

Mining the present: Reconstructing progressive education in an era of global change

Laura A. Edwards*

Michigan State University

Kyle A. Greenwalt**

Michigan State University

Abstract

This paper explores what might be seen as a paradox at the heart of the current push to “globalize” education: at a moment when administrators, especially in higher education, are seeking to globalize their programs (often for reasons having to do with increasing international competition and decreasing funding for education), global education offers a window through which progressive ideals might be re-asserted in increasingly standardized teaching and learning environments. To demonstrate, we offer our own attempts to globalize our teaching practice, through both personal and historical narratives. Ultimately, the paper seeks to complicate global education—both historical and contemporary versions—as we draw upon the work of John Dewey in an attempt to reconstruct our own particular version of a location-specific, globally minded, progressive education practice.

Keywords: Global education, teacher education, progressive education

* Laura A. Edwards is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Teacher Education at Michigan State University In the United States. Laura's work focuses on comparative and international perspectives on education. Her dissertation explores the implementation of early childhood education programs in Tanzania. Prior to beginning her doctoral studies, she taught early elementary grades in Phoenix, Arizona.

** Kyle A. Greenwalt is an associate professor in the Department of Teacher Education at Michigan State University In the United States. His work explores curriculum through narratives of lived experience. Kyle has taught and done research in Hungary, France, and the United States.

Correspondence: greenwlt@msu.edu

Mining the present: Reconstructing progressive education in an era of global change

Recently, the first author of this essay spoke with a department chair at a major research university. The talk turned to the first author's work in global education, to which the chair responded, "My dean said I have to globalize our teacher education program, but what does that really mean?"

What *does* this mean, indeed? The dialogues around teacher preparation often involve questions about study and teaching abroad opportunities, preparing teaching candidates and k-12 students for the challenges of international job markets, and considering the methods of teaching math in Asia. But is *this* global education? We believe that global education must be more than this. In this paper, we ask what that "more" might be, and do so through the lens of Deweyan progressive education.

This paper therefore explores what might be seen as the paradox at the heart of the current push to "globalize" education: at a moment when administrators, especially in higher education, are seeking to *globalize* their programs (often for reasons having to do with increasing international competition and decreasing funding for education), *global education* offers a window through which progressive ideals might be re-asserted in an increasingly standardized teaching and learning environment in the United States (and perhaps in other places as well). We believe that this pressure "to globalize" presents, perhaps paradoxically, new possibilities for a globally-minded progressive education.

Our paper is divided into four sections. In the first section, we introduce and talk about our own attempts to "globalize" our teaching by examining work we do in an experimental teacher education program at Michigan State University. Next, we locate the historical precedents for that work as we analyze prior waves of research on global education, and examine its essential contributions to progressive pedagogy during the Cold War era in North America. In the third section, we seek to complicate work in global education—both historical and contemporary versions—as we draw upon the work of John Dewey in an attempt to reconstruct our own particular version of a location-specific, globally minded, progressive education practice. We conclude the essay in the fourth and final section with the implications for future work in both pre-service teacher education and progressive education in a global context.

Making "Global Education" Concrete: A Narrative Examination of Our Own Work

Our interest in global education as an opportunity to reconstruct progressive ideals for the present time emerges out of our work at Michigan State University, where we both teach in the College of Education's newly constituted, globally focused teacher preparation track.¹ In this section, we discuss our experiences from within our particular institutional location, as teachers of a particular course, talking to a particular group of pre-service teacher candidates. Because this paper draws much of its inspiration due to the murky nature of verb, "to

globalize,” we will leave, for the moment, all references to “the global” undefined and untroubled. We ask our readers’ forbearance in this, as it is an issue we will return to later in the paper.

In order to write this section, we have drawn broadly from the tradition of narrative inquiry, particularly as conceptualized by Jean Clandinin and Michael Connelly (2000). As these authors note, “. . . experience is the stories people live. People live stories, and in the telling of these stories, reaffirm them, modify them, and create new ones. Stories lived and told educate the self and others . . .” (p. xxvi). Therefore, we bring before the readers the story we have lived together as co-teachers and co-creators of this course, drawing in particular upon the artifacts of our everyday professional life (course syllabi, assignments, and student work) so as to locate the meaning of our shared work. We tell what we tried to do, and in that telling, suggest what we think we might have accomplished—understanding, of course, that each one of our students would talk about the course in ways differently than we have.

Contextual Features of Our Work

In the fall of 2008, Michigan State University admitted its first cohort of students to its newly instituted, experimental teacher preparation track, the Global Educators Cohort Program (GECP).² These students enrolled in special global sections of the standard set of courses taken by pre-service candidates at the University. They were additionally required to have a global experience, which is generally understood to be some type of international study trip, as well as attend extra-curriculum sessions that seek to cultivate a global perspective. In all of their clinical work, up to and including their student teaching, candidates would be given global field placements.

Beginning with the second cohort of admitted students, pre-service candidates in the GECP were also required to take two additional, GECP-specific courses in their second year of university study. These courses are meant to be early-program capstone experiences. In the fall semester of 2010, we designed and taught the first iteration of one of the second-year capstone courses. The title of the course is *TE 352: Immigration, Language, and Culture*.

The course itself pre-existed the GECP, previously being offered to pre-service candidates wishing to focus on literacy instruction. While our own section of TE 352 was open only to candidates in the GECP, our first task was to imagine the ways in which a course with this title might be used to leverage issues in global education and program goals. That is, we had to “infuse” global education into a pre-existing slot within the university curriculum—a strategy that pre-shadows the primary approach we took when talking to the candidates about the prospects of enacting progressive global education in their own future schools and classrooms.

In the opening of the syllabus,³ we decided to address our students, teaching candidates, in this manner:

This course seeks to add to your knowledge of global education by both synthesizing and expanding upon your prior learning and beliefs. In this course, we will start with *children* and their needs. In particular, we will focus our discussion on the children of immigrants. As teachers, we interact with children via the creation of a *curriculum*. The context for this course is, therefore, *pedagogical*: we will ask how children and the curriculum can be brought together in order to create rich and varied learning experiences.

In so doing, we attempted to take an institutional space that had previously been devoted to “Minority language communities and cultures. Family literacy issues and values. Emergent and adolescent literacy development. Parenting and parental involvement. Home-school connection. Family literacy programs,” and reframe it into a specifically progressive context, whereby we follow Dewey’s famous dictum to see that “the child and the curriculum are simply two limits which define a single process” (1902/2001, p. 109).

The Intended and Enacted Curriculum

Like many university-based teacher education courses, we worked to model for the candidates our own vision of “good teaching”: learner-centered, activity-based teaching. Substantively, we chose research and writing that we hoped would focus the candidates on classic definitions of global education, the salient characteristics of (immigrant) children as learners, (second-)language learning, and the importance of travel and life-long learning for (global) educators.

Like pre-service teacher candidates in our larger teacher education program, GECP students are overwhelmingly white. The GECP admits students preparing to teach anywhere on the P-12 public school spectrum, as well as special education teachers. Yet the majority of the candidates are females who wish to gain an elementary teaching license. A majority of the candidates are from southeastern Michigan, most coming from suburban or exurban locations in the larger Detroit Metropolitan area.

Through research, conversation with candidates, and some good old-fashioned guesswork, we had some notion of what might attract candidates to a special teacher preparation program grounded in global education. For some candidates, it was an “easier” route by which to gain formal admittance to a program with relatively high entrance standards. For others, attraction to the program was based on the notion that an additional credential would set them apart in a relatively tight hiring market. But for a bulk of our candidates, we also knew that they were drawn to the cohort by their past experiences, and future desires, for international travel.⁴ This was the “raw material” from which we would work.

Our course is committed to working with this “raw material.” In our first offerings of the course, we showed the students Google Earth Tours, which we had created about our own lives—the places we have lived, learned and loved, and the experiences that have made us

who we are today.⁵ We then spent time teaching students to construct their own tours. The results of this project astounded us by the richness of the experiences present in the class. This richness ranged from candidates who have done faith-based social justice work in other parts of the globe, to candidates who were born while their parents were working overseas; from candidates who have taken Caribbean cruises, to candidates who have never left the state of Michigan. Whatever the scenario, we encouraged them to mine the locations of their lives for the experiences that have led them to an interest in global education.

Such early initial conversations had multiple purposes. Foremost, perhaps, is the effect it had on us as instructors. For in viewing the concreteness of a single life, and the emotions and desire invested in them, we were immediately pulled up short of typecasting our students. Second, we were able to introduce seminal readings about the nature of global education and to build upon their own life experiences as we sought to define what it is exactly that makes global education “global” (Chase, 1993; Pike & Selby, 1999). Finally, we were able to have candidates compare their experiences to those presented in a film we watched, *The Short Life of José Antonio Gutierrez* (Specogna, 2006), a film that is particularly good about raising the question of “who is a U.S. American,” and about troubling notions of unidirectional cultural assimilation.

Another example of a way we encouraged candidates to become more aware of their thoughts and definitions of global education was our next course assignment—a Global Educator’s Creed. Each candidate wrote, in their capacity as a global educator, to future parents or students in a letter or newsletter format, providing a statement that addresses their vision and practices as a global educator.⁶ As part of their statement, we asked them to imagine and explain what global education is, why globally educated people might be needed, and what that education could look like in their own concrete practice. This creed was then revised or re-written at the end of the course, to encourage a revisiting of their beliefs and goals as they developed as teaching candidates.

Having worked to locate our own salient life experiences, we then moved to research which would help the class start to understand better the salient life experiences of their future students, and, as noted above, most particularly immigrant children (Florez & Burt, 2001; Hatch, 2007; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Taylor, Bernhard, Garg, & Cummins, 2008; Valdés, 1998). Based upon these readings and our discussions, candidates were asked to create Immigrant Student Questionnaires.⁷ This task was meant to help students “think like a teacher,” and to see the importance of concrete knowledge of individual children as a basis from which to plan curricular experiences. The candidates each developed a 10-item questionnaire designed for future students. After each question, candidates provided a research-based rationale for each question, using both course materials and life experiences to support their argument. Then they wrote about how the information gathered would help them better respond to the needs of their own students.

We then returned to the notion of formal curricula, reviewing with students the distinction between a problems-based curriculum *integrated around* global issues versus a

disciplinary-based curriculum *infused with* global issues. For example, an interdisciplinary unit, based on the problem of *creating an equitable global water supply*, and which draws upon the various disciplines in its search for meaning and solutions, might be compared to a disciplinary-based unit that examines scientific knowledge as it relates to the water cycle, bringing in issues of the equity and quality of the water supply as an extension, where possible (Pike & Selby, 1999). Both approaches can be successful. The integrated approach of creating an interdisciplinary unit around the problem of equitable water supply, however, has the advantage of being more holistic in its approach to knowledge and action, and more directly addressing issues of global social justice.

In particular, we used these discussions to try and imagine what value global education might have in an era where school administrators are forced to be so cognizant of meeting standardized benchmarks and school-testing goals. Alongside the pragmatic advantages of infusion over integration, we also had our students read an article by David Ferrero (2006) on high-performing schools in Chicago that attempted to overcome the progressive/traditional debate by a careful mix of different types of learning experiences and community-building around shared values.

We closed the course by talking about travel opportunities and the meaning of teaching as community development work. To structure those discussions, we asked students to read about the life of Paul Farmer, as documented in Tracy Kidder's (2009) book, *Mountains Beyond Mountains*. In the candidates' final exam, they wrote about Farmer's work in global health, and they were asked to find connections between his life and the life they might hope to lead as a teacher.

Summary

In this section, we have shared what we attempted to do in our course, and some of the things that happened in the teaching of that course, particularly as it relates to getting to know our students. In this way, we have suggested what global education and progressive education looks like in our institutionally situated lives.

As noted, however, we have left the larger question of what "globalizing" education really means unaddressed. In order to start to do just that, we next turn to a discussion of the development of global education as a formal field of learning, teaching and research.

Global Education in Historical Context

Global education emerged as a reform movement in the 1960s in the United States. Seminal scholars whose work shaped the field were anchored at Indiana University, Ohio State University, Northwestern University, and the Center for Teaching International Relations in Boulder, Colorado, and included such stalwarts in the field as Lee Anderson, Chadwick Alger, James Becker, Robert E. Freeman, Steven Lamy, and Robert Hanvey. Later scholars, reflecting a more school-based approach and drawing upon transformations enacted

in the United Kingdom and Canada, included Graham Pike, David Selby, Barbara and Kenneth Tye, and Merry Merryfield. These scholars were all united by their insightful descriptions of the deepening of global interconnectedness, the rise of global systems, and the increased importance of non-state actors in these various processes, across the second half of the twentieth century.

The field itself is sometimes traced back to the November 1968 issue of the journal *Social Education*, an issue whose theme was “international education for the twenty-first century” (Gaudelli, 2003). Robert Hanvey’s seminal work, *An Attainable Global Perspective*, was published in 1975; soon after, in 1979, came Lee Anderson’s classic work, *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age*. Undergirding much of this scholarly work was an incredible amount of local and regional work with teachers around curriculum materials and reform.⁸

Generalizations are always somewhat insipid; in this case, they are unable to capture the richness and excitement of both the scholarly and practical work undertaken at the time. That said, we feel that a return to the history of the field is productive in situating our own current moment, and we therefore hazard a few observations based upon our own reading of the literature—now, at nearly 50 years removed. These include, first, the importance of the Cold War context for the rise of the global education literature, and second, the relatively brief moment of the field’s full flowering, before the onset of the currently dominant global discourse of market-based reforms as the best solution to the problem of radical inequity in outcomes as diverse as GDP, individual measures of happiness, and collective measures of health.

The Cold War Context for the Emergence of the Field

Even a relatively quick glance at the early global education literature shows that the centrality of Soviet-U.S. tensions for the development of the field. Indeed, the threat of nuclear holocaust was mentioned in nearly every piece we read, and in ways that powerfully remind us how fraught the 1960s were with the lived tension of the possibility of instant annihilation.⁹ That said, other themes are also clearly present in this body of work: liberation struggles in the formerly colonized areas of the world (Third-Worldism), technological revolution, and ecological crises (population growth, pesticide use, and even global climate change). The bipolar world is commented upon, but as only one important theme among many other pressing issues. Rather than its sole focus, then, the Cold War should be seen as an insistent background for the development of a U.S.-based, global education literature.

The early work in global education was primarily driven by political scientists with substantive expertise in international relations—scholars who had, it would seem, relatively little prior contact with schools and teachers. The U.S. federal government, in particular, funded some of the work through Part N of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.¹⁰ Much of the early seminal work in global education was long on substance (both in terms of rationales for why global education is needed, and in terms of the key content that should be taught), and, in comparison, relatively short on the process

whereby curriculum materials developed by experts are best transformed into learning experiences for individual, flesh-and-blood teachers and children.¹¹

For those familiar with the history of curriculum studies in the United States, this story should sound familiar. A little less than two years after the 1957 Soviet launch of the Sputnik satellite, the Woods Hole Conference was put on by the National Science Foundation, the United States Office of Education, the U.S. Air Force, and the RAND Corporation (Bruner, 1960). The list of participants, came together to “examine the fundamental processes involved in imparting to young students a sense of the substance and methods of science” (Bruner, 1960, p. vii), excluded school- or university-based curriculum workers. Yet the point here is not that the work of the early global educators was somehow driven by a U.S. Cold War agenda, nor that their work was a “sell out” to a militaristic world view (far from it!); rather, it is to point out the particular social context in which they had to struggle for both academic credibility and the attention of school administrators and teachers.

The Field’s Full Flowering: The Work of Progressive Global Educators at the Conclusion of the Cold-War Era

While it is only one read of the field, in our opinion, global education reached its peak attainments when it started implicitly to re-integrate previous themes from the history of progressive education— both in the U.S., but even more so, internationally— into global education’s prior focus on world systems, global interdependence, and non-state global actors. This reintegration spoke most clearly to the themes of schools as embryonic, socially-just communities, where the growth of children and teachers is put front and center, and sought through conjoint academic study and service to local, national, and global communities.

Two monographs represent, in our opinion, the best of this work: Graham Pike and David Selby’s (1988) *Global Teacher, Global Learner*, and Barbara and Kenneth Tye’s (1992) *Global Education: A Study of School Change*. In combination, these two works spoke clearly to the potential role of the school in effecting both individual growth and positive social change.

Summing up this work, nearly a decade after it first appeared, Pike and Selby (1999) defined global education as the intersection between worldmindedness—“a commitment to the principles of ‘one world,’ in which the interests of individual nations must be viewed in light of the overall needs of the planet” (p. 11)—and child-centeredness—a “lineage that has drawn inspiration from some notable progressive educators in many countries, including John Dewey, Friedrich Froebel, Maria Montessori, A.S. Neill and Leo Tolstoy” (p. 11). Worldmindedness is the experiential acquisition of head and heart knowledge of the locally-grounded and globally-connected planet, while child-centeredness is the acknowledgement that the quest for personal meaning is the best means for constructive change on a world-wide scale. Inner and outer dimensions of individual learning and social change converge, in the quest for a vision of global development that is at once spiritual and economic, all the while

grounded in a commitment to the protection of the Earth itself.

While the impact of this work has not been as widely distributed as we would like, it remains important to educators across the globe. Indeed, as we have seen, we used the work of Pike and Selby in our own global education courses. We view it as the best hope we have for rediscovering the heart and soul of progressive education in our own age of standardization, credentialism, and high-stakes testing. It is therefore back to our own work, as described above, that we wish to return—to view it both in the light of these more recent progressive global educators, as well as through the long shadow cast by Dewey over anyone attempting to do progressive work in our current age.

Working through the Ambiguities of Global Education: A Critique of Our Own Work

We were very fortunate to be able to share our syllabus, and an earlier draft of this paper, with someone whose work has been an inspiration for our own: Graham Pike. His responses were generous, but critical, and moved us to reflect on a variety of issues. Two things that he said stood out. First, this:

I wonder if, in your course, you encourage critiques of economic globalization, or is this phenomenon, in its present dominant forms, just accepted by default? This is often a difficult area for global educators, but if we are to move towards a more equitable and sustainable economic system, I believe we have to help teachers and students begin to develop critiques and look at alternative models of globalization. (2011, personal correspondence)

That is, he questioned the degree to which we engaged in critical discourse around what he called “asymmetrical interconnectedness.”

A second of Pike’s critiques was in direct response to something we wrote in the syllabus. In a section of the syllabus entitled, “Where We Are Coming From,” we had written this:

As the world becomes more interconnected, the ability to work, play and live in different cultures becomes more important. Looked at in a certain manner, we are all “immigrants,” because people today are so mobile, and will all likely encounter unfamiliar cultures and beliefs.

Pike responded in this manner:

I like the idea that “we are all immigrants,” as this draws on historical movements as well as the contemporary necessity for mobility. However, I’m sure you are aware of the need to be sensitive to Native American communities when you make such a statement (unless you are taking a very long historical perspective!). (2011, personal correspondence)

That is, he again questioned the implicit moves we made in our syllabus to “level off” differences that cry out for analysis. In both critiques, Pike is surely right about the dangers inherent in what we were saying to teaching candidates. More to the point, Pike points to the inherent slipperiness in the whole enterprise of “global education,” which can be enacted in a variety of forms, from less to more justice-focused, from an implicit valorization of market-based reform models to a direct challenge of them.

John Dewey himself never addressed “globalizing” discourses, nor ever identified his project as implicating “the global;” yet he nonetheless clearly spoke in ways that resonate with much of what we have discussed in this paper (his critiques of the dangers inherent in educational projects that are institutionalized and that support unthinking acceptance of the status quo). In particular, we think it is important to recall that the early work of Dewey, during his time of greatest concentration on the issues of public schooling, is absolutely clear about the limitations of imagining that a single social institution could simultaneously realize and promote both individual growth and intelligent social change. Rather than an unequivocal victory for public reformers, Dewey saw in the rise of nineteenth-century, state-based public schooling as a danger (1916/1997)—a theme picked up by subsequent scholars, such as Pike and Selby.¹²

In his later work, Dewey re-asserted his faith in bottom-up democratic social relations, and his insistence upon the search for what he calls “the great community.” Here, he acknowledged that “the old Adam,” that is, “the unregenerate element in human nature,” whereby the interests of the few are elevated above the interests of the many, always remains a danger (1927/1954, p. 154). The solution, optimistically, is communication: more talk, more listening, and better attuned action—“the perfecting of the means and ways of communication of meanings so that genuinely shared interest in the consequences of interdependent activities may inform desire and effort and thereby direct action” (1927/1954, p. 155).

Our teaching candidates in the GECP generally loved reading Tracy Kidder’s book about the life and work of Paul Farmer, *Mountains Beyond Mountains*. And it is through this book that we believe a possible reconstruction of our own intentions as progressive teacher educators can be made, in dialogue with the difficulties of enacting a global education practice that is both cognizant of what teaching candidates bring with them to *our* classroom, and the radical inequities likely to be found in *their future* classrooms—classrooms that most surely will include students from around the globe.

As Dewey noted, “the old Adam” is always present with us as teachers and learners. Resisting blind ignorance, becoming aware of how our actions impact thousands (if not millions) of others around the globe, requires the ability to listen and learn—to hear, and come to see, how our actions shape opportunities for equitable living for others. A book like *Mountains Beyond Mountains* vividly brings the consequences of our actions and inactions in the United States to life. And it does so by indicting both structural forces and personal in/action. Its biographical narrative makes you think that you could be the next Paul Farmer,

while at the same time pointing out the insanity of his life, and the utter infeasibility of voluntaristic, individual solutions to the problem of global inequity.

As we ended our course, we asked our teaching candidates to choose a favorite quote from the book, and to reflect on how it helped them understand what global teaching, global learning, and global schooling might look like. There are several scenes and moments of the book that our students often return to, but one in particular seems to capture the complexities and contradictions of global education in a way that we feel Dewey would appreciate. Through it, we hope that our teaching candidates come to understand the importance of a global perspective, and the lived contradictions of the work of teaching— an acknowledgement of ugly human tragedies while still persisting in finding beauty, hope, and a shared sense of humanity:

I straggled out of another ravine and as usual found Farmer waiting for me. He stood at the edge of a cliff, gazing out. I walked over to him. The view from where he stood was immense. Scrims of rain and clouds and swaths of sunlight swept across the yellow mountains in front of us and the yellow mountains beyond these mountains and over the Lac de Péligré. The scene, I realized, would have looked picturesque to me before today. So maybe I'd learned something. Not enough to suit Farmer, I suspect. Education wasn't what he wanted to perform on the world, me included. He was after transformation.

I offered him a slightly moist candy, a Life Saver from my pocket. He took it, and said, "Pineapple! Which, as you know, is my favorite," and then went back to gazing.

He was staring out at the impounded waters of the Artibonite [River]. They stretched off to the east and west and out of sight among the mountains. From here the amount of land the dam had drowned seemed vast. Still gazing, Farmer said, "To understand Russia, to understand Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Boston, identity politics, Sri Lanka, and Life Savers, you have to be on top of this hill."

The list was clearly jocular. So was his tone of voice. But I had the feeling he had said something important. I thought I got it, generally. The view of drowned farmland, the result of a dam that had made his patients some of the poorest of the poor, was a lens on the world. His lens. Look through it and you'd begin to see all the world's impoverished in their billions and the many linked causes of their misery. (Kidder, 2009, pp. 43 - 44)

Implications and Conclusions

What are the opportunities to reinvigorate progressive education? We think that the current trend toward "globalized" education is one of our best opportunities to promote embodied, learner-centered, socially conscious learning. In this paper, we explored the history and possible futures of global education and its relationship to issues important to progressive educators, as manifested in our own teaching. We feel that issues surrounding

global teacher preparation—for economic competition, for social and geographical mobility, for social justice, and/or for democratic social participation—might help us come to see some of the emerging opportunities for doing progressive education work. Yet we cannot do so without losing sight of the many dangers.

Ultimately, we do not suggest that progressive education and global education are the same, nor do we suggest they merge. What we propose to educators is that there are many similarities to be aware of, and that they should be emboldened to incorporate these progressive practices in their classrooms, as institutional spaces open up which might be appropriated—if only momentarily—for progressive ends. We hope that identifying the intersection between global education and progressive education opens up dialogue about progressive ideals to a much wider audience, thus providing a platform to broaden its influence even further.

As John Dewey concluded his book on the public and its problems—a book which seems as timely as ever, as we search out new opportunities to find transnational publics—Dewey asks us to consider the possibilities of *art*: as among the best ways to promote the types of conjoint social experiences that lead to the formation of intelligent publics. In one of the most poetic passages Dewey ever wrote, he claimed:

Common things, a flower, a gleam of moonlight, the song of a bird, not things rare and remote, are means with which the deeper levels of life are touched so that they spring up as desire and thought. This process is art . . . Artists have always been the real purveyors of news, for it is not the outward happening in itself which is new, but the kindling by it of emotion, perception and appreciation. (1927/1954, p. 184)

Viewed in this way, a politics that seeks to address global inequities is a politics that requires the cultivation of our deepest human sensitivities. This type of politics is “global” in scope and in its mode, because it calls upon the full range of human capacities, as we seek to connect out from the inner dimensions of our own personal journeys so as to support and sustain all living creatures on the planet. And, of course, the very planet itself. This, in our view, is a global education worth pursuing.

Endnotes:

¹ While our own work is determined by the current structural forces in play in higher education, global teacher education, as an idea and an ideal, is nothing new. For example, see the work of Anna S. Ochoa at Indiana University (Ochoa, 1986).

² See: <http://education.msu.edu/globalcohort/about>.

³ See: <http://te352.wikispaces.com/syllabus>.

⁴ On the importance of international travel as a formative experience for global educators, see Merryfield, 2000.

⁵ See: <http://te352.wikispaces.com/google+earth+directions>. For examples of our own tours, and two examples from our students, see: <http://te352.wikispaces.com/Mining+Progressive+Education>.

⁶ See: <http://te352.wikispaces.com/global+educators+creed>. For example of creeds from two of our students, see: <http://te352.wikispaces.com/Mining+Progressive+Education>.

⁷ See: <http://te352.wikispaces.com/Immigrant+Student+Questionnaire>.

⁸ See for example the reports by Becker (1982) and Freeman (1986).

⁹ As some examples: “the world seems well along to becoming a kind of tribal village . . .but the natives are armed with nuclear weapons instead of spears” (Becker, 1968, p. 637); “there is increasing recognition in cities and towns of their growing links to the world and the common fate they share--both economically and as potential nuclear targets--with cities and towns in other countries” (Alger & Harf, 1986, p. 8); “the arts, it is believed, can not only contribute to the understanding and attitudes needed to stay an ever-threatening holocaust but can also contribute significantly to man’s quality of living in a world which, hopefully, will survive” (Goodlad, 1964/1997. p. 52); and Lee Anderson quoting Barbara Ward’s work on “spaceship earth” (itself, of course, suggestive of the Cold War context), which stresses that “above all, we are neighbors in the risk of total destruction” (Anderson, 1968, p. 642).

¹⁰ The history of this funding for k-12 schooling programs, which is referenced in several places (Becker, 1982, p. 1; Freeman, 1986, p. vi), is complicated. It appears that it originally was located in Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, in section 603, known as the “Citizen Education Amendment,” before being reassigned to NESA in 1980, before being dropped in 1981. The purpose of the funds was to help U.S. citizens to “make informed judgments with respect to the international policies and actions of the United States.”

¹¹ A strong caveat is the regional work with teachers, as referenced above. That said, questions could be raised about how much of that regional work involved “external experts” working with teachers--a model that has been strongly questioned in much of the more recent teacher learning and induction literature.

¹² Pike and Selby (1988) go so far as to call the institution of public schooling—correctly, in our opinion—a “human potential dustbin” (p. 38).

References

- Alger, C.F. & Harf, J.E. (1986). Global education: Why? For whom? About what? In R.E. Freeman (Ed.), *Promising practices in global education: A handbook with case*

studies (pp. 1 - 13). New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.

Anderson, L. (1968). An examination of the structure and objectives of international education. *Social Education*, 32(7), 639-647.

Anderson, L. (1979). *Schooling and citizenship in a global age: An exploration of the meaning and significance of global education*. Bloomington, IN: Social Studies Development Center/Indiana University.

Becker, J. (1968). Introduction. International education for the twenty-first century. *Social Education*, 32(7), 637-638.

Becker, J. (1982). *Improving international understanding in elementary and secondary schools: A study of six projects*. Bloomington, IN: Social Studies Development Center/Indiana University.

Bruner, J.S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57(6), 318-325.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry : Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (2001). *The school and society & The child and the curriculum*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc. (Original work published in 1902)

Dewey, J. (1997). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1916)

Dewey, J. (1954). *The public and its problems*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press/Ohio University Press. (Original work published in 1927)

Ferrero, D. J. (2006). Having it all. *Educational Leadership*, 63(8), 8-14.

Florez, M. A. C. & Burt, M. (2001). *Beginning to work with adult language learners: Some considerations*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education.

Freeman, R. E. (Ed.). (1986). *Promising practices in global education: A handbook with case studies*. New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.

Gaudelli, W. (2003). *World class: Teaching and learning in global times*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Goodlad, J.I. (1997). *School curriculum reform in the United States*. Selections from the book reprinted in D.J. Flinders & S.J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (pp. 45-54). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published in 1964)
- Hanvey, R. (1975). *An attainable global perspective*. New York: Center for War/Peace Studies.
- Hatch, P. (2007). *What motivates immigration to America?* LWVUS Immigration Study: Background Papers.
- Kidder, T. (2009). *Mountains beyond mountains*. New York: Random House.
- Merryfield, M. M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(4), 429-43.
- Ochoa, A.S. (1986). Internationalizing teacher education. In R.E. Freeman (Ed.), *Promising practices in global education: A handbook with case studies* (pp. 46 - 52). New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.
- Pike, G. & Selby, D. (1988). *Global teacher, global learner*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Pike, G. & Selby, D. (1999). *In the global classroom, volume 1*. Toronto: Pippin Publishing Corporation.
- Specogna, H. (Writer & Director). (2006). *The short life of José Antonio Gutierrez* [Film]. Zürich: PS Film Zürich.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. & Suárez-Orozco, M. (1995) *Transformations: Immigration, family life, and achievement motivation among Latino adolescents*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Taylor, L.K., Bernhard, J.K., Garg, S., & Cummins, J. (2008). Affirming plural belonging: Building on students' family-based cultural and linguistic capital through multiliteracies pedagogy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 8(3), 269-294.
- Tye, B.B. & Tye, K.A. (1999). *Global education: A study of school change*. Orange, CA: Interdependence Press.
- Valdés, G. (1998). The world outside and inside schools: Language and immigrant children. *Education Researcher*, 27(6), 4-18.