที่บันทึกด้วยตนเองของข้าพเจ้าเอง

☐ ใช่ ☐ ไม่ใช่

ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับที่จะไม่รวมวิดีโอของผู้ที่ไม่ได้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยไว้ในบันทึกประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอ

☐ ใช่ ☐ ไม่ใช่

ข้าพเจ้ายอมให้มีการสแกนหรือถ่ายภาพงานในชั้นเรียนของข้าพเจ้า

☐ ใช่ ☐ ไม่ใช่

ข้าพเจ้ายอมให้มีการใช้คำพูดโดยตรง

☐ ใช่ ☐ ไม่ใช่

โดยการลงนามในแบบฟอร์มนี้ คุณไม่ได้เพิกถอนสิทธิตามกฎหมายของคุณและไม่ได้ปลดปล่อยผู้วิจัยความรับผิดชอบทางวิชาชีพ

ลายมือชื่อการเป็นผู้มีส่วนร่วมในการวิจัยของคุณยืนยันว่า:

☐ ข้าพเจ้าได้อ่านว่าการวิจัยนี้เป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับอะไรและเข้าใจความเสี่ยงและประโยชน์ ข้าพเจ้ามีเวลาเพียงพอที่จะคิดถึงเรื่องนี้และมีโอกาสที่จะถามคำถามและคำถามของข้าพเจ้าก็ได้รับคำตอบ

☐ ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับที่จะเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยนี้โดยที่เข้าใจถึงความเสี่ยงและการสนับสนุนจากการมีส่วนร่วมของข้าพเจ้ายอมรับว่าการมีส่วนร่วมของข้าพเจ้านั้นเป็นความสมัครใจ และยอมรับว่าข้าพเจ้าอาจยุติการมีส่วนร่วมของข้าพเจ้า

☐ ข้าพเจ้าได้รับสำเนาของแบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมโดยได้รับข้อมูลฉบับนี้ไว้เป็นบันทึกของข้าพเจ้า

ลายมือชื่อของผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย

วันที่

ลายมือชื่อของบิดามารดาหรือผู้ปกครองของคุณยืนยันว่า:

☐ ข้าพเจ้าได้อ่านว่าการวิจัยนี้เป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับอะไรและเข้าใจความเสี่ยงและประโยชน์ ข้าพเจ้ามีเวลาเพียงพอที่จะคิดถึงเรื่องนี้และมีโอกาสที่จะถามคำถามและคำถามของข้าพเจ้าก็ได้รับคำตอบ

☐

ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับที่จะอนุญาตให้บุตรของข้าพเจ้าเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยนี้โดยที่เข้าใจถึงความเสี่ยงและการสนับสนุนจากการมีส่วนร่วมของพวกเขา ยอมรับว่าการมีส่วนร่วมของพวกเขาเป็นความสมัครใจ และยอมรับว่าข้าพเจ้า หรือบุตรของข้าพเจ้าอาจยุติการมีส่วนร่วม

☐ ข้าพเจ้าได้รับสำเนาของแบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมโดยได้รับข้อมูลฉบับนี้ไว้เป็นบันทึกของข้าพเจ้า

ลายมือชื่อของบิดามารดาหรือผู้ปกครอง

วันที่

ลายมือชื่อของฝ่ายบริหารโรงเรียนของคุณยืนยันว่า:

คุณได้อ่านว่าการวิจัยนี้เป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับอะไรและเข้าใจความเสี่ยงและประโยชน์ คุณมีเวลาเพียงพอที่จะคิดถึงเรื่องนี้และมีโอกาสที่จะถามคำถามและคำถามของคุณก็ได้รับคำตอบ
คุณยอมรับที่จะอนุญาตให้ดำเนินโครงการวิจัยนี้ได้ในพื้นที่ของโรงเรียน
คุณได้รับสำเนาของแบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมโดยได้รับข้อมูลฉบับนี้ไว้เป็นบันทึกของคุณ

ลายมือชื่อของหัวหน้าฝ่ายบริหารของโรงเรียน

วันที่

ลายมือชื่อของผู้ช่วยหัวหน้าฝ่ายบริหารของโรงเรียน

วันที่

ลายมือชื่อของหัวหน้าส่วนโรงเรียนมัธยม

วันที่

ลายมือชื่อของผู้วิจัย:

ข้าพเจ้าได้อธิบายถึงการวิจัยนี้อย่างดีที่สุดที่ข้าพเจ้าจะทำได้ ข้าพเจ้าได้เชิญให้ถามคำถามและได้ให้คำตอบ

ข้าพเจ้าเชื่อว่าผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยเข้าใจอย่างถ่องแท้ว่าการเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยนี้เกี่ยวข้องกับสิ่งใด ความเสี่ยงที่เป็นไปได้ใดๆ
ของการวิจัยนี้ และเชื่อว่าเขาหรือเธอได้เลือกที่จะเข้ามาอยู่ในการวิจัยนี้อย่างอิสระ

ลายมือชื่อของผู้วิจัยหลัก

วันที่

Appendix C: Participant Recruitment Email

Dear Students,

The following request for your participation in a research study is made on behalf of Ms. Farrah Collette, who, in addition to being a teacher at Morehouse International School, is also a student in the Department of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland. She is conducting a research project called *Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand* for the completion of her master's degree under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman. The purpose of the study is to know more about how international school students figure out how they belong to the different cultures they experience between their home and school.

I am contacting you to invite you to participate in Ms. Farrah's research that focuses on how you experience culture between your home and family and school. Total participation in the research will require a total of two or three hours of your time, which will be spread out across approximately 6-8 weeks. You may decide to participate in **one, some, all, or no** aspects of the data collection described below.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please reply to Ms. Farrah by email at farrahc@rism.ac.th, in person at R308.

What you have to do to participate:

The data collection will begin in February and the anticipated start date is February 15th, the end date of participation is April 12th, 2019; the total length of extra time required of participation is approximately 1 hour 30 minutes to 2 hours spread out across this time frame. Observations occur in classrooms and activities your child is already involved in, so this time is not calculated in their time commitment.

You will be observed during one or two of your regularly scheduled classes and possibly during an outside-of classroom activity or club you participate in. Observation happens in your regularly scheduled times so does not require extra time on your part. You will be asked to do one or two personal interviews of 45 minutes, one focus group interview of 45 minutes, and submit one, private video journal of yourself discussing the topic, above, according to your desired length (suggested length is 30-45 minutes). All observations and interviews will be located on campus, and interviews will be held according to your availability during Flex Block time, study blocks, lunch, or after school. Video journals can be done wherever you like, as long as they do not film anyone else besides yourself due to consent reasons.

Participation eligibility:

According to this research, you are a third culture kid if your life experience requires the negotiation of more than one culture into your identity and experience. Because this study focuses on how students experience culture(s) at home that differ from Western culture at school, at least one culture at home must be “non-Western”. If you are in Ms. Farrah’s class, you are ineligible to participate in the study.

If you choose to participate in the study, you and your parent/guardian will be asked to give your free and informed signed consent. You can contact Ms. Farrah for a consent form, or print out the consent form yourself; before you participate you or your parent must return the hard copy signed by both yourself and your parent or guardian.

You are not required to participate if you do not wish to, even if you parent gives permission. It is neither a school nor IB requirement that you participate, and the decision whether or not to participate will not be reported to other teachers or students.

Participation benefits:

- Knowledge gain with graduate-level research, which will help with university prep and personal research knowledge.
- Your participation adds to current Academic research about cultural identity negotiation for international school students like yourself.
- You get to have your voice heard anonymously about challenges with cultural identity, and have the opportunity to review your interviews and help make adjustments as a participant.
- Your participation can help current and future international students like you, because teachers and administrators have the chance to better understand how you balance and negotiate culture.
- It is rewarding to have the chance to better understand the ways you overcome challenging cultural transitions

Participation risks:

- Difficulty or discomfort to talk about personal challenges experienced as a culturally diverse individual.

The interview questions are designed so that participants feel comfortable to answer and have the choice on what to share, and participants will not be required to answer questions if they feel uncomfortable to do so.

Benefits and Risks are further detailed on the attached consent letter.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact Ms. Farrah by email at farrahc@rism.ac.th, or by phone at 097-078-7537. If you would like to visit me in person, you can find me on campus in MIST 308.

Thank-you in advance for considering this request,

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr.chair@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

Appendix D: Parent Recruitment Email

Dear Parents of IB Diploma and Certificate Students,

The following request for your child's participation in a research study is made on behalf of Ms. Farrah Collette, who, in addition to being a teacher at Morehouse International School, is also a student in the Department of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland. She is conducting a research project called *Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand* for the completion of her master's degree under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman. The purpose of the study is to know more about how international school students figure out how they belong to the different cultures they experience between their home and school.

I am contacting you to invite your child to participate in Ms. Farrah's research that focuses on how your child experiences culture between home and family and school. Total participation in the research will require a total of two or three hours of your time, which will be spread out across approximately 6-8 weeks. You may decide to participate in **one, some, all, or no** aspects of the data collection described below.

If your child is interested in participating in this study, please reply to Ms. Farrah by email at farrahc@rism.ac.th, in person at M308.

What your child will be asked to do to:

The data collection will begin in February and the anticipated start date is February 15th, the end date of participation is April 12th, 2019; the total length of extra time required of participation is approximately 1 hour 30 minutes to 2 hours spread out across this time frame. Observations occur in classrooms and activities your child is already involved in, so this time is not calculated in their time commitment.

Your child will be observed during one or two of their regularly scheduled classes and possibly during an outside-of classroom activity or club you participate in. Observation happens in their regularly scheduled times so does not require extra time on your part. You will be asked to do one or two personal interviews of 45 minutes, one focus group interview of 45 minutes, and submit one, private video journal of yourself discussing the topic, above, according to your desired length (suggested length is 30-45 minutes). All observations and interviews will be located on campus, and interviews will be held according to your availability during Flex Block time, study blocks, lunch, or after school. Video journals can be done wherever your child likes, as long as they do not film anyone else besides yourself due to consent reasons.

Participation eligibility:

According to this research, your child is a third culture kid if their life experience requires the negotiation of more than one culture into their identity and experience. Because this study focuses on how students experience culture(s) at home that differ from Western culture at school, at least one culture at home must be “non-Western”. If your child is in Ms. Farrah’s class, they are ineligible to participate in the study.

If your child chooses to participate in the study, you must also give your parent/guardian free and informed signed consent. You can contact Ms. Farrah for a consent form, or print out the attached consent form yourself; before your child participates you or your child must return the hard copy signed by both yourself and your child. A copy of the consent form will be made and shared with you and one shared with your child.

Your child is not required to participate if they do not wish to, even if your give parental permission. It is neither a school nor IB requirement that your child participates, and the decision whether or not to participate will not be reported to other teachers or students.

Participation benefits:

- Knowledge gain with graduate-level research, which will help with university prep and personal research knowledge.
- Your child’s participation adds to current Academic research about cultural identity negotiation for international school students like yourself.
- Your child gets to have their voice heard anonymously about challenges with cultural identity, and have the opportunity to review interviews and help make adjustments as a participant.
- Your child’s participation can help current and future international students, because teachers and administrators have the chance to better understand how you balance and negotiate culture.
- It is rewarding to have the chance to better understand the ways your child overcomes challenging cultural transitions

Participation risks:

- Difficulty or discomfort to talk about personal challenges experienced as a culturally diverse individual.

The interview questions are designed so that participants feel comfortable to answer and have the choice on what to share, and participants will not be required to answer questions if they feel uncomfortable to do so.

Benefits and Risks are further detailed on the attached consent letter.

If you have any questions about me or my project, please contact me by email at farrahc@rism.ac.th, fcc837@mun.ca, or by phone at 097-078-7537. If you would like to visit me in person, you can find me on campus in MIST 308.

Thank-you in advance for considering this request,

Farrah Collette

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr.chair@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

Appendix E: Parent Recruitment Email in Thai

เรียนผู้ปกครองของนักเรียนหลักสูตร IB

คำร้องขอต่อไปนี้เพื่อให้บุตรของท่านมีส่วนร่วมในการวิจัยทำขึ้นในนามของ น.ส. ฟาร์ราห์ คอลเล็คต์ ผู้ที่
นอกจากการเป็นครูที่ร่วมจัด ยังเป็นนักศึกษาในคณะศึกษาศาสตร์ที่มหาวิทยาลัยเมโมเรียลแห่งรัฐนิวฟันด์แลนด์
เธอกำลังดำเนินโครงการวิจัยชื่อ เด็กวัฒนธรรมที่สามที่ปรับเรื่องของอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนในโรงเรียนนานาชาติในประเทศไทย
เพื่อขอจบการศึกษาระดับปริญญาโทภายใต้การกำกับดูแลของ ดร. เอลิซาเบธ ยีโอแมน
วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัยนี้คือการเรียนรู้เพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับวิถีที่นักเรียนในโรงเรียนนานาชาติรู้ได้อย่างไรว่าพวกเขาเป็นสมาชิก
ของวัฒนธรรมที่ต่างกันซึ่งพวกเขาได้สัมผัสระหว่างที่บ้านและโรงเรียน

ข้าพเจ้าติดต่อคุณมาเพื่อขอเชิญบุตรของคุณให้เข้าร่วมในการวิจัยของ น.ส. ฟาร์ราห์
ซึ่งมุ่งความสนใจไปที่วิธีการที่บุตรของคุณได้สัมผัสกับวัฒนธรรมระหว่างที่บ้านและโรงเรียน
การมีส่วนร่วมโดยรวมทั้งหมดในการวิจัยนี้จะต้องใช้เวลาของคุณทั้งหมดสองหรือสามชั่วโมง
ซึ่งจะใช้เวลาไปในระยะเวลาประมาณ 6-8 สัปดาห์ คุณอาจเลือกที่จะมีส่วนร่วมในแง่มุมแง่เดียว แง่มุมบางแง่มุม
แง่มุมทั้งหมด หรือไม่เลยแม้แต่แง่มุมเดียวของการรวบรวมข้อมูลที่อธิบายไว้ที่ด้านล่างนี้

หากบุตรของคุณสนใจที่จะเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยนี้ โปรดตอบกลับไปยัง น.ส. ฟาร์ราห์ ทางอีเมลที่ farrahc@rism.ac.th
หรือด้วยตัวเองที่ห้อง M308

สิ่งที่เราขอให้นักเรียนของคุณทำ:

การรวบรวมข้อมูลจะเริ่มขึ้นในเดือนกุมภาพันธ์และวันเริ่มต้นที่คาดการณ์ไว้คือวันที่ 15 กุมภาพันธ์

วันสิ้นสุดของการมีส่วนร่วมคือวันที่ 15 เมษายน พ.ศ. 2562

ระยะเวลาโดยรวมของเวลาที่จำเป็นของการมีส่วนร่วมอยู่ที่ประมาณ 1 ชั่วโมง 30 นาที จนถึง 2 ชั่วโมง

โดยใช้เวลาไปในกรอบเวลานี้ การสังเกตการณ์นั้นเกิดขึ้นในชั้นเรียนและกิจกรรมต่างๆ ที่บุตรของคุณเกี่ยวข้องอยู่แล้ว

ดังนั้นเวลาที่ท่านจึงไม่ได้คำนวณในการมีส่วนร่วมของพวกเขา

บุตรของคุณจะถูกสังเกตการณ์ระหว่างชั้นเรียนที่กำหนดเวลาไว้ตามปกติหนึ่งหรือสองชั้นเรียน

และอาจเป็นไปได้ระหว่างกิจกรรมนอกชั้นเรียนหรือสโมสรที่คุณเข้าไปมีส่วนร่วม

การสังเกตการณ์นั้นเกิดขึ้นในเวลาที่กำหนดไว้ตามปกติ ดังนั้นจึงไม่จำเป็นต้องใช้เวลาพิเศษของคุณ

เราจะขอให้คุณรับการสัมภาษณ์ส่วนบุคคลหนึ่งหรือสองครั้งเป็นเวลา 45 นาที การสัมภาษณ์กลุ่มหนึ่งครั้งเป็นเวลา 45 นาที

และสัปดาห์ที่ประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอส่วนบุคคลของคุณเองหนึ่งเรื่องซึ่งพูดถึงหัวข้อ ที่ระบุไว้ข้างต้น ตามระยะเวลาที่คุณต้องการ

(ระยะเวลาที่แนะนำคือ 30-45 นาที) การสังเกตการณ์และการสัมภาษณ์ทั้งหมดจะอยู่ในบริเวณโรงเรียน

และการสัมภาษณ์จะจัดให้มีขึ้นตามความพร้อมของคุณระหว่างช่วงเวลาตามกรอบที่ยืดหยุ่นได้ กรอบเวลาชั่วโมงเรียน

ช่วงเวลาอาหารกลางวัน หรือหลังโรงเรียนเลิก บันทึกประจำวันผ่านวิดีโอนั้นทำได้เมื่อใดก็ตามที่บุตรของคุณต้องการ

ทราบเท่าที่พวกเขาไม่ได้ถ่ายภาพคนอื่นนอกจากตัวคุณเองเนื่องจากเหตุผลเกี่ยวกับการให้ความยินยอม

การมีสิทธิในการมีส่วนร่วม:

ตามการวิจัยนี้ บุตรของคุณเป็นเด็กวัฒนธรรมที่สาม

ถ้าประสบการณ์ในชีวิตของพวกเขากำหนดให้ต้องปรับตัววัฒนธรรมมากกว่าหนึ่งวัฒนธรรมให้เป็นอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนและประสบ

การณ์ของตนเอง

เนื่องจากการวิจัยนี้มุ่งความสนใจไปที่วิธีการที่นักเรียนได้สัมผัสกับวัฒนธรรมที่บ้านซึ่งแตกต่างไปจากวัฒนธรรมตะวันตกที่โรงเรียน วัฒนธรรมที่บ้านอย่างหนึ่งวัฒนธรรมจะต้อง “ไม่ใช่วัฒนธรรมตะวันตก” หากบุตรของคุณอยู่ในชั้นเรียนของ น.ส. ฟาร์ราห์ พวกเขามีสิทธิ์ที่จะมีส่วนร่วมในการวิจัยนี้

หากบุตรของคุณเลือกที่จะมีส่วนร่วมในการวิจัยนี้

คุณจะต้องให้คำยินยอมอย่างเป็นทางการเป็นอิสระและ โดยได้รับข้อมูลจากบิดามารดา/ผู้ปกครองด้วยเช่นกัน คุณสามารถติดต่อ น.ส. ฟาร์ราห์ สำหรับแบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอม หรือพิมพ์แบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมที่แนบมาด้วยนี้ด้วยตัวคุณเอง ก่อนที่บุตรของคุณจะเข้าร่วมในการวิจัย

คุณหรือบุตรของคุณจะต้องส่งสำเนาฉบับเอกสารที่ทั้งตัวคุณเองและบุตรของคุณลงนามแล้วกลับคืน

เราจะเตรียมและแบ่งปันสำเนาแบบฟอร์มการให้ความยินยอมกับคุณและบุตรของคุณ

บุตรของคุณไม่จำเป็นต้องเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยนี้ถ้าพวกเขาไม่ต้องการ แม้ว่า你会ให้ความยินยอมจากบิดามารดาก็ตาม ทั้งทางโรงเรียนและ IB ต่างก็ไม่ได้มีข้อกำหนดให้บุตรของคุณต้องเข้าร่วมในการวิจัย และเราจะไม่รายงานการตัดสินใจว่าจะเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยหรือไม่ ให้คุณครูหรือนักเรียนคนอื่นๆ ทราบ

ประโยชน์จากการมีส่วนร่วม:

- การได้ความรู้กับการวิจัยระดับปริญญาโท ซึ่งจะช่วยในเรื่องของการเตรียมตัวสอบเข้ามหาวิทยาลัยและความรู้ในการวิจัยส่วนบุคคล
 - การมีส่วนร่วมของบุตรของคุณเป็นการเพิ่มพูนการวิจัยทางวิชาการในปัจจุบันเกี่ยวกับอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนทางวัฒนธรรมสำหรับนักเรียนใน โรงเรียนนานาชาติเช่นตัวคุณเอง
 - บุตรของคุณ ได้รับ โอกาสที่จะแสดงสิทธิและเสียง โดยที่ไม่ต้องเปิดเผยชื่อเกี่ยวกับความท้าทายในเรื่องอัตลักษณ์ตัวตนทางวัฒนธรรม และมีโอกาสที่จะทบทวนการสัมภาษณ์และช่วยให้เกิดการแก้ไขในฐานะผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย
 - การมีส่วนร่วมของบุตรของคุณสามารถช่วยนักเรียนนานาชาติในปัจจุบันและในอนาคตได้
- เนื่องจากคุณครูและผู้บริหารมีโอกาที่จะทำความเข้าใจได้ดียิ่งขึ้นถึงวิธีการที่คุณสร้างสมดุลและปรับให้เข้ากับวัฒนธรรม
- เป็นการคุ้มค่าที่จะได้มีโอกาสทำความเข้าใจได้ดียิ่งขึ้นถึงแนวทางที่บุตรของคุณเอาชนะการเปลี่ยนผ่านทางวัฒนธรรมที่ท้าทาย

ความเสี่ยงจากการมีส่วนร่วม:

- ความยากหรือความไม่สะดวกใจที่จะพูดถึงความท้าทายส่วนบุคคลที่ได้พบในฐานะบุคคลที่มีความหลากหลายทางวัฒนธรรม

คำถามระหว่างการสัมภาษณ์นั้นออกแบบมาเพื่อที่ผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะรู้สึกสะดวกใจที่จะตอบและมีทางเลือกในสิ่งที่จะแบ่งปัน และผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจะไม่จำเป็นต้องตอบคำถามหากพวกเขารู้สึกไม่สะดวกใจที่จะตอบ

ประโยชน์และความเสี่ยงนั้นอธิบายไว้เพิ่มเติมบนจดหมายให้ความยินยอมที่แนบมาด้วย

หากคุณมีคำถามใดๆ เกี่ยวกับโครงการวิจัยของข้าพเจ้า โปรดติดต่อข้าพเจ้าทางอีเมลได้ที่ farrahc@rism.ac.th, fcc837@mun.ca หรือทางโทรศัพท์ที่ 097-078-7537 หากคุณต้องการพบกับข้าพเจ้าด้วยตัวเอง คุณพบกับข้าพเจ้าได้ในโรงเรียนที่ห้อง MIST 308

ขอขอบคุณล่วงหน้าสำหรับการพิจารณาคำร้องขอนี้

ฟาร์ราห์ คอลเล็คต์

ข้อเสนอสำหรับการวิจัยนี้ได้รับการทบทวนจากคณะกรรมการสหวิทยาการว่าด้วยจริยธรรมในการอนุมัติการวิจัยมนุษย์และพบว่า เป็นไปตามนโยบายจริยธรรมของมหาวิทยาลัยแมน โมเรียล หากคุณมีข้อกังวลด้านจริยธรรมเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยนี้ เช่น สิทธิของคุณในฐานะผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย คุณอาจติดต่อประธานของ ICEHR ได้ที่ icehr.chair@mun.ca หรือทางโทรศัพท์ที่ 709-864-2861

Appendix F: Classroom Teacher Permission Request Script

Dear Teachers, Club Advisors, and/or Coaches,

The following request is made on behalf of Farrah Collette for your permission for her to attend one or more of your classes, meetings, rehearsals, or practices for research purposes. Farrah is completing a graduate degree with the Department of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland. She is conducting a research project called *Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand* for the completion of her master's degree under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman. The purpose of the study is to know more about how international school students figure out how they belong to the different cultures they experience between their home and school.

I am contacting you to ask for your permission to allow Farrah into your classroom, club, meeting, rehearsal, or sports practice to observe one or more of her student participants between now and April 12th, 2019. **Please reply via email to Farrah at farrahc@rism.ac.th to indicate whether or not you would permit her to observe her participant in your classroom or extracurricular activity. If so, Farrah will suggest a period during which she can come to observe her participant during a class or meeting time that the participant has with you.**

She will only observe and take field notes on her participant(s), and is not permitted to collect data from students who are not her participants, nor is she permitted to collect any form of data from you or your lesson. No data whatsoever will be collected from you, which also includes any personally identifiable information regarding whose class or activity a participant is attending; your personal teaching strategies, pedagogy, or philosophies will not be recorded, nor is this the object of observation for her research. Her presence in your classroom is for the sole purpose of observing one or more of her participants in terms of how their speech and behaviour relates to their experience negotiating cultural identities. Her research focuses on describing empowering processes and strategies that her participants use to successfully negotiate cultures between home and school, and in no way will the final report mention you or your personal class.

At the beginning of the lesson, Farrah will explain why she is present using the following script:

Hello, in addition to being a teacher at the school, I am also a graduate student in the Department of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland, located in Newfoundland, Canada. Within Education, my specialty area is Social Justice, and I research how students of diverse cultural backgrounds negotiate different cultures into their identities and life experiences. I am conducting a research project called Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International

School in Thailand. My research is supervised by Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman, and has been approved by Memorial University's Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research.

I am here today to observe and collect data on one or more of my participants attending your class / club activity, and for the sake of confidentiality I cannot reveal to you who my participants are. As I am here, any student who has not given me signed consent to be a participant will be excluded from my data, and your teacher / advisor / coach is also excluded from my data. What this means is that I cannot record any data from you or your teacher if you are not my participant. If you are my participant, you already know why I am here, but I must reiterate that you are not permitted to reveal yourself or other participants to your peers who are non-participants because all efforts must be made for your identity to remain anonymous in my report. Thank you for allowing me to attend your class today. While I am here I will be recording my field notes from observation and will obstruct your class / meeting / practice as little as possible.

If you would like to read my final report, it will be available at Memorial University's Queen Elizabeth II library, and can be accessed online at: <http://collections.mun.ca/cdm/search/collection/theses>. You can also provide me with your email address today, at the end of the session, and I am happy to email you an electronic version of the final report. Thank you to your teacher / advisor / coach, who, for the purpose of observing my participants, has allowed me to join you today.

For the sake of participant confidentiality, Farrah is not permitted to reveal the identities of her participant(s) to you, as participants and their parents/guardians have consented to the student's participation under the conditions of confidentiality listed on their consent letter. Farrah kindly requests your understanding and support in this matter.

Because key participants of the study are students and not teachers, follow-up interviews with teachers will not be conducted; however, the final research report will be shared with all teachers of observed classrooms, via email, and will also be available at Memorial University's Queen Elizabeth II library, and can be accessed online at: <http://collections.mun.ca/cdm/search/collection/theses>.

Please feel free to ask her any questions about the research before you decide to allow her into your instructional class; you can ask questions to her via email or in person in her classroom M308.

Thank you, kindly, for considering this request,

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and found to be in compliance with

Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr.chair@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

Appendix G: Instructional Time Observation Introduction Script

Hello, in addition to being a teacher at the school, I am also a graduate student in the Department of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland, located in Newfoundland, Canada. Within Education, my specialty area is Social Justice, and I research how students of diverse cultural backgrounds negotiate different cultures into their identities and life experiences.

I am conducting a research project called Third Culture Kids Negotiating Identities in an International School in Thailand. My research is supervised by Dr. Elizabeth Yeoman, and has been approved by Memorial University's Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research.

I am here today to observe and collect data on one or more of my participants attending your class / club activity, and for the sake of confidentiality I cannot reveal to you who my participants are.

As I am here, any student who has not given me signed consent to be a participant will be excluded from my data, and your teacher / advisor / coach is also excluded from my data. What this means is that I cannot record any data from you or your teacher if you are not my participant. If you are my participant, you already know why I am here, but I must reiterate that you are not permitted to reveal yourself or other participants to your peers who are non-participants because all efforts must be made for your identity to remain anonymous in my report.

Thank you for allowing me to attend your class today. While I am here I will be recording my field notes from observation and will obstruct your class / meeting / practice as little as possible.

If you would like to read my final report, it will be available at Memorial University's Queen Elizabeth II library, and can be accessed online at: <http://collections.mun.ca/cdm/search/collection/theses>. You can also provide me with your email address today, at the end of the session, and I am happy to email you an electronic version of the final report.

Thank you to your teacher / advisor / coach, who, for the purpose of observing my participants, has allowed me to join you today.

Appendix H: Interview Topics Domains and Questions

Research Question One: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the relationship of the multiple cultures students negotiate into their identity?

To participant(s): For all the answers you give, it is required and extremely important that you do not identify others in your answers. You can say things like “my friends” or “my family” or “my teachers”, but you cannot state their names, or say any details about them. The information you give me cannot identify other people, because they have not given consent to their information or personal identities to be collected for this research.

Research Question One: What constitutes being a Third Culture Kid (TCK), and how does being a TCK influence the relationship of the multiple cultures students negotiate into their identity?

Topic Domain One: Cultural Identity Negotiation Issues

Lead-off question: Without naming specific people other than yourself, can you describe a time where you have had to change the way you act at home or school because there are different things expected by each culture? Tell me as many details as you can about that situation. What did you say and do?

[Covert categories: beliefs of cultural norms, opinions on speaking English at school, expectations for home culture versus school culture, strategies for how to identify with school culture versus strategies for how to identity with home culture]

Possible follow-up questions:

8. How does it feel to have to fit into more than one culture?
9. Do your peers have to fit into more than one culture?
10. Do you feel more understood by people who have to fit into more than one culture?
11. Are there certain kinds of people that you think don't understand how you feel when trying to fit into one culture?
12. Do you feel like you belong to one culture more than another?
13. Can you describe some things from each culture that you appreciate the most?
14. Can you describe some things from each culture that you find the most difficult to deal with?

Research Question Two: How might hegemonic educational practices influence cultural identity negotiation?

Topic Domain Two: Cultural Hegemony and Educational Practices

Lead-off question: Have you ever felt like you don't fully belong to one culture? Describe what happened as if you were trying to give me as much of a detailed story as possible.

[Covert categories: feelings of cultural belonging, feelings of cultural displacement, personal values placed on culture, preferred cultural norms, feelings of being misunderstood, sociocultural insecurity, value placed on language acquisition, beliefs on economic power associated with cultural capital, issues relating to the literacy myth]

Possible follow-up questions:

9. Can you describe an experience you had where you didn't feel understood because of your culture?
10. Are there any traditions or events you do with your family that you find difficult because of your cultural identity?
11. Are there times at school where you feel the cultural expectations are in conflict with the cultural expectations at home?
12. How would you place value on Western education?
13. Do you think you are more successful because you have a Western education?
14. What are your opinions on the extent to which learning English will open doors for your future?
15. How do you think attending a Western school is perceived in the culture of your family?
16. Do you remember a time when you found it difficult to understand a new concept in school because the example given was too Western?

Research Question Three: How can educators help TCKs maintain a strong sense of their family culture (primary culture) while also negotiating the exposure to dominant local and globalized cultures at school?

Topic Domain Three: Enablement of Home and School Cultures

Lead-off question: Can you tell me about a time at school where you felt like your family culture was best understood? Pretend you have to give me the full amount of detail so I can understand a vivid snapshot of this experience you had, but remember not to reveal the identities of others.

[Covert categories: feelings on being culturally understood, success in cultural identity negotiation, educator strategies on how to empower students' multiple cultural identities, benefits of associating with peer TCKs, school practices or pedagogy that help foster culturally

empowering environments for TCK students, perceived educator strategies on how to recognize the importance of cultural identity]

Possible follow-up questions:

6. Think about a time when you felt like understood your culture was best understood by teachers. Can you tell me the story about this experience? Include as many details about your experience as possible, but remember not to reveal the identities of others.
7. Do you remember any experiences in a class where teachers talked about how culture is important to you and your classmates? How did this make you feel? Remember not to reveal the identities of others.
8. Are there any school events that you think help bring your family culture to your school experience?
9. What would you suggest teachers could do to make you feel like they understand your challenges of belonging to more than one culture? Don't talk about specific teachers, but instead talk about specific strategies any or all teacher(s) could do.
10. How does it make you feel when teachers use examples in class that relate to your family's culture? Can you think of any examples that you could give me details on? Be specific about your experience, but do not reveal the identities of others.

Appendix I: Individual Audio/Video Journal Participant Directions

Dear Participant:

Thank you for participating in the data collection for my research. This portion of the data collection is called a “Participant Video Diary”. What this means is that you will record yourself talking about the main focus questions of this research.

What is very important is that you do not record anyone else besides yourself; this includes things like their voices in the background, faces or bodies in the background, or people in the video frame with yourself. It is important that you only record yourself because others have not given their signed consent to participate in this research. Please don’t say your name in the video. It is only the audio in your video that will be transcribed so showing your own face is okay.

*Make sure you only talk about your experience and that you don’t give the names of your parents, your siblings, your friends, or your teachers. It is fine to say a generic thing like “my parents” or “my sibling” or “my friends” or “my teachers”, but do not name them and be careful not to give specific information about them that would lead others to determining their specific identity. Please also refrain from saying your name in the video, or saying anything that could be used to identify you personally.

You have the freedom to talk about anything you think is relevant to one, some, or all of these questions below. If you have other ideas you want to add about the topic of ‘negotiating cultures’ that are not in the questions below, you can talk about those, too, or instead of the suggestions below.

Research Question One:

Without naming names, how does it feel for you, personally, to belong to and negotiate between your culture at home and the Western culture at school?

Research Question Two:

Without naming names, do you feel like there are any experiences you have at school in which you have had some cultural conflicts between how each of your cultures normally expect you to act?

Research Question Three:

Without naming names, can you talk about experiences at school where you felt like you had the chance to benefit from Western culture, but also felt like your home culture was validated?

As you record yourself talking about the above questions, please feel free to organize and format what you say in a way that makes sense to you. A suggested length for your video is 10 -20 minutes’ total, and you can feel free to edit, remove, add, or re-record anything you say before you submit the final video to me, electronically, via your password protected email.

Due date for video: April 1st, 2019.

These interview questions are designed so that participants feel comfortable to answer and have the choice on what to share, and participants will not be required to answer questions if they feel uncomfortable to do so. If discomfort does occur, appropriate school resources are available for participants' assistance: a participant may contact either the High School section head (Mr. Jim O'Malley in H111A) or the Head of School (Mr. Dan Smith in AD206) if they need assistance, and a participant may also contact the Student Services Office (located in AD309) in person to seek professional counselling.

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr.chair@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

Appendix J: School Vision, Mission, and Commitments

School Vision: Morehouse International School will be known globally as a hallmark of international education, nurturing intellectual development, moral character, and physical well-being, while fostering compassion through action and shaping the lives of tomorrow's leaders.

School Mission: Morehouse International school provides an interfaith, inclusive, and academically rigorous education for students to be balanced, successful, and compassionate individuals.

School Commitments:

1. We will nurture a safe, positive, inclusive learning environment that challenges, engages, and supports ALL community members as individuals and embraces diversity such as ability level, age, faith, gender, nationality, sexuality, or race.
2. We will collaborate with a focus on learning to ensure all students have the necessary support for growth and development.
3. We will be open-minded and reflective about our practices.
4. We will assess and report learning based on evidence of learning; we will assess and report behaviors based on evidence of behaviors.
5. We will engage and support families as partners in the education of each child's head, hands, and heart.
 - a. Head: (Knowledge). We are: creative, critical thinkers, and open minded.
 - b. Hands: (Skills). We are: effective communicators, collaborative, and resourceful.
 - c. Heart: (Values). We: embrace diversity, lead a happy and healthy life, and help others.
6. We will use assessments and evidence collaboratively to guide instructional design and monitor student progress to ensure learning for all students.
7. We will ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum, co-curricular programs, and service learning experiences that engage and empower every student to be a balanced, successful, and compassionate individual.