

CONSTRUCTIVISM AND RECONSTRUCTIONISM: EDUCATING TEACHERS FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

Mary-Lou Breithorde and Louise Swiniarski Salem State College, Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Public education is characterized by tension between the goals of enlightening individuals and improving society. In the United States, the emphasis has been on individual needs. We design lessons which respect for child as a maker of meaning. We teach to individual learning styles and are concerned that the curriculum "make sense." Given an ideology which sees the individual as the source of economic and political welfare, we comfortably focus on their intellectual and personal growth and call it "constructivism".

At other times, education for social responsibility took priority. During economic depressions, wars and civic strife, we taught children to work together to build our country, save it, or improve it. We developed curriculum around social problems, engaged students in community service, and called it "reconstructionism".

America is having growing pains. We are in a time of great cultural change. The world has grown smaller. To avoid the twin dangers of reactionism and social instability, the debate must be resolved. Faced with polarization and growing conflict, educators must find a way to join the goal of social cohesion and improvement to the understanding that learning is essentially an idiosyncratic process of individual change. We cannot let reactionary voices who boldly confront the ethical and intellectual vacua in our public schools dictate our direction. Nor can we continue to suborn watered down political and social "neutrality" and confused relativism.

The authors will discuss the conditions endangering our nation's social fabric and its schools and breach the dichotomy between constructivism and reconstructionism, linking individual consciousness to social cohesion. We

will illustrate how we translate theory into practice as teacher educators, committed both to our students' individual enlightenment and their ultimate global citizenship.

INTRODUCTION: BRIDGING THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN SELF AND WORLD

In the early twentieth century, the work of John Dewey in education gave birth to what we would later call Progressivism. Progressive education had two strands. One concerned itself with the welfare of the individual child his intellect, his values and his having the tools to carry intellect and values into activity. The other strand emphasised the social context of education, how learning both reflects the social conditions of our lives and impacts on the lives of people in social groups. The first strand grew into humanistic education with its focus on the mind, values and behaviour of the individual "whole child"; the other, into social reconstructionism, which aimed at articulating and directing the social purposes of education toward improving the lives of people in the aggregate. Dewey considered both strands. He wrote about the centrality of personal experience in the process of learning in Democracy and Education (1916), for example, and, later, in a time of economic stress, considered the limits of an ideology which champions the individual in Individualism: Old and New (1930) and the journal The Social Frontier that he and his colleagues published from the mid 1930s to the late 1940s.

The tension between the welfare of the individual and the welfare of society is still with us. In the United States, the balance is always tipped in favor of the individual. We believe as a nation the good of the individual results in a general good. From Thomas Jefferson's faith in a "natural aristocracy"

(Ford, 1899, cited in Tozer, 1993) to Ronald Reagan's "trickle-down economy", our heroes argued from their bully pulpits that, given a land of great natural resources and given laws to ensure freedom of thought, speech, movement, choice and religion, things would work out well for the greatest number, provided that the individual was left alone. The successful would be appreciative enough and sensible enough to provide for the unlucky few and in so doing ensure the preservation of "the system" and avoiding bloody revolt.

Lived out in the classroom, this ideology directs the focus of teachers toward actualising the potential of individual children. We build from the research of Jean Piaget to understand a child's learning and development as a matter of individual meaning-making, lately relabelled as constructivism (Fosnot, 1996). We make decisions about curriculum, about materials, about pedagogy based on this idea that good teaching begins with children's constructing of their own experiences. Good teaching draws them along on a continuum from what they already know to what they need to learn. How they learn, we believe, is affected by idiosyncratic biographies, by the fascinating variety of styles of thinking enhanced by gifts of creativity or limited by special learning disabilities. We look at the mediating effects of language, of family styles, of physical environments, and we modify our programs to respond to their myriad "individual needs".

Research on teachers' conceptions of their work demonstrates their attention to the individual. For example, in comparing American to Japanese teachers, Hamilton et al. (1991) found that even while American teachers arrange their students in groups, they teach to them and assess them as individuals. Japanese teachers, on the other hand, focus globally on the achievement of the whole group rather than on its individual members. Earlier, a Connecticut inquiry (Hetzl, 1978), as well as a 1981 study by one of the authors,

confirmed that teachers conceive of their responsibilities as limited to the welfare of each child in their classroom, rather than extending to the welfare of the nation or the world.

There have been a few times in American history when our national emphasis on individualism has been challenged in the 1930s, when the Great Depression caused us to question the efficacy of rugged individualism, and again in the 1960s when a difficult war and the "discovery" of poverty and racism raised national questions of social justice and moral principle. Amid cries for reconstructing society and correcting social, economic and political inequities, educational reconstructionism called for school reform, a broader curriculum and a wider net cast to include all children under the public education umbrella. These times, however, were aberrant lapses in an overriding commitment to the freedom of (the individual at the expense of the health and welfare of the group. In between social, economic and political crises, we return to the project of pursuing our own life, liberty and happiness.

It is the end of the century. At this critical point in America's history, waves of great change are again causing a refocusing of educational goals. The impetus for this refocusing comes from several factors which have fundamentally changed our national reality and which will not allow us to continue with the "same old, same old". One is demographic. America in 1997 is "browning". By the year 2050, a nation which has been for a long time, while 75% white will be only 52% white, in great part due to a surge in Latino and Asian immigrants of child-bearing age. Family structures have changed to a degree that schools cannot ignore. Mothers are not available for daytime conferences with teachers. Fathers are often just plain not available. The most important adults in children's lives may be their grandmothers, their foster parents, their church sponsors. In Lynn, Massachusetts, new home for a group of Somalian

refugees, the children of many mothers live fatherless in a house run by one adult male. It is this man who signs permission slips for field trips and comes to school on "parent nights".

A second developing factor is our people's behavior. We are more violent, more demanding, more acquisitive, less patient. We build walled communities or live in high rises where children are not easily allowed into the street to play after school. Our children, and many adults, spend inordinate hours watching television, plugged into computers or buckled up to personal exercise machines that substitute for the physical labour we no longer have to do. Much of our population, frustrated by the images of wealth on television and in popular magazines, which they can't or don't believe they can acquire, take out their hostility on the perceived sources of their deprivation—their spouses, their children, their bosses, the owner of the neighborhood store, the ethnic group whose way to success seems smoothed by preferential treatment or politics. A graduate student, a Caribbean immigrant, informed one of the authors that he believed the reason why immigrants from Russia and from Cambodia made faster economic progress in America was that "they each receive \$20,000 from their governments when they leave". Unemployed whites resent blacks, blacks resent Koreans, everyone resents Jews and Chinese.

On the other hand, there is a new emphasis on caring in late 1990s United States, probably as a result of an increasingly harsh social order. "Quality circles" in business, participatory decision-making, site-based management, cooperative learning groups, the notion of "emotional intelligence" as a valuable commodity in business as well as in personal relationships, are all indicators of attention to the interpersonal. Sadly, we have moved so far away from civility and mutual aid, we are now having to teach basic social skills to young children.

Ironically, in a nation which champions the "natural" right of the individual, we assume that our success and failure rest with external forces beyond our control. While, for example, Asian philosophies and religions teach individuals to take responsibility for their own progress toward achieving the "right path", American children and their families tend to attribute success to hard work but failure to external causes or "bad luck". It is not difficult to see why "special education" and the ever-increasing numbers of diagnostic labels proliferate in United States schools, while the criteria for special education are much narrower in Japan (Swiniarski, Breitborde & Murphy, 1999).

A third factor impelling change is the globalisation of economies and communications. If Americans ever lived like ostriches with their heads in the sands of parochialism, we can no longer do so. If we were ever arrogant about our "unique" and sacrosanct place in the world, we can no longer be so. Our children are dying at embarrassing rates in infancy and in adolescence. Our waters are overfished, our clothing is made abroad, our labour and our genius have stiff competition, our industries have gone global. Our presidential elections still impact on the rest of the world, but leaders and alliances and issues in the rest of the world affect us just as importantly. With expanding communications technologies, the world is at our doorstep and it is knocking loudly.

America is having growing pains. We are in a time of great cultural change. The world has grown smaller. To avoid the twin dangers of reactionism and social instability, the debate must be resolved. Against the pressures of changing demographics, rising consumerism, and worldwide competition, the public, and its teacher-leaders, are making choices in the voting booth and on the streets. In response to the domestic threat of growing militia organisations which arm Timothy McVeighs with rock-hard rationales for public violence, Vice President Albert Gore bemoans the destructive

potential of extreme individualism in "an environment that ignores a person's connections with family and community" (*Boston Globe*, 1997, p.A20). Faced with polarisation and growing conflict, educators must find a way to join the goal of social cohesion and improvement to the understanding that learning is essentially an idiosyncratic process of individual change. We cannot let reactionary voices who boldly confront the ethical and intellectual vacuums in our public schools dictate their direction. Nor can we continue to support curricula that water down political and social "neutrality".

We Americans try to cram knowledge into children's heads incurious about what they already come to school knowing and incurious about the social contexts of that knowledge. What limits American educational consciousness, and ultimately limits American educational efficacy, the acceptance of a dichotomy between the individual and society which Dewey knew to be false. Arguing for the idea that intelligence is inseparable from its object (1938), Dewey knew that the meaning that an individual makes of his or her experience is grounded in the immutable fact that the individual is a member of society. The first focus of learning is the child's own experience, but that experience is profoundly social. Years later, Paulo Freire would call the critical awareness of one's life conditions "conscientizacao," or the ability to perceive social, political and economic contradictions and take action (1970). Decrying curricula that were collections of discrete, abstracted, decontextualised "facts," Freire reminded us what Sylvia Ashton-Warner had long known as a teacher in New Zealand (1963): that "unteachables" could be taught if concepts and skills made sense to them, and what made lasting sense was the stuff, and the problems and questions, of their own lives. Why are some of us toiling for someone else's profit when we have little of the products of our own labour? Why are we

planting what someone else wants us to plant when it may not be good for the land or for our own stomachs? Why are we taught to read the words of someone else's language, which we may not be able to use to our own advantage? Why are African American children asked to learn about white liberators and not about their own? Why are the children of New England fishermen taught about environmental policies without reference to their impact on the local economy? Why are Cambodian adolescents forced to choose between "American", ways and the traditions of their elders? Why are we scrambling to acquire toys and things no longer made in America when our purchases support child labour and limit the educational horizons of children in Pakistan and Honduras?

Furthermore, within the socially-contexted, socially- intelligent individual is the promise of his or her taking action. For Pestalozzi (1894), for Montessori (1936), for Dewey, for Freire, for Brameld (1956), education united the head, the heart and the hand. Learning without changing or doing is not learning. Nor can an individual learn something new without its affecting his or her actions in the world. Like Dewey, the authors assert that teachers "as a matter of fact" strengthen social forces, whether conservative or progressive, in their daily decisions and interactions in the classroom. The question for teachers is "whether they are doing so blindly, evasively, or intelligently and courageously" (Dewey, 1935, p.7).

The task for teacher educators is to recognise, value and build upon the immediate knowledge of our students, to understand and help them understand the social conditions of their lives, to guide them to look inward into their experiences and then outward to the world, to treat their own students as precious individuals but also as world citizens like themselves. Teaching in largely local or regional colleges or universities, living in a nation prizing liberty over social welfare, working with teachers-in-training who are understandably more

concerned with surviving in a classroom of children than contributing to the survival of the world, our effort to expand their social consciousness and sense of social responsibility is not easy. We believe the best way to enlarge our students' focus is to begin with their own experience, its social contexts and its social ramifications, moving from a sharing of concrete experiences to the abstract idea that these experiences are inherently social and ultimately global, and provide them with opportunities for directly experiencing the global. The remainder of this paper describes changes in a teacher education program which recognises the need to globalise its curriculum and unite individual consciousness with social cohesion, through a constructivist teaching process with reconstructionist educational goals.

THE CALL FOR INTERNATIONALISING EDUCATION

The word is out in academia: we must internationalise the curriculum for the Global Age. The call for world perspectives in curriculum and instruction comes from within nations and from international agencies and is intended for the entire spectrum of the educational process, pre-school to graduate school. For comparative educationists, the reasons for a global approach to education are unmistakable. The global economy, international trade agreements, the communications technology explosion, world migration and immigration, mutual environmental and health concerns, are all issues that have connected nations in transnational organisations, alliances and businesses.

Unfortunately, these global developments have not roundly resulted in curriculum implementation. There has been a lack of coherence and systematisation; approaches to implementing an international perspective in education have been related to special projects in particular institutions, particular disciplines, and at particular age levels. They have also been hampered by higher education institutions' inattention to global perspectives in

teacher training. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development through its Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, has been researching the impact of the international setting on higher education (OECD, 1996, p.3). OECD is studying the feasibility of international credentialing in the professions of accounting, architecture, engineering and law. It has identified not only barriers but opportunities and routes to take in order to implement a global and cohesive program of professional training in these areas. In this effort, several member nations have established case studies for developing and assessing feasible approaches to professional programs. The authors of this paper will explore the feasibility of globalising teacher education using as a case study our own institution.

Education is a socially-embedded process. Internationalising teacher education holds more challenges than many other professions because of the conflicting social and cultural differences within nations, not to mention between them. The inherent dilemma in educating for democracy (identified by John Dewey as the problem of meeting the needs of the individual while meeting those of society) is as evident in teacher education as in public primary and secondary education. The questions posed by the work of Lawrence Kohlberg, Carol Gilligan and others concerning the relative moral importance of universal (global) imperatives and the immediate social contract can be debated in discussions of professional ethics in teaching,

Communication, central to the success of any global curriculum, poses many problems as well. On one hand, the globally-literate educator seeks to avoid the "tower of Babel" discourse of rampant individualism, while on the other hand she/he must attend to the voice of the individual within the voice of the masses. The task at hand is to help teachers shape a social message that is respectful of the individual, while at the time responsive to the

necessary mandates for a just and civil community. Finding the balance on the continuum between the construction of one's own perception of rights, responsibilities and personal meaning and the world's need for social reconstruction is a daunting but crucial task for any teacher education program in a democratic society. Philosophically, the process requires a curriculum that deals with themes such as unity and diversity, social justice and the valuing of the individual. In practice, teacher education needs to identify the competencies that the globally-literate teacher exhibits. Institutions need to provide for opportunities to infuse global education into their mission, vision and implementation.

CASE STUDY DESCRIPTION: SALEM STATE COLLEGE

Salem State College, established in 1854 as a teacher-training institution, is a comprehensive institution of 10,000 undergraduate and graduate students offering a variety of majors and organised into three schools: Human Services (including Education), Business, and Arts and Sciences. The college is a publicly-supported institution, with a student body of 5,000 undergraduate "day" students, about two-thirds of whom commute to campus from home, and another 5,000 part-time "continuing education" and graduate-degree students. Most students have part-time or full-time jobs to support their education, and, often, their families, as well. Most are the first in their families to attend college.

In its mission statement, the college has expressed its commitment to support and celebrate cultural diversity in the campus and the community. It offers globally-oriented courses in its core curriculum, hosts several multicultural student organizations, recruits and supports minority enrolment, and brings many speakers and performers from a variety of cultures to campus for special programs. Salem State College provides many opportunities to study abroad for a semester,

including our own Student Teaching in England program. International students have residential and academic staff available to them; the group hosts fairs, festivals and open houses each semester.

Salem State offers some 25 teacher certification programs. At the baccalaureate level, all of them are interdisciplinary, including a combination of major "clusters" of study in the liberal arts as well as a sequence of professional courses. We emphasise liberal education as crucial for in-depth understanding of the content areas of teaching and of issues of international concern, with the power to think critically about them. The professional course sequence requires all students to study the multicultural classroom, global perspectives in cultural diversity, and social policy. Supplementing the core requirements are elective courses that address global education specifically and promote world citizenship. Opportunities for professional development programs offer life-long learning to working educators. These are available through our Continuing Education and Graduate Programs, our Center for Educational Professional Development, and our Northeast Global Education Center, a grant funded resource co-directed by the education and geography faculties to promote global awareness among local educators.

While Salem State College does include multicultural and multinational students, the majority are from the local northeastern region of Massachusetts. They were born and have grown up in towns like Ipswich and Marblehead and cities like Salem and Gloucester, in an area closely circumscribing the college. These communities were for a long time white, working- and middleclass bastions, whose residents were employed in small businesses, the General Electric plant, or in the declining shoe or fishing industries. The region has experienced significant demographic change, with great numbers of immigrants, especially from the Caribbean and Central America, from Southeast Asia and from the

former Soviet bloc countries. Our teacher education students, however, are still largely white, female, native-born, Irish and Italian Catholic, first-generation college attendees, whose range of experience has been quite narrow. To exhort them to consider themselves world citizens is a cry in vain; many of them have never left New England.

Our students' lives, however, are rich in experience. Their family relations, their rituals and celebrations, their work lives, are important aspects of humanity. Having been schooled in abstracted, decontextualized ways, their education has been devoid of their own experience. Guiding them to understand their own worlds affords them new learning. In our multicultural education class, we begin by asking students to examine artifacts and symbols of their own cultures, to reflect upon what it means to be an "Irish American" or a "Dominican American" or a "New Englander." Sharing stories, students find that what they thought was personal experience turns out to have been a social phenomenon. Questions emerge: why is my father, whose father came to this country as a poor immigrant, so resentful of new immigrants? How can I continue to tolerate my beloved uncle who tells offensive "ethnic jokes" at Thanksgiving? How is it that my grandparents and parents can speak Polish and I can't? We proceed to observe and read about and discuss the other ethnic groups. Students begin to compare their own experiences with those of others, finding differences and finding many similarities. We make global connections, researching the links between the Greater Boston Irish community and the two Irelands, between the Haitian and Dominican immigrants and the history and development of their Caribbean homelands, between racism and ethnic conflict in the United States and civil strife in the Congo and Bosnia. Lines between "them" and "us" become a bit blurrier; certainly, there is a greater understanding of issues that affect all human beings while they are enacted differently in different places. Students

learn about the new and unfamiliar in the secure knowledge of their own personal experiences. Beginning with themselves and their own communities and cultures, we ask them to consider cultural and international differences and concerns in a holistic, thematic way, thereby avoiding a "tourist approach" to Global Education (Derman-Sparks, 1993).

GLOBAL EDUCATION BRINGS CONSENSUS

At Salem State College we are engaged in the task of moving students from a knowledge of the impact of culture and social context in their own lives to an understanding of the impact of different cultures and contexts on others' lives, to a full understanding of human issues from a world perspective. It is essentially a task of seeing beyond diversity to human unity. Linking constructivist learning to a reconstructionist focus is at the heart of making teacher education global.

Global education is by nature multi-faceted and embraces a broad scope. Rather than a single course of study, global education is a perspective, an attitude, and an approach to teaching and learning. It has been defined as "seeing things through the eyes and minds of others-and it means the realization that while individuals and groups may view life differently, they also have common needs and wants." (Tye, 1990, p. 5). Global education has further been defined in several contexts as a study of the "interconnectedness of systems... ecological, cultural, economic political and technological" (Tye, 1990, p.5). The global education perspective promotes basic life skills for living and interacting in today's world. It is inclusive of all people and all ages in its call for a moral commitment to social and individual behavior. We have framed global education as structured on ten principles which define its broad scope and serve as a guide to those who would redesign educational programs to include the world (Swiniarski, Breitborde & Murphy, 1999). We use these ten principles in

assessing our own teacher education program, in designing new programs of study and courses, and in monitoring our progress toward providing teacher training that is global in scope.

THE TEN PRINCIPLES OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

The Ten Principles of Global Education which follow are broadly stated to allow for alternative strategies for implementation and for discussion of the questions inherent in their articulation. They are meant to be guides for all areas of the curriculum and for all levels of teaching. We are using them to shape a teacher education program that works with a generally parochial student body to help them form a world view and sense of world citizenship. The principles respect students' individual identities and experience, as they use that identity to link the local and the global, the particular and the universal, the self and society.

The Ten Principles of Global Education

1. Global Education is basic education.
2. Global Education is life long learning.
3. Global education is cooperative learning.
4. Global education is inclusive of all.
5. Global education is education for social action.
6. Global education is economic education.
7. Global education involves technology.
8. Global education requires critical and creative thinking
9. Global education is multicultural.
10. Global education is moral education.

(Swiniarski, Breitborde & Murphy, 1999, p.5)

1. Global Education is Basic.

We believe that globally literate teachers need to be informed professionals. Thus, we require that our students evidence a mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills, a core of knowledge about the

world and a competency to meet world class standards of performance in their assignments and practica. World literature, world history and cultural geography are core course requirements of the program, along with mathematics, laboratory science, writing, psychology, and the humanities.

Infusing a world perspective in professional courses affirms the importance of global education as basic in teacher education. Several courses in the professional sequence accomplish this; for example, our multicultural education course exposes students to issues and information concerning culture and education not just affecting the lives of American children but of children around the globe. Our reading education courses emphasize children's literature from many cultures and nations and the universality of, for example, folk themes. We are working to expand this perspective in other courses. Students are encouraged to share their own stories and their own views in a atmosphere of acceptance and curiosity. This kind of student exchange both acknowledges where and who each student is, while it extends individual experiences by asking them listen to the accounts of others. Course assignments structure research and observation of cultures, societies, viewpoints, models, beliefs and behaviors through readings, participant-observation experiences, project design and experiential activities. Course experiences require that students exchange thought, dialogue, debate, model, produce, perform, visit, research, write, create, construct, deconstruct, and reconstruct.

The core coursework centres on the basics of effective teaching incorporating universally accepted theories of teaching and learning, the study of a variety of teaching/learning styles and approaches, the impact of cultures and belief systems on teaching and learning and a respect for the individual learner at all ages and stages.

2. Global Education is Lifelong Learning.

We applaud the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development for its five year commitment to "Making Lifelong Learning a Reality for All" (OECD, 1996, p.3). Learning begins in the earliest years when attitudes and dispositions are formed, so our efforts to reach out to educators, children, families and the general public begin with our programs in Early Childhood Education and extend through adult education.

At Salem State, we have established the Northeast Global Education Center to reach out to educators, families and children in the community to globalize the curricula and activities of their schools and community agencies. The center houses a resource room of multiple media materials, provides consulting and speaker bureau services on global education and establishes a forum for exploring various aspects of global education based on the needs and interests of specific audiences.

To assist working teachers in the professional recertification, the center and other arms of the college offer a variety of seminars, conferences, courses, institutes, workshops and travel study programs. In some instances teachers themselves are consultants and presenters at these events. Several teachers have led Salem State-sponsored work-shops for their colleagues sharing the in which they have woven global understandings into their own personal and professional growth. From global and multicultural education projects that engage children in our elementary laboratory schools, to the opportunity to "student teach" in a local multicultural setting or abroad in an international placement, to travel study seminars that take teachers to different corners of the globe to exchange and share with like professionals, to formal courses on international teaching models and educational policies, we are attempting to provide opportunities for people of all ages to learn about the world.

3. Global Education is Cooperative Learning.

Teaching can be an isolating experience. To guard against the traditional isolation of the classroom teacher, our program builds in opportunities to practice professional collaboration. We structure activities and assignments that encourage group effort, team teaching, peer learning and mentoring. Field placements and lesson plan designs in some courses pair student participant observers. Faculty model collaborative approaches to teaching and model cross-disciplinary, interprofessional cooperation by presenting programs in collaboration with representatives of such groups as the Massachusetts Geographic Alliance, the National Geographic Society, UNICEF, the Association of Childhood Education International, and Plan International. Cooperative learning experiences are designed to respect each individual's contribution while at the same time requiring each person to contribute to the group. Each member assumes a role, takes responsibility for specific tasks, listens to the other voices in the group, and works toward consensual action. Work standards are clearly developed and defined (Michaelis & Garcia, 1996, p. 311), while appraisal of the effectiveness of the group product remains an inherent responsibility, and decision, for each member (Michaelis & Garcia, 1996, p. 312).

The connections between cooperative learning and global education are evident. While global issues and world events can provide the subject matter for cooperative learning practice, more importantly, the goals of cooperative learning reflect those of global education. Both aim to instill in individuals the motivation and habit of grappling with group issues for common gain and to promote common ventures, while acknowledging each individual's unique contributions to the whole. Both aim at beginning with individual experiences and arriving at mutually satisfying solutions.

4. Global Education is inclusive of all.

To me equality is the important thing. I don't want preferences, I don't want to be preferred as a woman. But I want it acknowledged that I am a human being who has the capacity to do what I have to do, and it doesn't matter whether I was born a man or woman. The work will be done that way.

(Mary Eugenia Charles, Prime Minister, Commonwealth of Dominica, in Exley, 1996, n.p.).

Global education by its very nature deals with issues of race, class, gender and ethnicity, with facing and correcting inequity and injustice, and with promoting tolerance and acceptance. It aims at providing students with an understanding that the world's riches have not been equally shared, that the world's people have not been equally heard, that what may appear to be good for one group may be harmful to another, and, ultimately, harmful to all.

Global education affects people with disabilities, people living in fine houses and those living on the streets, those with money and those without. Salem State, as a publicly supported institution of higher education, is a prime context for inclusive education. The college supports programs for students of all backgrounds, with physical and learning disabilities, the "traditional" student and the student who is returning to school as a mature adult. Our programs require courses in special education and focus attention on linguistically diverse learners. We continually ask our students to consider the needs and perspectives of those whose learning styles, life conditions and voices are different from their own. Formal study of Howard Gardner's "multiple intelligences" (1983), Mary Belenky's "women's ways of knowing" (1986), David Elkind's "Sympathetic Understanding of the Child" (1994), Joan Erikson's work on the final stages of old age, "The Life Cycle Completed" (1997), and Jonathan Kozol's books (for example, 1995) on the experiences of poor children and their families present students with the challenge of

including in their worldview the young and the old, males and females, the economically advantaged and the disadvantaged, and many ways of learning and knowing. But global education extends students even further to understand other geographical, cultural, social, racial, national and religious viewpoints. Field experiences expose them to learners of all ages, backgrounds and life conditions, and our success at providing them with an inclusive view of humanity is assessed not only by their performance in class, but also in their practice in the field.

5. Global Education is education for social action.

Crucial to knowing is doing. The overall purpose of global education is to educate all "to be socially responsible for the world they inhabit" (Swiniarski, Breitborde & Murphy, 1999). From Dewey to Brameld to Nel Noddings (1995), many have supported the connection between thinking, valuing and acting. This responsibility includes defining and protecting the rights and duties of world citizens as well as those citizens of any nation-state. In that context, global education "mandates an action plan for the protection of these rights" (Swiniarski, Breitborde & Murphy).

Teaching students advocacy roles by encouraging them to find their own voices, defend their own ideas, champion their rights and those of others is an important ingredient in any teacher education endeavor. Student-involving advocacy projects have ranged from working to institutionalise women's studies in the undergraduate and graduate curricula, to tutorial programs in local elementary schools, to book drives for a community action agency, to textbook collections for African nations. A campus-wide commitment to community service learning provides credit-bearing volunteer experiences in local schools and community agencies. The education honor society implements a community service project each year. Directly related to global initiatives, education students have

participated in the national movement to find support for the United States Congress's ratification of the Rights of the Child. We introduce our students to agencies such as the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, Educators for Social Responsibility, and the Children's Defense Fund to demonstrate the power of collaborative effort in joining the causes of common concern to people everywhere.

6. Global Education is economic education.

*Is a rich life more important than being rich?
(Gezelis and Millwood in I Want More)*

The answer to this question surely invites philosophic debate. Discussion of the answer brings together our personal values, our view of class, the role economics plays in society, the definition of the world as a marketplace with us as the consumers. Do we individuals create society or are we individuals its product? Are we rich by our own standards or by the material benchmark of wealth set in this age of consumerism? How much impact do we have on supply, demand, manufacture and distribution of material goods?

Clearly we live in a global economy. The price of wheat in one country affects the price of bread in another. Multi-lateral trade agreements are springing up across borders, around ocean rims, and between regions and continents. Transnational corporations are employing an international workforce. The debate of the future of the euro dollar affects America as much as the international monetary value of the U.S.A. dollar. As we approach the new millennium, our role as consumers has increased in importance. Workers, many of them children, risk exploitation in an amorphous transnational labour pool. International retail chains produce goods available globally and marketed in cookie-cutter shopping centres to the masses of consumers for whom buying has become a major leisure activity.

Informed, globally literate teachers should be aware of international and global economic developments and their effects on world, national and local events. Economic forces explain much of world politics, geography, history and human behaviour. Calls for world standards in education reform and restructuring are outcomes of our new worldwide economy. The children in our classrooms are young and growing consumers; the decisions they make about what and how much to buy, what and how much to produce, where and under what conditions they will labor, what is necessary and what is merely desirable, what is real and what is advertised will have global impact. The soccer balls they kick may have been sewn by Pakistani children. The warnings on cigarette packs they see negotiated on television may not appear on those same packs in other nations.

We send our students out to supermarkets and clothing stores to read packaging and labels. They peruse the "classified" section of the newspaper to formulate hypotheses about economic behaviour and local-global economic links. We address economic disparities and motivations in several education courses concerned with student behaviour and school policies. We tread carefully and with critical questions in the area of school business partnerships and school-to-work projects, fearing we will fall unthinking into the answer to that question, "Do we form society, or are we its products?"

7. Global Education requires technology.

Much has been written about the impact of technology on teaching, the shaping of the child, the view of teaching and learning, the homogenising of world societies. Television, videos, computers, the Internet and e-mail have been hailed and assailed. The frontier of the information age is wide open. The role of distance learning, the use of technology in world-wide communication and the exploration of the universe

as well as the world are inviting routes for future educators to pursue. The Global Village is here largely due to the influence of technology, which can submerge its individual citizens or liberate them. The choice is critical for teacher educators.

Central to the standards of our teacher education program is the thoughtful use of technology. All Salem State students must demonstrate computer literacy before graduation; some become expert by electing major "clusters" or graduate educational-technology degrees. Our teaching methods courses incorporate the use of information, multimedia and communications technologies. The last has the most immediate value for widening students' perspectives to include the globe. Projects addressing, for example, engaging children in a study of our local maritime history and marine life can include virtual communication with children in seaside communities in other lands. In reviewing our own teacher education programs, faculty can consult with other models developed in other nations.

Technology as a tool for learning and teaching rapidly changes, as it in turn changes the very nature of learning and teaching. With current technological resources for locating and presenting information, the work of teaching becomes more a matter of helping children formulate good questions, search widely and effectively for information, and compare and evaluate critically. Technology-enhanced teaching as problem-posing, decision-making, evaluating and articulating is teaching which fits well with the critical-thought basis of global education.

8. Global Education requires critical and creative thinking.

In an age in which "facts" are selected and presented in increasingly sophisticated ways, in an age where change is constant and problems must be solved quickly, critical and creative thinking are fast becoming survival skills. How is one to decide

whether the Gulf War was won, whether G.A.T.T. is a good idea, and whether any of this matters to Americans? In order for children to understand complicated international and international developments and their implications, in order that they learn to participate in the world as creative problem-solvers and critical evaluators, we must help them develop powers of analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and divergent thought. Global education in an information age, where that information is controlled, constrained, packaged and filtered through, necessitates our teaching children to use cognitive tools to make sense of the information around them. This is an old idea; Plato's aim was the education of "philosopher kings." Dewey, centuries later, said that democracy required that all of us be educated as "philosopher kings." Feminists would ask us to make room for the "philosopher queens."

Bloom's Taxonomy, creative-thinking models, and brain-based teaching strategies are woven into professional coursework and field practica. Lesson plans and journals must incorporate high-level questions, synthesis activities and reflective evaluation. All graduate teacher education programs require courses in theories of thinking and learning, which acquaint students with research and practice in critical and creative thinking. Group projects such as cooperatively designed thematic units show evidence of creative thought and collaborative sharing of ideas.

9. Global Education is Multicultural Education.

While the globe becomes more homogenised, local communities are becoming more heterogeneous. Transportation access, mass migration and immigration have produced multicultural neighborhoods in many locations around the world. Somalians live in Helsinki, Russians in Boston, Indians in London, Taiwanese in Auckland, Chileans in Stockholm, English in Cape Town. Multicultural education is inherent in global

education, which helps explain the mass movement of peoples particularly in this half of the twentieth century. Families are increasingly multicultural, international and interracial.

Educational and cultural theorists describe stages of movement from ethnocentrism and hegemony to ethnoglobalism. Inevitably, says James Banks (1997), schools and other public institutions will change and broaden their foci and their policies. We hold onto traditional mainstream, "centric" ideas until they are untenable, unacceptable and ineffective. Our response, then, will be to add onto traditional policies and content "new" information related to new populations. For example, in schools we may add a "Black History Month" to our curricular calendar and bilingual education classes. This "ethnic additive" approach soon becomes insufficient, however, as our constituents recognize that mainstream assumptions are still in place. Banks' third stage of cultural and curricular change describes a fundamental change in viewpoint, in that we move from ethnocentrism to a willingness to look at "facts" and experiences from multiple perspectives. Hence the story of the Westward Expansion of the United States is now told from the points of view of the explorers, the frontiersmen, pioneer women, Native Americans, the federal government, the Chinese railroad builders. In the final stage of curriculum change and in response to the knowledge that no society is isolated from all others, educators begin to draw connections between nations. In this "ethnonational" stage, themes and cultural experiences transcend national borders. African Americans look to Africa, not just for information about their roots, but to learn how current issues and experiences resemble African experiences. Educators look at problems attendant to national expansion and the fate of indigenous peoples as universal.

At Salem State we incorporate a multiple perspectives, ethno-national framework into our teacher education programs, through courses such

as Multicultural Education and Global Perspectives on Cultural Diversity. Methods courses in reading, social studies, mathematics and science emphasize culturally-connected learning. Professors demonstrate culturally-sensitive teaching strategies, exploring connections between, for example, cognitive learning styles and their cultural roots. Classroom climates promote cross-cultural dialogue and exercises to promote experiential awareness of cultural differences and similarities. Students undertake field placements in culturally diverse settings. Our aim is respect for and celebration of human diversity based on accurate knowledge of differences, with the ultimate aim of finding unifying themes and experiences.

10. Global Education is Moral Education.

In the Global Village, differences in values, lifestyles, political decisions abound. How do educators account for it? Cultural, political, economic values are partly relative to historical and geographic contexts. Democracy is put to the test in an increasingly complex but interrelated world. In the United States, the world of moral differences has come home. Immigrant families arrange marriages for their children. Parents exhort teachers to use corporal punishment to discipline their children. Families take their children out of school for weeks at a time for religious or cultural reasons. In the words of Beane and Apple (1995, p.5), democracy has been a defense used countless times everyday to justify almost anything people want to do: ... (on the other hand) ... it is not uncommon to hear some people say that democracy has simply become irrelevant, that it is too inefficient or dangerous in an increasingly complex world ... For these people the democracy defense has become ... not sufficient to get them what they want. (Beane & Apple, 1995, p.5) How are we to regard moral choices different from our own? How is consensus achieved in a morally complex world? The authors assert that the very least we can do is examine the disparities, their roots and their consequences, to

structure a dialogue in the hope of teaching reflective responsibility, securing mutual respect, and coming to some workable agreement. Global education asks individuals to regard their choices in the context of their relationship to and impact upon world events. It promotes moral development through the study of content knowledge; through a discussion of values inherent in curriculum, instruction and educational policy., and through the practice of skills and behavior.. and reflection on their implications and consequences for oneself and others.

Our students make ethical decisions throughout the course of their academic career and into their preprofessional and professional lives. Moral behavior operates in a field of concentric circles; in the center is the individual actor, whose choices and actions affect her immediate milieu, then spiral further to touch the lives of others. 'Me decision to become a teacher, to create opportunities for optimum learning for themselves and their students, and to reach out to real children in field practica or in international settings requires thoughtful commitment, vigilance, diligence and empathy as well as intellectual understanding. We treat our students as the builders and the architects of their professional lives, insisting on their taking responsibility for their actions but guiding them in reflecting on the social implications of their choices. Complicating our own decisions in offering guidance, however, is our knowledge of the friendly argument between the late Lawrence Kohlberg (1984), for whom the highest level of moral decision-making was based on abstract universal principles, and his former student Carol Gilligan (1982), whose research supports the idea that, at least for women, moral decisions depend on social relationships, an ethic of caring, and the ability to listen to "different voices."

At Salem State College, we are committed to democratic schools at all age levels. Absent the practice of moral theories, the ideal world-class

educational system is merely a utopian construct. Democratic schools, where all have a voice, where the entire community is involved in the educational "project," where decisions are made rationally and with an understanding on their impact on all members of the community, are the "real-life stories" and exemplars of moral education (Beane & Apple, 1995, p.9). Democratic, globally educating classrooms provide children with stories, exemplars and procedures whose moral bases structure a discourse concerning belief systems, human rights and dignity, environmental protection, and peaceful and ethical resolutions to conflict. Once again, the individual's experience and construction of knowledge is central. From early childhood through higher education, morally based, globally-oriented education begins with the individual's choice, action, and reflection on its social impact. Global education provides a moral attitude, a perception and a disposition that teaches the individual to develop a code and course of action at once acknowledging himself or herself and providing for the well being of the planet (Swiniarski, Breitborde & Murphy, 1999).

CONCLUSION: CONNECTING SELVES

The preceding section of this paper describes one institution where teacher educators are working toward globalising (and perhaps internationalising) the scope of its program and the perspectives of its students. In recognizing both the centrality of an individual's experience to learning and teaching and the fundamentally social context of that experience, we attempt to bridge the theoretical gap between individual interest and social responsibility. Piaget, as the author of constructivism, never assumed the learner created meaning in isolation from the surrounding conditions; nor did he assume that the act of meaning-making had consequences only for that individual's life. Constructivism provides us with an understanding of the process of learning; it is left to social reconstructionism to provide us with its origins and its outcomes. Working from our

students' experiences and from the immediate conditions of their lives—from the strength of their commitment to their families and to their neighborhoods—we will continue to create opportunities to use those experiences as "scaffolds" for attending to and understanding intercultural, international, and global issues. The conditions that will sustain their broadened vision and their broadened notions of their work will involve both internal and external forces. It is important that the new experiences we offer them be accompanied by a continual revisiting and reflection that will result in changed ways of thinking, or "habits of mind" (Dewey, 1938). It is important also that we arm them with the ability to articulate strong philosophical positions, for the school "cultures" they will meet as new teachers may be dauntingly disempowering. Externally, they will have to argue for administrative support for curriculum change, for funding for new teaching materials and resource libraries.

Much in the climate of our society, of our schools, and even of our own college works against the global education agenda. If we are to be true to our own words, we must face the task knowing the nature and the scope of the problem. The greatest barriers to our uphill battle to globalise teacher education are ideological ones. Too many of us in the United States have a sense of entitlement out of proportion to either social reality or social justice. Too many of us are concerned more with what we have than what we do, what we take rather than what we give, how fast we're moving rather than where we're going, how we appear rather than who we are. Global education in the United States today includes teaching the positive social skills that educators used to take for granted in their students—teaching children how to share, how to speak politely, how to wait—losses in civility that have accompanied ideological egocentrism (Breitborde, 1996). Faced with domestic problems, we assume we need to "bunker down" behind the

closed gate and the high walls and take care of our own, disconnecting from the rest of the world. The fallacy in this response is that we cannot keep the world out. Global issues have a way of catapulting themselves over the wall into our backyards. To work to keep them out is to look backward toward a political isolationism that is unworkable and dangerous. To invite them in is to open our eyes, our ears and our hearts and to acknowledge that to live on this earth is to live together.

REFERENCES

- Ashton-Warner, S. (1963). *Teacher*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Banks, J.A. (1997). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Beane, J. & Apple, M. (1995). The case for democratic schools. *Democratic schools*. Alexandria, Virginia. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Belenky, M. et. al. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- The Boston Globe* (1997). Gore takes on roots of militias. (June 13), p. A20. Boston, MA: Author.
- Brameld, T. (1956). *Toward a reconstructed philosophy of education*. New York: Dryden.
- Breitborde, M.L. (1996). Creating community in the classroom: Modeling 'new basic skills' in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 47 (5), 367-373.
- Derman-Sparks, L. (Winter, 1993). Revisiting multicultural education What children need to live in a diverse society. *Dimensions of early childhood*, 6-10.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

- Dewey, J. (1930). *Individualism: Old and new*. New York: Minton, Balch.
- Dewey, J. (1935). The Teacher and his world. *The Social Frontier*, 1 (4), p.7.
- Exley, H. (1996). *In celebration of women*. New York: Exley Publications.
- Elkind, D. (1994). *A sympathetic understanding of children*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Erikson, E. & Erikson, J. (1997). *The life cycle completed*. New York: Norton.
- Ford, P.L., ed. (1899). *The writings of Thomas Jefferson*. New York: GP Putnam Sons, cited in Tozer, S.E., Violas, P.C., and Senese, G. (1993). *School & society: Educational practice as social expression*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Fosnot, C.T., ed. (1996) *Constructivism: theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gezelius, H. & Millwood, D. (n.d.) *I want more*. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Authority and Konsument Verket.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Hamilton, V.L., Blumenfeld, P.C., Hiroshi, A. & Miura, K. (1991). Group and gender in Japanese and American elementary classrooms. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 22 (3), 317-346.
- Hetzel, D.C. (1978). A Comparison of British and Connecticut elementary teachers' opinions on their educational aims ad priorities and on their views of the role of the teacher. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 38, 5910A. Arm Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, No. 7803683.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development, volume 2: The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing Grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Michaelis, J. & Garcia, J. (1996). *Social studies for children*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Montessori, M. (1936). *The secret of childhood*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- Noddings, N. (1995). A Morally defensible mission for schools in the twenty-first century. *Phi Delta Kappati*. 76 (5), 366-368.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1996). *The internationalisation of higher education*. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1996). *Lifelong learning for all*. Paris: OECD.
- Pestalozzi, J.H. (1894). *How Gertrude teaches her children*. Syracuse, New York: George Allen and Unwin.
- Sherr (Breitborde), M. L (1981). Teacher self esteem and social vision: Conceptions of social role and responsibility. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, No. 8 126763.
- Swiniarski, L., Breitborde, M. & Murphy, M. (1999). *Educating the global village: An inclusive view of the child in the world*. Columbus, Ohio: Prentice Hall-Merrill.
- Tye, K. (ed.). (1990). *Global education from thought to action The 1991 ASCD yearbook*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

