

Introducing Globalization and Sustainability Issues in Teacher Education: A Case Study of Two Courses in a Social Justice-Oriented Program

Tania Ramalho & Barbara Beyerbach

Department of Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education, State University of New York, Oswego

ABSTRACT

The paper describes the process of developing a global education curriculum in two teacher education courses at a state university in the United States. The initiative intended to develop critical thinking from diverse perspectives about global issues, motivate trainee teachers to include global education and instruction in their own practice, and to consider identities as global citizens. Student responses before and immediately after the innovation are described, and conclusions drawn on further steps to be taken in thinking about sustainability and globalization in teacher education.

What would happen if teachers embraced the identity of *global citizen* (Banks 2004) and sought to help their students develop such an identity? What if they regularly infused issues of globalization and sustainability in the curriculum? As teacher education professors at a state university in the United States, we provide our students with insight into such wider political contexts during class discussions about poverty, race, ability, gender and sexuality. We aim to give them an understanding of the impact of oppression on education and schooling. In fall, 2006, we taught two courses: to undergraduates *Culturally Relevant Teaching* and *Critical Pedagogy*, and a graduate course. We used the occasion to collaborate in introducing a unit on globalization and sustainability. In these courses we examined underlying ideological values and beliefs in economic, political, educational, judicial and other institutional systems that perpetuate oppression within the United States and beyond.

By globalization we meant not only the economic integration of world markets within a capitalist framework, but also all of the ways in which we are interconnected (Bigelow & Peterson 2002). In the courses we examined aspects of the social, political, technological, military, and cultural impacts of global interconnections as well as economic relations. By sustainability, we meant living in ways that conserves the Earth's resources to ensure the survival of subsequent generations, while eliminating poverty (United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization 2007). In the courses we examined child labour, fair trade agricultural initiatives, alternative energy sources, and conservation initiatives in a global context.

As Brazilian and U.S. born educators we had invested effort into better understanding omissions, distortions, and stereotypes in our education through study and travel in Latina America, Europe, and Africa. This gave opportunities to renew our commitment to developing our perspectives of global citizens. Each of us had experienced our students' reluctance to think about oppression experienced here and now, and about our roles in perpetuating the status quo. We wanted to teach about globalization and sustainability in ways that connected conditions and events taking place elsewhere in the world to those in the United States.

This paper describes the context, procedures and outcomes of our work on introducing globalization and sustainability into teacher education. Section 1 offers a brief historical account of global education in the United States, and discusses our assumptions about the importance of teaching about globalization and sustainability in teacher education. Section 2 provides information about

the conceptual framework and programs for teacher education in our School of Education, and a description of the two courses. In section 3, we outline the curriculum project's goals, instructional activities and reading materials, and approach to evaluation. Section 4 analyzes responses to six pre- and post- assessment survey questions completed by students. In section 5, we indicate what learned from the project and some steps towards furthering the study of sustainability and globalization in teacher education.

INCLUDING GLOBALIZATION AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES IN A TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM.

Global education was one aspect of a movement for internationalizing education in the USA after World War II, as the country identified itself as a world leader. This movement initially focused on international understanding and intercultural communication against the backdrop of the Cold War. It gained momentum during the 1960s and 1970s, as government and Foundation support was made available for curriculum and teacher professional development, particularly after the UN proclaimed 1970 as International Education Year (Kenworthy 1970).

Merryfield (1997) traces global education in the 1970's to the work of a number of authors. Hanvey (1975), in *An attainable global perspective*, "set forth five dimensions of global perspectives—perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and awareness of human choices" (Merryfield 1997: 3). Becker (1979), acknowledged as "the grandfather of global education", summarized the field in *Schooling for a global age*. Anderson (1979), a policy analyst and spokesperson for global education, provided a valuable practical guide in *Schooling and citizenship in a global age: An exploration of the meaning and significance of global education*. The work of all three was fundamental to the engagement of the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) in global education so that a position paper was published in 1982 establishing a definition, "the efforts to cultivate in young people a perspective of the world which emphasizes the interconnection among cultures, species, and the planet" (Merryfield, 1997:183). Merryfield also cites the work of Alger (1986) that influenced the linking of US cities and states to the rest of the world, thus applying the "think globally and act locally" (Ward & Dubos 1972) as a principle of global education. In 1988, feminist scholar Elise Boulding published the influential *Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world* (Boulding 1988), calling for the use of imagination in envisioning the praxis of peaceful societies in a technological world. This was the result of women's concerns and activism around militarization, the nuclear threat, and U.S. intervention in Central America during the first years of Ronald Reagan's conservative revolution.

Concern with globalizing the curriculum has increased since the 1990s. A series of projects were developed. In 1991, K Tye edited the Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, *Global education: From thought to action*, and, in 1992 published with B Tye, *Global education: A study of school change*. Both books arose from activities related to the Global Education Network Project in 11 schools in California. Returning to project schools ten years later to conduct a survey of teachers, B Tye found out that project participants continued to incorporate global issues in their curriculum. In

addition, many non-participating teachers had started addressing them as well (B Tye, 2007, pers. comm., August 27). In the Midwest, Merryfield, Jarchow & Picket (1997) edited *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators*, drawing on practical experiences. In recent years, research and writing about global concerns in education from policy and practice perspectives has expanded considerably (Spring 2007; Suarez-Orozco et al. 2007; Noddings 2005; Kirkwood-Tucker 2003; Merryfield 2002; Stromquist & Monkman 2000; Burbules & Torres 2000). Content information, curriculum and lesson plans have been made widely accessible through the World Wide Web. The site created by Tye (www.globaledyellowpages.org), for example, lists numerous organizations and links to global education resources.

Yet despite these initiatives, the inclusion of global education into mainstream K-12 and to teacher education curricula has been mostly confined to social studies and methods in social studies in teacher education (National Council for the Social Studies 2008). Gutek (1993: 26) wrote, “Despite the richness and variety of the literature on international education, progress in incorporating the international dimension into teacher education and elementary and secondary education programs in the United States has been slow and uneven. At times, there is a great but often unactualized enthusiasm for incorporating this international education into American education”.

One reason for the relatively slow change is that teachers do not have the content background to easily integrate knowledge about globalization and sustainability into teaching. They tend to teach as they have been taught. Many teachers have gone directly from being students to being teachers and have not been exposed to work settings where they might get first hand understanding of some of the impacts of globalization. Since the enactment of No Child Left Behind legislation (U.S. Department of Education 2008) under the Bush administration, teachers in the U.S. have been under extreme pressure to improve academic performance of students in literacy and mathematics. Students are tested annually and schools are held accountable. Professional development initiatives are most often directed at these curriculum areas rather than social studies where globalization and sustainability issues may be more easily integrated.

While critical analysis of United States history and understanding of cultures internationally do take place in K-12 schools, these do not represent mainstream curriculum and instruction. Organizations such as the Rethinking Schools collective of social justice-oriented teachers and Teaching Tolerance (a project of the Southern Poverty Law Center), dedicated to anti-bias education, have developed resources for teaching from critical global perspectives. Their publications, however, do not appear on state approved reading lists.

A SOCIAL JUSTICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME

Our concerns with these absences led us to decide to make our preservice teachers aware of how to integrate these resources into state mandated curriculum. As Dewey (1916) and others have pointed out, democracy is endangered when the people do not mind it. We wished teachers, as global citizens, to learn and to care about building democracy. In order to achieve this, we decided to include globalization and sustainability (UNESCO 2007) as

central topics in our teacher education's curriculum. Our view was that these topics would serve our students' needs to acquire information and to think critically about global issues. They would give scope to consider global perspectives in a teacher's role as developers of curriculum and instruction. They would also urge teachers to consider identities as global citizens. We considered students thinking critically entailed acquiring historical understanding of events or conditions of life from multiple vantage points, and diverse political perspectives. Conservative, liberal and more radical standpoints should be presented to give students an opportunity to judge for themselves the merit of ideas, assumptions and policy proposals affecting their lives. The study of globalization requires us to regard the United States within a web of historical relationships, not as a stand alone country. Globalization and sustainability address poverty and labour conditions. They take into account child, immigrant and women's labour, and shed light on the impact of economic development beyond profit and gain. They highlight their socio-cultural, political, and environmental costs (Lardner & Smith 2005).

Teachers make curriculum and instruction decisions that contribute to the reproduction of society and to resistance to oppression (Sleeter & Grant 2007; McLaren 2006; Apple 2006; Giroux 2003). We expect teachers graduating from our programs to think in terms of social justice implications of their actions in classrooms. By offering instruction on globalization and sustainability, we expect them to transform these into curricular and instructional practices that will present youth and families with new ideas and behaviours in society locally and globally.

We have been concerned with the development of a teacher identity that understands global issues, even if it does not entirely displace nationalism and patriotism in favour of global citizenship concerned with the well-being of all humans. It is our intention that students, besides having pride in being Americans, also understand themselves belonging with others to the human species. It is as human beings that our survival and thriving are endangered when we live unsustainably. It is as people who can think in terms of mutuality with others within and outside national borders that we become better able to think in global terms.

In 1998 our School of Education adopted a conceptual framework committed to social justice. It established that our graduates are to become "socially conscious catalysts for change who create and sustain school environments where excellence is cherished and social justice flourishes" (State University of New York Oswego School of Education 1998). Drawing from the thought of our colleague Patricia Russo (2008), the teacher education programs define teaching for social justice as working to interrupt cycles of oppression in the classroom on the basis of two core concepts:

The first concept is: There is injustice in our world. Some groups of people are consistently privileged; while others are consistently disadvantaged. The privileging and disadvantaging becomes unjust when it is unearned or undeserved. Often such injustice is perpetuated around race, class, gender, ability, or sexuality groups that people are identified with. However, the faces of oppression often differ across time, place, and situation. Understanding how privilege operates, how disadvantage (or marginalization) occurs, how advantage or disadvantage is cyclical in nature, and how people tend to deny that such injustice is occurring is half of the work we do in Curriculum & Instruction to help our

students understand teaching for social justice [...] The second essential concept that must be developed is: Teachers can interrupt the cycles of oppression. Helping pre-teachers learn how to interrupt (or challenge) oppression means learning about (or inventing) strategies to counter oppression (of race, class, gender, (dis)ability, sexuality, and others) across the grade levels and content areas in which our teachers work. Teachers can work as change agents through the content or topics they address as well as through particular pedagogical practices that tend to undermine patterns of oppression. (Russo 2008:1)

To support teachers learning to become agents of social change, we urge critical reflection about what we call “specs”, an acronym for social, political, economic, and cultural systems affecting schooling and education (Ramalho 2006). This term was developed to make it clearer that every educational event takes place in settings characterized by certain social, economic, political and cultural features. When identified, these help teachers make critical pedagogical decisions in terms of curriculum and instruction, and of ways they relate to individual or groups of students. We use “specs” in two senses. Specs is shorthand for specifications, and for spectacles, or lenses. In the sense of *specifications*, students are urged to consider the question: *What social, political, economic and cultural factors operate at this historical juncture that affect my school, my students, and my work?* In the sense of *spectacles*, or lenses students are oriented to ascertain: *How do barriers of poverty, race, ability, gender and sexuality impact educational equity and compromise the schooling experience?* These lenses are required to ground teachers’ understanding historically and sociologically.

Students learn the “specs” of schooling and education throughout our K-12 teacher education curriculum. At the undergraduate level, the first semester offers a course in the Foundations of Education, *Schooling, Pedagogy and Social Justice*. It examines the history of power relations in institutions within the U.S. looking at the way race, class, gender, ability and sexuality oppressions have shaped schooling as an institution and the life chances of American students. Students come into the program hoping to learn fun teaching activities to help children learn. But they have to examine their upbringing and communities for issues of oppression that will affect their teaching. During the next three semesters, students take courses in foundations of disability studies from an advocacy perspective; literacy; and, methods in socially conscious and culturally relevant pedagogy. We challenge students to move from thinking about marginalized students as needing charity from people of good will, and encourage them to examine social structures that keep certain social groups disadvantaged. The course *Culturally Relevant Teaching* is taken along with *Teaching Methods* the semester before they engage in teaching for social justice in greater depth, with a focus on practice.

Culturally Relevant Teaching conceptualizes teachers as multicultural workers who teach from anti-bias (Derman Sparks & the ABC Taskforce 1989; Grayson & Martin 1997; McGovern. 1997; Froschl, Sprung, & Mullin-Rindler, 1998); anti-racist (McLean Donaldson 2001); anti-sexist (McCormick 1994); and culturally relevant perspective and pedagogy (Gay 2000; Grant & Sleeter 1998; Ladson Billings 1997; Sleeter & Grant 1999). These selections call for teachers to help students identify and challenge injustices around race, class, gender, ability and sexuality; to provide all students with opportunities for teacher analytical feedback, response opportunities and attention; and to examine and

critique lesson plans for students of all ages from a variety of social justice approaches. Norms of whiteness and manifestations of racism in schools are examined for their deficit views of minority students (Tatum 1997; Smith 1998; Banks & Banks 1993; Sleeter & Grant 1999). Students are encouraged to imagine life from the perspective of oppressed groups and develop understandings of the issues and dilemmas present. Students' understanding of positionality (Adams & Bell 1997; Cochran Smith & Lytle 1993, 1999; Ladson –Billings 1995; Lindsey 2003; Ndura 2004; Russo & Beyerbach 2001) and need for critical consciousness (Freire 1970) are emphasized through reflection and awareness of constructed knowledge of teaching and learning throughout a teacher's career span, beginning with the preservice experience (Cochran- Smith 2004; Grayson and Martin 1997; Pang 2004).

In the semester after this course we encourage students to move from awareness to applying their learning in the classroom. We encourage them to shift from a focus where they claim to be colour blind and to treat all students the same, to acknowledging and teaching about differences, integrating multicultural curriculum, and actively teaching anti-bias curriculum. In the last semester of the program, the course, *Professionalism and Social Justice* functions as a capstone experience in teaching for social justice. It sponsors a professional conference where all student teachers engage in presentations of lessons with social justice themes they developed and taught in their K-12 classrooms. We have them critique their own and each others' lessons to see if they actively challenge injustice and expand students' understanding of the diverse people of the world.

In the course students write a cultural autobiography and reflect on how their cultural beliefs will impact their teaching practice. They complete popular culture action research projects in which they examine media for bias and construct culturally relevant, anti-bias lessons. For example, students examine the enormously popular Disney channel television show, *Hannah Montana*, analyzing how gender is constructed. Their work reveals that through the programme, girls receive a message about 'getting a boyfriend'. They go on to construct lessons to engage 4th -6th grade students in deconstructing these representations. They may have them choose a male and female lead character, list descriptive verbs for each with supporting evidence, and then generalize about the messages about boys and girls present in the show.

In the course students also conduct studies of a cultural group other than their own. They prepare lessons teaching about the group's history within the United States, including continuing oppressions, and current issues. One group looked at Hispanic Americans, beginning by examining the very label, identifying diversity within the group, comparing and contrasting experiences of Puerto Ricans born in NYC who move back and forth between New York and Puerto Rico with recent Mexican immigrants. They examined the school performance of each sub-group, issues of acculturation and ethnic identity, experiences of racism, bilingualism, illegal immigration, migrant work, and imperialism. They looked for authentic instructional materials representing a range of views on these issues, and planned developmentally appropriate learning activities.

At the master's level in the Literacy and the Curriculum and Instruction programmes, the course *Critical Pedagogy* scrutinizes in greater depth social and educational issues, re-

examining sexism, racism, poverty, ableism, heterosexism and homophobia. The curriculum elaborates on feminist and Marxist perspectives, comparing and contrasting these with prevailing liberal and conservative perspectives. Many students learn to distinguish these for the first time. The course investigates concepts in the field of Critical Pedagogy, focusing on the contributions of critical education scholars followers of Freire (1970) such as Apple (2006), Giroux (2003), McLaren (2006), hooks (1994), Horton (1998) and Wink (2004). They engage in discussions about who holds the power to define the curriculum, and the differences between the formal official state-mandated curriculum and the hidden curriculum in schools. They discuss instruction, assessment and teacher relationships with students, parents, peers and administrators within a critical framework. They are asked to envision meaningful student-led project-based liberatory practices that help constitute the K-12 students as critically informed citizens of a democratic nation. Discussions of the social scientific utopian novel by feminist writer Marge Piercy (1985), *Woman on the edge of time*, aim at identifying the social, political, economic and cultural factors impacting the education and praxis of the main character, a Mexican-American woman in poverty.

ASSESSING STUDENTS' LEARNING

In order to understand how students responded to the course we developed pre- and post-assessment surveys. These included questions about globalization, sustainability, and global issues that should be included in the K-12 curriculum. We were also interested in how student teachers might address these issues in their teaching. Project activities associated with this investigation took place during three of the fourteen class meetings of each of the courses. In the beginning of the semester, we organized eight mixed groups of graduate and undergraduate students and assigned each a chapter from *Rethinking globalization* (Bigelow & Peterson 2002). Meeting independently, they were expected to summarize and present contents using PowerPoint slide shows to teach hands-on lessons. Students were asked to read the introductory section of the book about the concepts of interconnectedness of social issues globally, globalization and its myths, and the goal of sustainable development. Graduate students were encouraged to serve as mentors, sharing their greater experiences in classrooms. We worked with a total of 23 undergraduates and 22 graduate students. Of the 55, three were students of colour, and the others were white, middle and working class students from predominantly small town settings in our region. Three-fourths of the students were female. This demographic profile reflects the teaching force in the United States.

In the first of the three classes dedicated to the project, students completed a pre-assessment survey. The next week we addressed three topics, starting with the presentation on the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, which placed the study of globalization and sustainability in the context of international efforts to involve teachers globally in concerns about the necessity of sustainable development. We followed with the showing and discussion of *Bringing home Durban* (Powers 2002), on the United Nations World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance held in Durban, South Africa, August 31 to September 4, 2001. We ended the class with a discussion of the issues raised in the introduction of *Rethinking globalization*.

Much of the information presented was new to students, who questioned why this history was unfamiliar.

The following week was devoted to group presentations. Students demonstrated creativity in the lessons they taught, summarizing *Rethinking globalization* chapter contents, often complex economic matters to which they had never before been exposed. Students manifested disgust with issues such as the exploitation of workers, and child labour. Many voiced commitment to activism around the issues researched, such as writing to companies profiting from child labour or boycotting certain labels. Strategies for including these topics in their students' curricula were discussed. Before leaving at the end of class, students filled a post-assessment survey asking the same questions as had been asked in the pre-assessment instrument.

In the pre- survey, the response given about the meaning of globalization by most students focused on increased communication and interdependence between peoples internationally. For example, students wrote about "greater interconnectedness and interdependence between the world's nations", "the world is getting smaller as we communicate via internet", and "we are all interconnected". These answers lacked perspective on the functioning and role of capitalism in fostering globalization as historical phenomena. In the post-assessment survey, answers frequently conveyed connections between the economy and globalization. Some students used a richer vocabulary to define globalization as "distribution of goods and services from place to place"; "the interconnection of various economies and cultures"; "the connection of nations along the expansion of technology". However, "interconnection and interdependence of the world's nations" was still the prevailing description.

The answers about disadvantages and advantages of globalization in the post-survey showed almost all students used greater precision about economic relations mentioning discrimination, poverty, environmental degradation, and colonialism. Students wrote, "many people are taken advantage of"; "resources are depleted"; "we have things at good prices, but not at a good price for others"; "inequalities of food, health care"; "Westernization of other countries." Benefits cited for globalization were "diffusion of ideas and materials worldwide", "products being more available", "access to technology for greater numbers of people", and "making us more aware of other cultures".

In the first survey, the question about sustainable development was answered with "I do not know" by one-third of the graduates and over half of the undergraduate students. Those who answered offered: "maintaining what we have", "the country is able to sustain itself", and that sustainability has to do with "a country's self-reliance". We read these definitions as smart guesses. After the lessons, more students recognized the concept of sustainability, writing about it as "development that does not deplete resources therefore is growing at a rate that can be sustained"; "being able to preserve the environment and provide for everyone, for generations to come, without depleting the resources"; "being able to survive but not over-consume resources so that others cannot survive". The advantages of sustainable development indicated were "cleaner environment", the possibility that "all people would have enough to live comfortably"; and that sustainable living "demands critical thinking on our part in making way for a better tomorrow for our children and

grandchildren”. On the other hand, disadvantages involved “making do with fewer things, with less money”, and “having to learn moderation in consumption”. There was a definite pessimistic sense that the institutionalization of sustainability will be difficult.

In terms of advantages and disadvantages of sustainability, between one-third and one-half again answered, “I do not know” in the pre-survey. Other answers reflected the guessing gamut from “development keeps improving” to “things remain as they are”; with only one student writing that sustainable development “preserves the Earth.” Answers like, “the rich become richer and the poor, poorer,” and “some people do not want change and are greedy” indicated that sustainability is still a fuzzy concept in the U.S. and not widely discussed, at least in these students’ experiences.

In the pre-assessment survey, students were asked to pinpoint five global issues they would include in the K-12 curriculum, indicating how they might address them in current or imagined classrooms. They listed familiar concerns related to culture and multiculturalism, including racism and white privilege, already emphasized in the courses. To teach about war, they cited Iraq; and named poverty, overpopulation, global warming, and environmental degradation as issues to include in the curriculum, thus revealing clarity about challenges facing humanity. The graduate students, beginning career teachers more experienced in classrooms, articulated how they would teach about these matters in greater detail and with a wider variety of strategies.

In the post- survey, global education topics increased in number and types. Environmental concerns came to the forefront, along with the economy, and resource utilization, three central features of sustainable development. Human rights, poverty, hunger, consumerism, self-determination of all countries, imperialism and colonialism, “terrorism”, and even “what makes people hate the U.S.” were added. More important was what students revealed about their teaching approach to these topics: they would talk to their students openly about them, not “protect” them from the seriousness of issues. They would show the “truth” and develop critical thinking using active games, for example, about conservation; discussing political cartoons and written materials from news magazines and newspapers, and documentaries; and inviting speakers on global matters to their classes. They thought that *Rethinking globalization* was a good resource from which to draw when developing instructional activities that could be adapted and used in their classrooms.

Students wrote about globalization and sustainability issues with greater accuracy and richer conceptual language in the post-assessment survey, demonstrating what we consider an appropriate beginning level of understanding of some of the complex factors associated with globalization and sustainability. Groups created slide shows and used them to inform other class members and invite contributions. They adapted or used activities from *Rethinking globalization* to involve classmates, practising instructional strategies they may employ in the future. One of the groups provided a good example of the global to local to personal approach, setting a station to serve coffee, a commodity that has human and environmental costs beyond the prices at the grocery store or at agricultural exchange. Students employed the exercise suggested in Durning’s (2002) ‘Just a cup of coffee?’ a short text describing the processes coffee beans go through during production, with a focus on the consumption of energy and other resources, from growth on plantations located

where native forests had been cleared, through harvest, drying, transportation, roasting, and preparation. Participants were able to reflect and appreciate the importance of global politics of food.

Such activities required application of concepts to new situations, and brought abstract or until then invisible global issues to the personal and local levels. In summary, through the project, not only did students learn new content but they perceived that the challenges of globalization and sustainability charged them with emotions required to making a commitment to doing something to educate their own students. The practice lessons they developed and conducted may well serve as models for future practice in their classrooms.

Class participants used the words, “thought provoking”, “disturbing”, and “astonishing” to describe their experiences learning fresh information about the social, political and economic and cultural relations between nations globally, about the history of colonialism, and the human and environmental costs of capitalist economic activity. Writing in her journal, a Critical Pedagogy student indicated,

Last class we had our presentation on the *Rethinking globalization* book. I really enjoyed this class and the presentations were very thought provoking. Two presentations that really stuck on my mind were the two that dealt with child labour and sweatshops.

Students asked why they had not been exposed before to facts and viewpoints such as those presented in *Rethinking globalization*. We took the opportunity to discuss different political points of view on globalization and sustainability. An objective for the global education inclusion project was to demonstrate the impact of conservative ideas on the curriculum, and raise questions from more liberal and progressive angles.

Our courses were not redesigned to fully include global education; nevertheless, we found that, within the constraints, our short-term project led students to consider and learn about globalization and sustainability issues through critical lenses. They read and heard, some for the first time, about how the U.S., through economic, political and military relations with other countries, may be implicated in activities that hurt children, women, men, and the environment across the globe, and that teachers in a democratic society have a role in addressing these questions.

However, with regard to student identities as global citizens, we have no evidence of achievement. We did not include the concept in the pre- and post- assessment surveys, nor did we ask students to speak to that directly. We spoke about global citizenship during our presentations and discussions on sustainability and the international struggle against racism. We did not believe that such a short term project, largely conducted by students themselves, could show changes in identities. We decided not to be concerned with finding evidence as much as with keeping in mind, and sharing it with the students, the potential power of teachers who identify themselves as global citizens who contribute to the nurturing of new generations of humans to think critically and globally in order to act locally.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Bell, L.A. & Griffin, P. (1997) *Teaching for social justice: A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.
- 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*. New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.
- American Association of Colleges and Universities (n.d.), *Global Learning*, Available at <http://www.aacu.org/resources/globallearning/index.cfm> [Accessed on 9 July 2007].
- Anderson, L. (1979) *Schooling for citizenship in a global age: An exploration of the meaning and significance of global education*. Bloomington Indiana: Social Studies Development Center.
- Apple, M. (2006) *Educating the right way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Banks, J.A. (ed.) (2004) *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Banks, J.A. & Banks, C.A.M. (1993) *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Becker, J.M. (1979) *Schooling for a global age*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bigelow, B. & Peterson, B. (eds.) (2002) *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools.
- Boulding, E. (1988) *Building a global civic culture. Educating for an interdependent world*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bringing Durban home: Combating racism together* (2002) [DVD] Directed by Thorn Powers. Sunnyside, New York: Sugar Pictures.
- Burbules, N. & Torres, C.A. (2000) *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Chomsky, N. (1993) *Year 501. The conquest continues*. Cambridge Massachusetts: South End Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2002) *Media control: The spectacular achievements of propaganda*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2004) *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance (The American empire project)*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1993) *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1999) 'Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities'. In *Review of Research in Education*, 24 (1), 249-305.

Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D. & Fries, K. (2004) 'Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy'. In J. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (eds.) *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Macmillan.

Derman-Sparks, L. & the ABC Task Force (1989) *Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and education*. Available at http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publicATIONS/Projects/digitexts/dewey/d_e/chapter08.html [Accessed on 12 May 2008].

Durning, A.T. (2002) 'Just a cup of coffee?' In B. Bigelow & B. Peterson (eds.) *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Froschl, M., Sprung, B. & Mullin-Rindler, N. (1998) *Quit it*. New York: Educational Equity Concepts.

Gay, G. (2000) *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grayson, D. & Martin, M. (1997) *Generating expectations for student achievement: An equitable approach to educational excellence. Teacher Handbook*. Canyon Lake, California: Gray Mill.

Giroux, H.A. (2003) *The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grant, C.A. & Sleeter, C.E. (1998) *Turning on learning: Five approaches to multicultural teaching: Plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill.

Gutek, G.L. (1993) *American education in a global society: Internationalizing teacher education*. New York: Longman.

Hanvey, R.G. (1975) *An attainable global perspective*. New York: Center for War/Peace Studies.

Herr, N. (Professor of Science Education, California State University, Northridge) (2008) *Television & Health*. Available at <http://www.csun.edu/science/health/docs/tv&health.html>. [Accessed on 26 August 2008].

Hooks, B. (1994) *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Horton, M. (1998) *Long haul: An autobiography*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Johnston, M. & Ochoa, M. (1993) 'Teacher Education for Global Perspectives: A Research Agenda'. In *Theory into Practice*, 32 (1), 64-68.

Kenworthy, L.S. (1970) *The International dimension of education (background paper II)*. Washington DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kirkwood-Tucker, T.F. (2003) 'Global pedagogy in teacher education: from a curriculum of national citizenship education to a curriculum for world-centred citizenship education'. In *World Studies in Education*, 4 (2), 91-107.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1997) 'Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and Policy'. In J.A. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (eds.) *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Lamy, S.L. (1991) 'Global education: A conflict of images'. In K.A. Tye (ed.) *Global education: From thought to action. 1991 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lardner, J. & Smith, J. (2005) *The Growing economic divide in America and its poisonous consequences*. New York: The New Press.

Lindsey, J. (2003) 'Culture's role in teacher identity: Prompting teachers to explore their cultural background'. In *Action in Teacher Education*, 25 (4), 9-13.

McCormick, T.M. (1994) *Creating the nonsexist classroom: A multicultural approach*. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaren, P. (2006) *Life in schools: Introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McLean Donaldson, K. (2001) *Shattering the denial: Protocols for the classroom and beyond*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

McGovern, M. (1997) *Starting small*. Montgomery, Alabama: Teaching Tolerance.

Merryfield, M, Jarchow, E. & Pickert, S. (Eds.) (1997) *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Merryfield, M. (1997) 'Infusing global perspectives into the social studies curriculum'. In W. Ross (ed.) *The social studies curriculum. Purposes, problems and possibilities*. Albany, New York: Suny Press.

Merryfield, M. (2002) 'The difference a global educator can make'. In *Educational Leadership*, 60 (2), 18-21.

National Association for Multicultural Education 2007. Available at <http://www.nameorg.org/aboutname.html#goals> [Accessed on 21 August 2007].

Ndura, E. (2004), 'Teachers' Discoveries of their Cultural Realms: Untangling the Web of Cultural Identity'. In *Multicultural Perspectives*, 3 (3), 10-16.

Noddings, N. (2005) *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2000) *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pang, .V (2004) *Multicultural education: A caring-centered, reflective approach*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Piercy, M. (1985) *Woman on the edge of time*. New York: Random House.

Ramalho, T. (2006) 'United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development'. Paper presented at the *annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Francisco, California.

Raval, P. (2006) 'Integrating Global Perspectives in Teacher Education Programs'. Available at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p35805_index.html. [Accessed on 21 April, 2008].

Rethinking Schools Online (2007) Available at <http://www.rethinkingschools.org/>. [Accessed on 21 August 2007]

Russo, P. & Beyerbach, B. (2001) 'Moving from polite talk to candid conversation: Infusing foundational issues into a long-term professional development project'. In, *Educational Foundations*, 15 (2), 1-20.

Russo, P. (2008) *Teaching for social justice*. Available at www.oswego.edu/~prussol. [Accessed on 13 May 2008].

Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (1999) *Making choices for multicultural education*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (2007) *Turning on learning*. New York: John Wiley & Son.

Smith, G.P. (1998) *Common sense about uncommon knowledge: The knowledge bases for diversity*. Washington D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

- Southern Poverty Law Center (n.d.) *Pioneering Anti-Bias Education*. Available at <http://www.splcenter.org/center/tt/teach.jsp>. [Accessed on July 20 2007]
- Spring, J. (2007) *New paradigm for global school systems: Education for a long and happy life*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Stromquist, N. & Monkman, J. (2000) *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanhan, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Suarez-Orozco, M. (2007) *Learning in the global era: international perspectives on globalization and education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- State University of New York Oswego School of Education (1998) *School of Education conceptual framework*. Available at <http://www.oswego.edu/education/conceptualframework.htm>. [Accessed on 18 April 2007]
- Tatum, B.D. (1997) *“Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria” and other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.
- The Color of Fear* (1994) [Video] Directed by Lee Mun Wah. Berkeley, California : StirFry Seminars and Consulting.
- The Corporation* (2004) [DVD] Written, produced and directed by Mark Achbar, Jennifer Abbot and Joel Bakan. United States: Zeitgeist Films Inc.
- Tye, K.A. (ed.) (1991) *Global education. From Thought to Action: 1991 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tye, K.A. (n.d.) *The global yellow pages*. Available at <http://www.globaledyellowpages.org/>. [Accessed on 20 July 2007]
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (n.d.) *Education for sustainable development*. Available at http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=23295&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html. [Accessed on 19 July 2007].
- United Nations *Millennium Development Goals*. Available at <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/index.html>. [Accessed on 19 July 2007]
- United Nations Department of Public Information News and Media Services Division (2001) *High commissioner for human rights calls for intensified efforts after United States, Israel leave world conference*. Available at <http://www.un.org/WCAR/pressreleases/rd-d29.htm>. [Accessed on 20 July 2007]
- United States Department of Education (2008) *Summary of proposal regulations within the No Child Left Behind Act*. Available at <http://edpubs.ed.gov/Product-Detail.aspx>. [Accessed on 26 August 2008]

Ward, B. & Dubos, R. (1972) *Only one earth: The care and maintenance of a small planet*. New York: Norton Press.

Weiner, L. (2000) 'Research in the 90s: Implications for Teacher Preparation'. In *Review of Educational Research*, 70 (3), 369-406.

Wink, J. (2004) *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Xanthopoulos, J. (2005) 'Global education'. In M.C. Horowitz (ed.) *New dictionary of the history of ideas*. Farmington Hills, Michigan: Thomson Gale.

Zinn, H., Buhle, P. & Konopacki, M. (2008) *A people's history of American empire*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Tania Ramalho

Tania Ramalho is an Associate Professor of Education at the State University of New York (SUNY) at Oswego where she teaches Critical Pedagogy in the Literacy and Curriculum & Instruction master's programs. She chairs the Women's Studies Advisory Board. Her scholarly interests relate to intersections of race, class, and gender, in particular, in social justice-oriented education; global education, including development education; and, teacher professional development.

Correspondence: Tania Ramalho, ramalho@oswego.edu.

Barbara Beyerbach

Barbara A. Beyerbach is a Professor of Education at the State University of New York (SUNY) at Oswego, teaching in the area of Culturally Relevant Teaching and Methods of Teaching. She co-directs Project SMART, an interdisciplinary K-12 teacher professional development program to support urban/rural partnerships to improve teaching for all children. She is widely published in the areas of culturally relevant teaching, teacher professional development, and teaching for social justice.

Correspondence: Barbara Beyerbach, beyerbac@oswego.edu.