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Abstract

This dissertation is a case study examining the ways global perspectives are incorporated in a preservice teacher education program consisting of a social studies methods course and a practicum class. The goal is to reveal external and internal tensions student teachers and teacher educators experience when they try to implement global perspectives in their class and then to ultimately contribute to finding new kinds of teacher capacity in order to prepare preservice teachers as globally-well-prepared teachers.

This study is based on three research questions: First, what images or narratives about the globalized world do preservice teachers and teacher educators bring into a preservice social studies methods class? Second, what kinds of global perspectives and tensions about global perspectives do preservice teachers and teacher educators experience in the social studies methods class? And, third, in what ways, do preservice teachers represent their interpretations about the globalized world in their students’ teaching practices?

The first finding shows that student teachers have seen the world through limited and narrow perspectives on the globalized world based on their U.S.-centered schooling and personal experiences. The second and third findings reveal that behind the difficulties student teachers and teacher educators feel for incorporating global perspectives are many tensions (1) between existing topics as ‘explicit content’ and global topics as ‘inexplicit perspectives and examples’ in set curriculum, (2) between ‘manageable knowledge’ and ‘expanded knowledge,’ and (3) between the social studies methods class and student teaching in a school. These tensions reveal the conflict between the neoliberal standpoint and the radical standpoint, and between a traditional paradigm and a transformative paradigm.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The conception of teacher capacity has been changed over time. Teacher capacity meant subject matter, pedagogical method, teaching practice along with the knowledge of psychology, history of education, and principles of education until the 1920s. However, during the 1940-1950s, the concept shifted to observable patterns of classroom behaviors, attitudes, viewpoints, and intellectual and emotional qualities, which is reappeared as ‘process-product’ research trends in the 1970s. While school curriculum was continuously overhauled, teacher capacity was limited to the knowledge about their disciplines in the 1960s. In the 1980s, however, due to the emphasis on the interior lives of teachers, teaching was defined as continually responding to changing circumstances and interacting with the curriculum and diverse learners. Recently, the emphasis on standard-based reforms and publically established standards has resulted in higher expectation of teacher knowledge, skills, and dispositions (McDiarmid & Clevenger-Bright, 2008).

As seen in the above historical trends, the standard qualification, separate disciplines, and the failure of public schools in the U.S. have been overestimated in the concept of teacher capacity. However, the issues of diversity and social justice for the most part have been marginalized from the mainstream discourse (Grant, 2008; Grant & Agosto, 2008). As a result, some teacher educators have advocated new teacher capacity in terms of what candidates need to know in increasingly diverse classrooms teaching non-white students and other traditionally marginalized groups along with critical consciousness on social justice (Grant, 2008; Howard & Aleman, 2008).
However, conceptualizing the quality of a globally-well-prepared teacher is not sufficiently established as an essential capacity in the global era. Rather, due to great demands of the times of globalization, the area of internationalization of teacher education is becoming a politically competitive field supported by contrasted discourses without commonly recognized knowledge, skill, or dispositions regarding globally-well-prepared teacher. This dissertation work was conducted as a part of this need by addressing potential and tensions surrounding globalizing teacher education curriculum.

**Background of the Study**

Over the last few years, I have spent time conceptualizing global education in teacher education settings as well as examining the internationalization of teacher education. This revealed that the internationalization of teacher education is enclosed by diverse and often conflicting social discourses. This study employs three conflicting discourses—neoliberal, radical, and transformative approaches—in order to map the area of internationalization of teacher education in terms of their views of the globalized world and the influences of these perspectives on teacher education. Among the diverse ways of defining the “internationalization” of teacher education, this study concentrates on internationalization of teaching content and methods for the development of globally well-prepared teachers, because an innovated teacher education curriculum, as Merryfield (1997) has pointed out, could be one of the most direct ways to connect student lives to the globalized world.

In looking into how competing social discourses define globally competent teachers in more detailed ways, this study focuses on three main elements of internationalizing teacher education—knowledge, skills, and actions—through the prisms of neoliberal, radical, and transformative stances. In terms of knowledge, how these three discourses define knowledge
about the global world and people from other societies is considered. While the neoliberal approach focuses on global competitiveness in the global market, and the radical approach concentrates on global inequality between privileged societies and underprivileged societies, the transformative approach emphasizes global diversities and connectedness as “right” knowledge about the world. Also, these three discourses provide students with conflicting knowledge about people in other societies as trading partners (or hegemonic rivals), oppressed neighbors, or solidarity partners, respectively.

In terms of skills, this study focuses on conflicting meanings of cross-cultural and cooperation skills. While the neoliberal approach emphasizes basic literacy skills such as reading and math, the radical approach focuses more on critical thinking skills, referring to the possession of multiple, conflicting perspectives, and the transformative discourse emphasizes more complex and triplized thinking skills, an ability to see flexible interactions between global structure and local people. What is more interesting is that all of the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative stances stress similar skills such as communication skills and problem-solving skills, yet they stress different interpretations of those skills.

Lastly, with regard to the element of actions, these three discourses define a citizen’s role in different ways. As a brand-new version of citizenship education, the neoliberal global education defines a citizen’s role as a consumer or entrepreneur who is consuming other cultures as commodities, creating a place beyond traditional boundaries and local restrictions, and building economically liberal relationships, as well as a traveler who is freely moving across time and space without being encumbered by national boundaries. However, the radical discourse defines the role as a social reformer who can apply their knowledge and skills to challenge the structures that globally perpetuate oppressive social orders and systems, and the
transformative discourse regards the citizen’s role as a community-builder who participates in, and contributes to, the community at a range of levels from the local to the global.

By adopting these conflicting discourses on internationalizing teacher education as analysis frames, this study examines what values teachers bring into their classrooms and what kinds of struggles they experience when they try to incorporate these values into their curriculum. In short, this dissertation seeks to illuminate how preservice teachers construct and represent the image of a globalized world within three different levels of learning experiences—the preservice teachers’ narratives about globalized world based on their previous global experience, the preservice teachers’ interpretation on global perspectives in a preservice teacher education class, and their student teaching practices. Based on theoretical background and research interests, I have three main research questions as follows:

1. What images or narratives about the globalized world do preservice teachers and teacher educators bring into a preservice social studies methods class?
2. What kinds of global perspectives and tensions do preservice teachers and teacher educators experience in the social studies methods class?
3. In what ways do preservice teachers represent their interpretation about the globalized world in their students’ teaching practices?

**Overview of Methodology**

This study uses the case study as a main research method. Through this method, I focused on the case, the social studies methods course in light of competing global education discourses. In particular, this study employs qualitative method, in-depth interviews, and participant observation for two reasons: First, the above research questions cannot be answered without a researcher participating in the class and listening to the instructor and students’ thoughts about
their class and global issues; Second, as an international student and a complete stranger in this classroom, qualitative methods were helpful to understand the research field thoroughly.

I observed an elementary school social studies methods course, called Teaching Elementary Social Studies, in the fall of 2009 and an online class called Issues and Practices in Addressing Diversity in Elementary Education in the spring of 2010. I interviewed a total of eight students and an instructor. The first research question was answered through an analysis of narratives on the globalized world and global experience of preservice teachers and a teacher educator. The second question was addressed by an analysis of course materials and student teachers’ assignments, classroom observations, and interviews with preservice teachers and a teacher educator, and the third question was answered through an analysis of interviews with preservice teachers and their work as a student teacher. The data was gathered over fall 2009 and the late spring 2010 and examined over the fall 2010 and the spring 2011.

Overview of the Study

In chapter two, I examine competing meanings of “internationalization of teacher education” in light of three contested discourses. The neoliberal stance has emphasized rigorous standards in teacher education since it considers teacher education to be a global commodity competing with other universities in the global higher education market (Dolby & Rahman, 2008). The internationalization strategies from the neoliberal standpoint are the enhancement of deregulation policies, the development of a result-oriented environment, and the development of school-business alliances (Apple, 2005; Flippo, 2003; Zeichner, 2003). The radical stance has problematized the existing binary assumption of Western superiority and all other’s inferiority and criticized American education as historically perpetuated a legacy of colonialism (Merryfield, 2006a; Merryfield & Subedi, 2006; Sleeter, 2003). For this approach, internationalization of
teacher education refers to bringing alternative worldviews, such as those redefining relationships between European colonialism and current global economic practice (Vavrus, 2002), and developing new global teaching contents and methods such as a pedagogy of imperialism (Merryfield, 2006a). Lastly, the transformative stance has been focused on cultural differences of non-Western societies as an alternative to resolving social or environment problems of Western societies (Spring, 2007). As part of the internationalization of teacher education, the transformative approach has introduced new ways of seeing globalization by showing non-Western people change the existing global discourse and create their own localized and culturalized version of global discourses (Breidenbach & Zukrigl, trans., 2003). In addition, problematizing the current traditional site-bounded paradigm, they suggest a transformative paradigm connecting individual, local, and global needs and taking advantage of multiple local and global sources of teaching and knowledge (Y. Cheng, 2001). Based on these definitions, I examine each discourse in terms of competing concepts of knowledge about the globalized world and “others,” cross-cultural and cooperation skills that are essential in the global era, and citizen’s roles.

In chapter three, I outline the research framework and the research method used for this study. First, I frame my research based on the categorization of global discourses and global education by the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative approaches. This reason that I depend on those social discourses to analyze my research field is because it provides more a comprehensive description about global perspectives as well as the tensions existing within the field. Second, I identify research questions and methodology. In particular, I chose the case study as research method because this study focused on the intrinsic and instrumental needs of the case (Stake, 1995). As an international student unfamiliar with an undergraduate teacher education
course, I was required to understand this class as a particular case. Yet, at the same time, I have studied the case with specific interests and questions, which is something other than understanding this particular course. Therefore, based on the need of particularization and generalization, I employed the case study as the main method of this study. Third, I introduce participants and sites observed and interviewed in the 2009-2010 academic year following more detailed data collected for data analysis and triangulation strategies. Lastly, I conclude this chapter by addressing the limitation of the study.

In chapter four, I examine the global image and narratives revealed by eight student teachers and a teacher educator of a social studies methods course. First, I identify their general image of the globalization or globalized world and then make the image concrete and detailed by examining their diverse experiential areas such as family background, extracurricular activities, relationships with immigrant or international friends, and travel abroad experience. By doing so, I show student teachers have seen the globalized world through limited and narrow perspectives. Second, I focus on the student teachers’ experiences in their K-12 school curriculum, which show that American school curriculum mainly deals with national interest and leadership and does not go beyond Western civilization. Lastly, I wrap up this chapter by looking at these global experiences in light of global discourses.

In chapter five, I address global perspectives and the tensions that participants experienced in a social studies methods class and then address the ways of representing perspectives in student teaching settings along with different tensions. First, I describe a typical class and general elements of the class including literature circle, weekly topics, and social inquiry projects in order to give an overall picture of the class. Second, I examine the location of global topics/issues in the class objectives as well as the ways to teach global topics. Then I
describe global perspectives that student teachers learned through their weekly readings and book-club readings as well as four social inquiry projects. Lastly, I address the ways student teachers define their practicum school and their identity as well as the ways of teaching global contents in the classroom. I also show how both the teacher educator and student teachers experienced many difficulties and obstacles to teach and learn global perspectives. Finally, I clarify tensions behind those difficulties connecting these tensions to grand discourses.

In chapter six, I summarize and explicitly discuss overall images/narratives and tensions described in previous chapters and then interpret them by connecting them to the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative discourse. In particular, teacher education reform traditions such as academic and professionalization tradition are involved when understanding the relationship between tensions and global discourse. Next, I discuss the implication for teacher education revealed by this dissertation work and then conclude by suggesting some implication for further research.

**Significance of the Study**

Indeed, previous works have focused on the theoretical explanations of internationalizing teacher education or global education. However, few empirical works researching diverse tensions surrounding internationalization of teacher education programs are found. Even among these few works, most studies depend on exemplary works of implementing global topics or perspectives in teacher education programs as shown in the next chapter. Therefore, the conceptual and pedagogical tensions found in teaching contents or methods when teacher educators or teachers try to internationalize their curriculum and actual teachings remain unanswered or underdeveloped. Furthermore, how these tensions in an ordinary teacher education setting are connected to grand global discourses and represented in their teaching
practices are also rarely examined. Therefore, this empirical study will contribute to teacher education research, first, by describing experiential knowledge about diverse tensions surrounding internationalization of teacher education programs in an ordinary preservice teacher education class, and, second, by conceptualizing how these tensions in a preservice teacher education class are contextualized within the context of conflicting social discourses.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

As vividly seen in the history of global and international themes in social studies from the end of World War II to the end of the twentieth century, the efforts to internationalize social studies in American schools have been faced by tensions with both competing priorities and outright opposition (Sutton, 1998). These tensions resulted in international and global dimensions being only been partially incorporated into the social studies curriculum in the U.S. For example, new global education materials were created in the late 1960s and 1970s. At the same time, a conflict existed between the inexorable pressure to focus on the concern of the United States and grass-roots support by educators for global education during the period. In the 1980s, the release of an educational report, *A Nation at Risk*, caused increasing pressure to demonstrate that all students are competent in basic skills (e.g., math and reading skills). As a result, the report lowered administrative incentives to enhance the social studies curriculum including global education (Sutton, 1998). These tensions have changed global education into a highly contested field.

Based on the same assumption, this chapter discusses how these tensions, represented by three competing social discourses – the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative discourse – form the main contents of global education in disparate ways. First, I briefly define three discourses and show how these concepts align with various metaphors and theories of globalization in the literature. Then, I examine the main social discourses surrounding the internationalization of teacher education and discuss how these social discourses conceptualize and differentiate the knowledge-based, skill-based, and action-based approaches to global education.
Competing Discourses Surrounding Global Education

Spring (2008) outlined the current major goals of global education: 1) educating students with skills for the global workplace in the postindustrial society; 2) teaching communication and math skills as well as interpersonal skills for proper work attitudes in primary and secondary education; 3) accommodating migrant populations in national school systems through multicultural education; and 4) privatizing schools by providing parents choices of schools under the forces of the marketplace and government control through curriculum standards and testing. The first two goals and the last goal are deeply connected to the neoliberal discourse in that they aim to equip students with market-friendly skills and also import business models into the school system (Apple, 2005).

Even though current global education is highly influenced by the neoliberals, this chapter does not confine its discussion about global education to the neoliberal discourse or the above current major goals. Rather, in order to discover diverse characteristics of global education, I examine the elements of global education from diverse theoretical approaches. This study particularly focuses on the neoliberal school, the radical school, and the transformative school that McGrew (2000) suggests as three distinct examples of how globalization conditions the patterns of global inequality and world order. The reason that this chapter focuses on these three contrasting discourses is because these standpoints not only provide a more comprehensive description about the area of global education, but also show the disparate views of how the “global world”, “others”, and citizenship education are perceived. In addition, the areas of global education are not limited to specific skills such as math skills, or specific areas such as multicultural education. Rather, global education teaches students more diverse elements including knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Besides, global education is more than teaching
globalization because it not only informs students of how the globalized world looks, but it also teaches students global identities and ways of changing the world. Despite this broad approach, one focus of this study is internationalizing teacher education curriculum. Thus, this study defines global education as one way of internationalizing teacher education by incorporating global perspectives into the curriculum.

The literature dealing with global education often categorizes this into diverse approaches. There are several of these categories competing for dominance in global education that, in spite of the different terms associated with each of them, share assumptions based on the same social discourse. In this study, I use three terms to explain this contested situation: the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative approaches. The neoliberal approach to global education focuses on how the globalized world has been “developed” through accommodating the Western model of economy, culture, politics, etc. From this standpoint, non-Westernized societies who continuously benchmark the Western model will be “developed” and those who do not follow the model will remain underdeveloped. In order to advance their society, the most important virtue is to create a liberal or flexible economic environment, which are more market-friendly and free of government regulation. The radical approach, on the other hand, emphasizes how non-Western societies have been “oppressed” as a result of the imposition of the Western model of globalization. The radical theorists disclose various oppressions caused by current globalization, and so attempt to redirect the globalization away from the Westernized colonization perspective to avoid oppression issues. The transformative approach concentrates on local and regional societies worldwide, noting the intense interconnections to another. In this perspective, various social-cultural groups are also “differentiated” from each other by the hybrid combinations of global culture and local culture. From the transformative standpoint, every
single society is influenced by other societies as the result of globalization, yet the influence is not unidirectional. In other words, local people do not merely accept the global culture, but transform it as it combines with their own traditions, language, beliefs, and other aspects of their local culture. Therefore, the transformative approach focuses on the selective acceptance of global culture and cultural transformation.

The term ‘transformation,’ however, has been used in diverse contexts. Originally, the term was used during the eighteenth century when capitalism became established. According to Karl Polanyi (1944), the Western economic system mainly depended on “the principles of reciprocity or redistribution or of individual house-holding” until the eighteenth century (Harriss, 2000, p. 326). At the end of the century, however, a new principle of self-regulating markets came to popularity in European economic systems. The self-regulating market economy completely changed existing social relations in a way that the market economy determined social relations, as opposed to social relations determining market conditions. As a result, non-economic claims or commitments in local contexts could not interfere with the operation of the market. Polanyi called this structural change of society the ‘Great Transformation.’ In this context, ‘transformation’ means the change of social relations by economic structural changes based on (individual) economic motives. The reason why Polanyi called the above historical process of capitalism settlement the ‘Great Transformation’ is because economic structural change does not merely influence the economic arena, but also impacts the social arena. From today’s standpoint, economic change impacts an even broader range than just social relations, but includes the political, cultural, and environmental arenas. Therefore, the transformative approach to global education addresses more comprehensive changes by globalization, particularly focusing on cultural transformation, while the neoliberal approach highlights
favorable economic shifts, such as increasing jobs and the creation of new types of work positions.

The radical approach, similar to the transformative approach, addresses diverse changes in social, political, cultural, and environmental arenas resulting from globalization. For example, the East Asian currency crisis in 1997 resulted in a complete economic structure change. In particular, Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) imposed as a condition of loans from International Monetary Fund (IMF) mandated privatization of state-owned companies and deregulation in employment protection legislation in South Korea. This economic structural change has diminished the traditional working culture based on the balance between labor unions and management and created a new working culture based on unequal and competitive relations between full-time workers and part-time workers. Tauli-Corpuz (2006) describes how SAP privatization of coal mining in India, driven by the World Bank, has caused contamination of rivers, an increase in fluoride poisoning, the displacement of towns, and an increase in power rates by 500%. Both examples in these two countries show that current globalization, driven by global financial agencies, has created a comprehensive cultural transformation over social, political, and environmental arenas. In this, the radical approach and the transformative approach share a common point.

However, in the sense that the radical standpoint mainly concentrates on the uneasy relationship between upper, external powers, and local powers, it is different from the transformative approach. This does not mean that the transformative approach always looks for favorable relations like those of the neoliberal. As Mander and Tauli-Corpuz (2006) show, global financial agencies can weaken national-level environmental and labor laws and diminish indigenous economies and cultures, and so it can be said that globalization often plays the role of
a cruel power demolishing local communities. This viewpoint understands the unequal power relationship between global and local powers in a one-directional way and at the same time assumes a one-way relationship between the North and the South in the sense that global power represented by Western rich countries always impact indigenous people in non-Western, poorer countries. The transformative approach, on the other hand, focuses on the ever-changing power relations between global power and national/local level, which means a two-way or dynamic relationship between them. According to McGrew (2000), globalization does not simply mirror North-South geopolitical division but forms new patterns of inclusion and exclusion, which makes crude North-South relationships meaningless. Of course, globalization results in unequal power relations but these are always changing for many reasons including national economic policies influencing global agencies and peripheral countries threatening economic prosperity of core countries, as seen in the late 1990s financial crisis in East Asia. The transformative approach tries to provide a more accurate analogy instead of the core-periphery in a globalized world, by addressing the dynamic structural relations between North and South or global and local.

In addition, the transformative viewpoint focuses on cultural differences existing even in the globalized world. This characteristic vividly shows how the transformative approach differs from the neoliberal approach. From a neoliberal standpoint, the more the world becomes globalized, the more the world becomes homogeneous since globalization creates one gigantic market where many countries come to do business and, as a result, a shared global culture is formed. The globalized world provides both Western and non-Western people with similar daily life experiences by establishing similar cultural commodities, such as the same movies and the same foods. In this shared culture, each country serves others by exchanging goods through trade
and, in doing so, they sometime compete with other societies. However, the transformative school of thought considers globalization a function that discloses cultural differences. In other words, the global village created by the globalization process draws attention to cultural and language differences. These differences between radical and transformative as well as between neoliberal and transformative lead this study to focus on three approaches to global education.

These diverse and competing approaches in global education are also identified in the current scholarship. This is because global education has been historically grounded on the highly contested territory related to disputable theoretical frameworks, as I explained in the introduction. From my perspective, each approach could be connected to one of the above three discourses. According to Sleeter (2003), for instance, global education is based on various ways of thinking about globalization, such as the following metaphors: the global village, military competition, networks of interdependence, the McWorld metaphor, the spaceship earth metaphor, and the neo-colonialism metaphor. Although student learning depends on teachers’ interpretation of these metaphors, each metaphor assumes a particular discourse about the globalized world.

The military competition, the networks of interdependence, and the McWorld metaphors may follow the current neoliberal discourse since these metaphors depict competitive global-connectedness as an ideal or unavoidable condition. Accordingly, they do not disrupt the existing corporate globalization trend and describe economic relations in a mutually beneficial way. On the contrary, the neo-colonialism metaphor is grounded in an opposite discourse in that it opposes current global power relations among nation states and people, but also tries to redirect the current unequal process of globalization. In this sense, the neo-colonialism metaphor is deeply connected to the radical approach. However, the global village and the spaceship earth
metaphors focus on the other discourse, that the more the world becomes globalized, the more
the world becomes deeply interconnected. Drawing attention to cultural differences around the
world, the global village metaphor informs students of various ways that people globally move
and interact through migration, travel, and communicating over the Internet. In comparison, the
spaceship earth metaphor concentrates on the integrated nature of the Earth’s ecosystems that are
threatened by human actions, and teaches about environmental issues and actions that young
people can take to address the building of environmentally sustainable systems (Sleeter, 2003).
These two metaphors may follow the transformative approach in that they highlight global
interconnections, cultural differences, and shared global goals among countries.

Spring (2008) also addressed major theories regarding globalization and education. First
of all, world culture theory, which is similar to Sleeter’s military competition, networks of
interdependence, and McWorld metaphors, assumes that all cultures are slowly integrating into a
single global culture that is either influenced or dominated by Western culture. Based on this
assumption, the theory argues for a dominant position of the globalized Western school model.
On the other hand, the world systems theory assumes two major unequal zones between
dominant Western schooling and non-Western schooling. Similar to Sleeter’s neo-colonialism
metaphor, it criticizes existing unequal global power relations. Postcolonialist theory, which
criticizes the assumption on ‘inferiority’ of non-Western schooling, also makes a similar
assumption regarding globalization and education in the world system theory. However, the
culturalist theory emphasizes multiple models in the global flow of educational ideas as well as
the diverse adaptations of local actors. Compared to the world culture and world systems theory,
the culturalist theory has a very unique assumption about the globalized world since it assumes
neither a static single world nor a static divided world. Based on these assumptions associated
with the globalized world, it is possible to say that the world culture theory follows the neoliberal approach; the world system theory and postcolonialist theory springs from the radical approach; and the culturalist theory moves along the same path as the transformative approach.

Prior to examining specific elements of global education in light of these three approaches, there needs to be a look into the broader social contexts surrounding the teacher education reform and the internationalization of teacher education.

**Mapping the Internationalization of Teacher Education**

According to Liston and Zeichner (1991), the tradition of reform in 20th century U.S. teacher education is divided into four categories, the academic tradition, the social-efficiency tradition, the developmentalist tradition, and the social-reconstructionist tradition. Followers of the academic tradition believe that preservice teachers should have an education program that is firmly based in the traditional academic disciplines in order to resolve the quality issues related to teacher education. Through careful analysis of successful teachers and their work, the social-efficiency tradition tries to specify what pedagogical knowledge and skills preservice teachers should obtain as well as what explicit criteria should be measured in behavioral terms. The developmentalist approach is far more child-oriented and its characteristics are summarized through three definitions of teachers as naturalists, as artists, and as researchers. Finally, the social-reconstructionist tradition focuses exclusively on developing social consciousness and reform abilities among preservice teachers along with the development of an integrated social foundation approach, restoring the destroyed integrity by subject-matter boundaries in order to help teachers make wise educational decisions. Zeichner (2003) re-addresses these four approaches in terms of their strengths and weaknesses related to how to deal with the shortage of qualified teachers and the continuing unequal spread of these qualified teacher candidates in
different school districts in the U.S. He renames the social-efficiency tradition the “professionalization agenda,” the academic tradition the “deregulation agenda,” and the social-reconstructionist tradition the “social justice agenda.” He excludes the developmentalist approach in this discussion because he thinks it is not only less important in the 21st century, but it could be aligned either with the social-reconstructionist or with the professionalization agenda.

The professionalization agenda argues that inequities and injustice can be remedied by raising standards for teaching and teacher education and by greater investment in teaching and public schooling. The deregulation agenda asserts that there is a need to break what they see as a monopoly of colleges and universities by encouraging alternative certification programs and by dismantling state teacher certification processes. They believe that there should be better support for teacher’s subject matter knowledge and verbal ability and that pedagogical knowledge should be replaced by apprenticeships. The social justice agenda maintains that teacher education is effective in preparing teachers to become culturally responsive teachers. This reform also emphasizes new teaching standards such as a knowledge base for culturally responsive teaching as well as efforts to recruit, prepare, and retain more teachers of color. Internationalization of teacher education is also based on these teacher education reform traditions and agendas.

The “internationalization” of teacher education has been defined in various ways. While one trend of internationalizing teacher education focus on borrowing and lending of teacher education policies through transnational cooperation programs or comparative and international researches, another trend concentrates on inservice or preservice teacher exchange program. Another trend highlights internationalization of teacher education curriculum by innovations in teaching contents and methods. As a representative scholar of the last approach, Merryfield has argued for the innovation of teacher education framework in order to solve the essential lack of
connection between global contents and the students’ lives in current K-12 curriculum (Merryfield, 1997; 2006a; 2006b; Merryfield & Subedi, 2006). From the teacher education programs that she participated in as a faculty member along with her review of the literature on exemplary global educators, Merryfield draws on the great variety of pioneering teacher education frameworks (Merryfield, 1997). Besides, other teacher educators assert internationalizing teacher education by incorporating diverse teaching and learning resources brought from the Internet for the development of world-class curriculum and pedagogy in the technologically interconnected world (Y. Cheng, 2001). Among diverse trends of internationalizing teacher education, the focus of this study is located on the last definition, which pursues internationalization of teacher education by innovating pedagogical knowledge and teaching strategies. Based on this definition, this section addresses how the internationalization of teacher education has been impacted by three discourses—the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative stances—and how these discourses could be connected to the teacher education reform tradition.

Firstly, since the neoliberal discourse considers American teacher education as a commodity that is a part of higher education, this neoliberal approach has emphasized the standardization of teacher education in order to compete with other universities in the global teacher education market (Dolby & Rahman, 2008). The neoliberal strategy to succeed in the global market consists of three parts: the enhancement of deregulation policies, the development of results-oriented environments, and school-business alliances. Under the deregulation strategies, the neoliberal approach tries to break what they see as the monopoly of colleges and universities by encouraging alternative certification programs (Zeichner, 2003). For example, in the 1980s, the release of A Nation at Risk: Teachers for Tomorrow’s Schools by the Holmes
Group and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century by the Carnegie Corporation resulted in harsh criticism of U.S. public schools for their failure compared to other countries. They suggested the elimination of undergraduate teacher education programs, and instead encouraged the establishment of post-baccalaureate programs (Grant, 2008). Their suggestion is based on the belief that anyone can teach reasonably well after completing these certification programs, as well as preservice teaching experiences in their practicum sites (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Next, as another strategy to internationalize teacher education, the neoliberal stance has created a result-oriented environment that continuously requires teachers to prove their quality by measured outcomes such as standardized test scores (Apple, 2005), which leads newer teachers to benchmark testing and testing preparation (Imig & Imig, 2006). This result-oriented characteristic has an influential impact, not only on the process of preparing and recruiting teachers through high-stakes teacher testing, but also on the process of inservice teaching by standardized tests (Flippo, 2003). Finally, the neoliberals have continued to argue for a school-business alliance through for-profit programs and school-based apprenticeships focusing on strict achievement of the state’s certification/content standards (Vavrus, 2002).

These neoliberal strategies of internationalizing teacher education are strengthened by the academic tradition in U.S. teacher education reform. For example, as Liston and Zeichner (1991) and Zeichner (2003) have argued, the academic tradition has criticized education courses, students, and faculty for their intellectual superficiality, and a great deal of duplication of liberal arts and science contents, all of which fit into neoliberal deregulation strategy. Also, this antagonistic viewpoint against the university-based teacher education programs resulted in the condemnation by the academic tradition scholars that education courses exclusively focused on the technical and vocational aspects of teacher education, which preservice teachers could learn
through an apprenticeship experience in a school (Zeichner, 2003). Also, as the neoliberal discourse supports the current practices of corporate globalization that were initiated by European colonialism in the 15th century and has been perpetuated as Eurocentrism and U.S.-centrism (Vavrus, 2002), the academic tradition only values Western cultures and disagrees with curricula that goes beyond a selection of the “great resources of Western civilization” (Kliebard, 1998). However, I doubt the neoliberal assertion—that American teacher education could succeed in the global teacher education market by raising the state’s certification/content standards, establishing a measurement system of the outcome, and privatizing university-based teacher education through for-profit programs—because their belief is based on a narrowly defined teacher capacity, such as verbal ability and subject matter knowledge. This limited imagination of teacher capacity is neither culturally relevant nor globally competent in the globalized world.

By contrast, the radical discourse invites us to consider the internationalization of teacher education in both skeptical and alternative ways. First, this approach criticizes how American teacher education has produced a binary assumption about the globalized world that divides the world into Western superiority and the rest of the world’s inferiority (Merryfield & Subedi, 2006). For example, in her chapter titled “Moving the center of global education,” Merryfield (2006a) pointed out an European orientalist perspective that considers the East as an uncivilized place in comparison to the West as a civilized place has become a dominate assumption in U.S. schooling. In the opinion of radical global educators, American teachers have been teaching students a historically perpetuated legacy of colonialism without a skeptical and historical view. As Sleeter (2003) analyzed, this argument is valid because many state and national curriculum
standards privilege particular metaphors that do not disrupt existing global power relations by omitting unequal global power relations and viewpoints from the oppressed.

Second, the radical discourse provides a great deal of alternative worldviews along with teaching global contents and methods. For example, radical global educators emphasize critical global perspectives on the relationship between European colonialism and current global economic practice (Vavrus, 2002). In order to help students understand that existing worldviews on globalization resulted from a legacy of Western imperialism, Merryfield (2006a) also suggested the so-called “pedagogy of imperialism,” (p. 182) which inquires how the educational legacy of imperialism shapes mainstream academic knowledge, and how the imperial framework limits students’ worldview of other people, societies, and cultures. Lastly, as an alternative model to the dominant Western standpoint, some radical global educators support subaltern-perspective awareness that appreciates the epistemic privilege of subaltern peoples, because marginalized groups know more about their own oppression than outsiders do, and consequently encourages oppressed voices to speak through them, as opposed to speaking for marginalized people (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011).

The radical approach to the internationalization of teacher education is especially supported by the social-reconstructionist tradition among the four teacher education traditions, since the tradition considers curriculum as an instrument of social change, as well as considering teacher education as an important means of the social justice movement through the critical social consciousness and the reform abilities of teachers (Liston & Zeichner, 1991). In a similar way, this radical discourse attempts to challenge the existing neoliberal globalization and to eliminate global inequality on the basis of the Western model of globalization and Western privilege. Nonetheless, the followers of the social-reconstructionist tradition only focus on
localized or nationalized issues such as White privilege, and highly emphasize the social conditions of the poor and their racial minority and voices. Even though this tradition has appropriately addressed the problem of a culturally ill-prepared teacher who cannot build bridges between the material to be learned and students’ personal/cultural knowledge and experiences (Villegas, 2008), the tradition has kept silent concerning the matter of a globally ill-prepared teacher who perpetuates Western privilege and a colonized mind in the U.S. schooling system (Merryfield & Subedi, 2006). However, this radical approach advocates for values beyond the nation-state-centered approach, and reevaluates how we have theorized local-global relationships as the relationship between the center and the periphery through the colonial or neo-colonial imagination (Subedi, 2009). For this reason, the radical discourse about the internationalization of teacher education can provide the existing social-reconstructionist tradition with new ideas about how American teacher education has excluded the non-Western societies and people.

As the last general category of social discourse on internationalizing teacher education, the transformative discourse provides teacher education with quite different perspectives on culture and globalization from the neoliberal and the radical discourses (Spring, 2008). First, the transformative approach pays attention to cultural differences in global era rather than focusing on global competitiveness or global inequality. In other words, the transformative discourse enjoys the cultural differences of non-Western societies, and sometimes believes that these foreign viewpoints could be an alternative to resolving many problems of Western societies. For example, Spring (2007) contrasted Western ways of seeing/knowing with indigenous and Confucian ways of seeing/knowing, in that the former emphasizes their analytical ways of seeing while the latter stresses a holistic view focusing on ecological relationships between human beings and nature, which helps students learn how humans can live together.
Second, the transformative approach is based on the concept of multiple-dimensions of globalization. In comparison, the neoliberal discourse assumes only one-dimension of globalization because the neoliberals consider the Westernized global system as a developed model as well as non-Westernized systems as late-blossoming models, which pursue a Westernized model. In contrast, the radical educators recognize two-dimensions of globalization and are aware of the reverse side of the West-led globalization, that non-Western people have been oppressed and exploited by Western societies since the colonial era. However, the transformative discourse focuses on the situation that non-Western people change existing global discourses and create their own localized version of global discourses. For instance, Breidenbach and Zukrigl (trans., 2003), in their anthropological research on globalization, described how the world has become homogeneous but at the same time heterogeneous through the influence of economic globalization along with numerous examples showing how non-Western people exploit global commodities for their own benefits. This flexible relationship between the local and the global helps teachers/students challenge stereotypes and engage in advocating possible changes within local and global contexts.

More importantly, the transformative discourse criticizes how current teacher education produces globally-ill-prepared teachers, as the radical approach argues. However, their blame lies more upon the current traditional site-bounded paradigm (Y. Cheng, 2001). According to Yin C. Cheng (2001), the teacher is the only source of teaching and knowledge in the traditional site-bounded paradigm, but the transformative paradigm takes advantage of multiple local and global sources of teaching and knowledge. Therefore, the goal of teacher education is to develop teachers’ ability to network their class to unlimited resources (Y. Cheng, 2001). In addition, the internationalization of teacher education, in this transformative stance, aims to develop a globally
well-prepared teacher with an innovative categorization, that is to say, one who can consider the linguistically and culturally diverse classroom as a favorable resource rather than as a difficult, hard, and problematic situation (Dooly & Villanueva, 2006).

Last but not least, even though the transformative discourse plays a role in internationalizing teacher education as a political bumper and as a new paradigm in a new era, the danger of “happy global multiculturalism,” (Heilman, 2006, p. 195), which simply celebrates cultural differences and cross-cultural knowing or enjoys others as a pleasurable commodity, may be harbored in this approach. In order to help teachers/students understand that differences, including incompatible belief systems, can also cause discomfort and difficulties (Merryfield, 2006b), the critical perspectives on global inequality guided by the radical discourse needs to be considered alongside the transformative approach. Also, considering that both approaches are under the influence of global standards imposed by international standardized tests such as PISA and TIMMS (Waks, 2003), market-driven politics, and evidence-oriented culture (Apple, 2005), the cooperation between both discourses will be essential for, as Waks calls, “fundamental curriculum change” going beyond the institutional ‘grammar’ of schooling (Cuban, 1992, as cited in Waks, 2003), which is described as discipline-based and textbook-based teaching of standardized curriculum contents with tests linked to college admission requirements.

The questions we face now are: “How have these diverse social discourses surrounding the internationalization of teacher education influenced teachers’ lives and their teaching practices?” “What values do teachers bring into their classrooms among these diverse and often conflicting social discourses?” and “What changes do they want to or hesitate to make in their teaching practices, in particular their curriculum, within the global context of teacher education?” There are two ways of answering these empirical questions: 1) By examining the more detailed
elements of global education that each social discourse asks teachers to embody; and 2) By examining both specific and ordinary ways in which teachers adapt these new ideas of education. Prior to addressing these empirical research questions in a specific case study, the following section discusses the main elements of global education that the three social discourses identify.

**Competing Elements of Global Education**

Hansen (2008), who addressed the purpose of teacher education as preparing a person to lead a productive life and to contribute to public interests, argued that a great variety of definitions of the “educated person” determine numerous purposes of teacher education. Likewise, the three discourses regarding internationalization of teacher education have their own definition of the educated person. According to Shultz (2007), the neoliberal educators identify the educated person as someone who is freely moving throughout the world, for either participating in business or consuming global commodities, without being encumbered by national boundaries. Next, the radical discourse identifies the educated person as someone who understands how this globalized world creates poverty, and oppresses and agrees with his/her responsibility to challenge state and corporate structures. Lastly, the transformative approach identifies the educated person as someone who understands herself/himself as intricately connected to people and issues that cross national boundaries, and, at the same time, who can build relationships through embracing diversity and finding a shared purpose across all circumstances in which people are situated (Shultz, 2007). In short, each educated person might be called the competitive global worker, the reflective global reformer, and the innovative global solidarity-builder, respectively. In order to examine how teachers can rear these educated persons more practically, we need to narrow down the purpose of global education into more detailed
elements. Not surprisingly, these highly contested discourses diverge not only in terms of general areas of teacher education, but also specific elements of global education.

As general elements of global education, this section employs three categories: knowledge, skills, and actions. The first reason that I focus on these three categories is that these categories are basic elements that many global education scholars conceptualize. For example, Davies (2006), drawing on Lynch (1992), pointed out the development of knowledge, skills, and values regarding human rights and the social responsibilities of citizens in order to globalize citizenship education. Banks (2004) also argued that global citizenship education should help students acquire knowledge, attitudes, and skills by appropriately working not only in their nation-states, but also in diverse world societies. Oxfam, a confederation of 14 organizations with the goal of finding lasting solutions to poverty and injustice, asserts that the components of global citizenship education consist of three categories of “knowledge and understanding,” “skills,” and “values and attitudes” (Oxfam, 2006). Furthermore, the blend of these knowledge, skills, and dispositions allows students to become actively involved in citizenship education within global contexts (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005). I accommodate both knowledge and skills as basic components of global education in this study, since the global education literatures constantly highlights knowledge about the globalized world and people as well as the indispensable skills to thrive in the global era. However, this study employs another element of global education, “action,” instead of attitudes or dispositions, because encouraging students to take action has become a more effective and inevitable way of solving urgent global challenges as opposed to rearing certain attitudes (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011).

The second reason that this section relies on knowledge, skills, and actions for basic elements of global education is because these three categories also open up spaces to reveal
various goals of global education. First of all, if we illuminate global education through a “knowledge-based” category, global education aims at informing students of new knowledge about the global world in order to influence their decision-making at the global level. On the other hand, if we see global education through a “skills-based” category, its goal is to develop skills for success in the global era, especially developing skills in cross-cultural communication and cooperation. However, if we depend on an “action-based” category, another goal of global education is to help students take action in order to resolve global challenges and to make innovations in the world. In this way, these three elements complement each other regarding the goals of global education. In addition, examining each category through the prisms of the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative discourses reveals conflicting points in global education. The work to address how differently each discourse articulates knowledge about the global world, skills for intercultural competence, and action to innovate the world is very important since it contributes to embodying how to internationalize teacher education by innovating school curricula.

Competing knowledge of “the World” and “Others.” Considering the specific knowledge that global education literature addresses, this area mainly deals with specific concepts related to global citizenship. For example, while Oxfam (2006) has pointed out six main concepts such as social justice, diversity, interdependence, sustainable development, peace, and conflict, Davies (2006) has addressed human rights and citizens’ social responsibilities as essential knowledge for global citizenship. However, Buras and Motter (2005) focused more on such academic concepts as the nationalism of the oppressor/oppressed and the cosmopolitanism from above/below, and Rizvi (2008) has asserted relationalities, situatedness, critical imagination, and reflexivities as main concepts of cosmopolitanism learning. Although these
concepts are useful in preparing students to be global citizens, I realized that these concepts are
difficult to grasp in a common preservice teacher education, and even in a social studies methods
class after a pilot study (see the next chapter). In order to connect this literature review section to
my dissertation work, this portion focuses more on general common knowledge likely assumed
by normal teacher education classes. Thus, this knowledge-based global education section is
divided into two parts: First, knowledge about the global world or global structure, and, second,
knowledge about non-Western people. Throughout this section, I address how the neoliberal, the
radical, and the transformative discourse conceptualize “global others” and the global world by
focusing on their contested points.

Neoliberal discourse. First, the neoliberal discourse informs student of their own version
of “right” knowledge about the world. This discourse acknowledges that national economies
have been “integrated into” the international economy under the dominance of a single global
market (Friedman, 2006). Since the global market becomes the place with which different
countries and societies are directly interconnected and exchange goods (Sleeter, 2003), this
approach shows us the possibilities of genuine interaction among people from different cultural
traditions (Rizvi, 2008). As a bridgehead of the neoliberal discourse for the beneficial
relationship, Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) or Transnational Corporations (TNCs) are
introduced as essential institutions to “flat” or deregulate monopolistic regulations of
“underdeveloped” societies (Friedman, 2006). As a result, a “McWorld” came into existence in
the gigantic market, referring to consumerism without borders and accordingly the spread of
mass global culture (Sleeter, 2003). However, the neoliberals have another image of the world,
which pays attention to multiple political/military authorities competing for power and
dominance. Consequently, they inform students of shifting political and military alliances among
nations and provide critical perspectives toward nations that challenge U.S. supremacy (Sleeter, 2003). In order to survive in the one competitive world, they think that each country should follow the principles of liberal transnational trades as well as the rule of international law, which are criticized as Neo-colonialism or Western privilege by the radical educators.

The neoliberal discourses also have different pictures of “right” knowledge about “others” referring to people in non-Western societies. The neoliberal approach, based on the competitive “McWorld” worldview, describes others in other countries as potential trading partners, competitive rivals, or enemies threatening U.S. political and economic interests (Sleeter, 2003; Vavrus, 2002). For example, a neoliberal columnist defines Muslim culture as a tribal culture (Friedman, 2006). Based on a clear line between the market-friendly culture and the market-defiant culture, Westernized culture is described as the innovative culture that is characteristic of intangible focus and extreme willingness to pull resources together for the sake of economic development. However, the other culture is depicted as a “tribal” culture in which unreasonable discrimination against women exists, and that limits potential productivity in ways that discourage people from improving and advancing, which consequently prevents them from achieving economic successes (Friedman, 2006). Due to this assumption of an “innovative” or “tribal” society, therefore, other cultures need to be changed rather than understood in the neoliberal approach.

Radical discourse. The radical discourse, however, informs students of quite different knowledge about the global world. Above all, this stance resists the rhetoric of “inevitability” of globalization and problematizes the ahistorical and apolitical assumption of current globalization (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Rizvi, 2008). For this reason, this approach focuses on a North-South division as a consequence of uneven globalization (Shultz, 2007). Teaching a power relationship
in which a nation state indirectly controls the political and economic system of another nation state and people, the radical approach reveals that everyday life within global networks of production under profit-driven systems in fact mirrors and reproduces colonial relations of earlier decades (Sleeter, 2003). In a similar analysis of the global structures, some radical educators, drawing on postcolonialism, insist that global education teaches students a broad view of the “colonized” world in terms of alienation of oppressed peoples’ cultural ways of being and their views of the world (Merryfield, 2006a; Merryfield & Subedi, 2006; Viruru, 2005). The oppressed relationship between the colonizer and the colonized could be expanded to the influence of the educational legacy of imperialism on mainstream academic knowledge (Merryfield, 2006a), and the process of establishing power as the creation of stereotypes (Loomba, 1998; Stoler & Cooper, 1997, as cited in Viruru, 2005). As a marked contrast to the above neoliberal explanation, in this discourse, the economic activities of IGOs or TNCs are introduced to students in terms of their political, economic, and social oppression, and economic exploitation and destruction of marginalized societies (Shultz, 2007). Rather, the radical global education familiarizes students with successful political struggles and social movements against the neoliberal operations, as Bigelow and Peterson (2002) described as a “vital source of hope for the future” (p. 7).

In addition, the radical approach provides students with a disparate image of consciousness of “others” as the oppressed neighbors or the subaltern voices. First of all, the radical educators are interested in the diverse cultures of marginalized people, such as people of color, women, children, and the poor, due to their critical angle on social justice as well as global perspectives on human rights and diversity (Merryfield, 2006a; Vavrus, 2002). In other words, the reason that the radical discourse values the awareness of others is not because the people are
their trading partners or international rivals, but because they are under inhuman conditions caused by globalization. However, they do not consider the oppressed as someone who needs to be saved, but, as seen in their slogan “learning to learn from below” (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011, p. 524), they consider them as solidarity comrades. For instance, since this approach appreciates the epistemic privilege of subaltern peoples, they encourage oppressed voices to be spoken through them (Freire, 1970). Yet, as Young (2001) juxtaposed the appearance of decolonization along with political and economic domination in the Western imperialist project, the subaltern-perspective awareness led by radical global education is always examined within the structures of Western domination (Spivak, 1998, as cited in Viruru, 2005).

*Transformative discourse.* The transformative approach to global education pays attention to cultural and language differences around the world, and the need to learn respect these differences. Therefore, the approach informs students of different world cultures and various ways that people globally move and interact (Sleeter, 2003). Also, transformative educators teach students a complex and dynamic set of international/national/local relationships (Shultz, 2007), which helps them to understand how they are deeply involved in the globalization process even within their local communities. However, the transformative approach does not only celebrate cultural diversity as a result of complex and dynamic relationships, but also believes that globalization results in new patterns of power relations in terms of inclusion and exclusion. For example, Viruru (2005) pointed out the erosion of North-South hierarchies as well as the ambiguity and complexity of all human relationships instead of fixed relationships. Davies (2006) also argued for new models of transnational relations that link marginalized people throughout the world irrespective of whether they are in core or peripheral countries. Related to the role of IGOs or TNCs, this approach also asserts a new development consensus that
recognizes global development as a shared global challenge and responsibility amongst states and societies, the North and the South, and industrial and post-industrial society, rather than imposing the Western model of economic development on non-Western societies. In this way, the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative approaches to global education provide teachers/students with contested knowledge about the global world or global structure.

In addition, the transformative discourse focuses on the cultural differences of non-Western people and the possibilities of solidarity with them to diversify current political/economic structures, rather than stress the current domination structures themselves. The reason that this approach considers ‘others’ as solidarity partners is because they regard them as people who are creating new hybrid versions of global discourse for their individual and local needs. Therefore, the transformative discourse teaches students about their different human beliefs and values as basic “right” knowledge about ‘others’ by introducing positive elements of other cultures (Spring, 2007). Also, this approach informs students of conflicting points of view between local and global ‘ways of seeing’ in other communities, and, as a result, teaches them more complex, dual, and hybrid cultures and identities in the global era (Davies, 2006; Merryfield & Subedi, 2006). Another reason that transformative global educators concentrate on others as solidarity partners is because they believe these people are involved in new ways of negotiating between local and global agendas through acting in solidarity (Davies, 2006). As this world becomes more technologically globalized, fewer boundaries between local and global arenas will lead to more global fellowship and solidarity based on shared visions of justice and democracy (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011; Sleeter, 2003). In sum, the neoliberal, the radical, and the transformative discourse provide students with conflicting knowledge about ‘others’ as trading partners (or hegemonic rivals), as the oppressed neighbors, or as solidarity partners,
respectively, based on contested knowledge about the “competitive,” “oppressed,” or “diverse” world.

**Competing cross-cultural communication and cooperation skills.** As the second general element of global education, current globalization discourses call for a skills-based approach to global education. In this approach, the purpose of global education is to develop skills in cross-cultural communication and cooperation (Friedman, 2006; Gardner, 2006; Merryfield & Subedi, 2006). For instance, by addressing intercultural competencies, referring to an ability to think and work with other people from different cultural backgrounds, Gardner (2006) argues that global education for the purpose of developing cognitively flexible and culturally sophisticated students will be the cornerstone of educational systems in the global era. According to the global education literature, these cross-cultural communication and cooperation skills are composed of basic literacy skills, critical thinking skills, and triplized thinking skills. While the neoliberal approach emphasizes basic literacy skills, the radical and the transformative approach focuses more on critical thinking skills and triplized thinking skills respectively. However, what is more interesting is that all of the neoliberal, radical, and transformative approaches stress the same skills, such as communication skills and/or cooperation skills, in order to equip students in the global era, yet they stress different interpretations of those skills.

**Neoliberal discourse.** Neoliberal discourse considers cross-cultural communication skills to be basic literacy skills such as reading and math, because they believe these basic skills are essential, not only for the competitive global workplace in the postindustrial society, but also for the lifelong education of the students themselves (Spring, 2007). They argue that students should be equipped with literacy and math skills to communicate with the outside world (Friedman, 2006; Spring, 2007). Their emphasis on basic literacy is also fueled by international standardized
assessments such as PISA or TIMMS, or by the U.S. nationwide standardized tests led by the No Child Left Behind Act. Also, in the neoliberal approach, developing communication skills refers to being proficient in speaking foreign languages and being familiar with the culture of potential trading partners or economic rivals (Vavrus, 2002). For example, the Alberta government funds an international education program for the acquisition of foreign languages and cultures as a means to a successful participation in the shrinking world of economies (Alberta Learnning, 2003, as cited in Shultz, 2007). Nonetheless, the followers of the neoliberal discourse doubt the capacity for public schools to provide those skills, and consistently assert the establishment of for-profit schools based on a schools-business alliance instead of public education (Vavrus, 2002; Zeichner, 2003).

However, despite the prosperity of these basic literacy and foreign language skills in education, some scholars criticize standardized skills-focused education as creating schools that act as factories for processing raw human materials, in which students are certified to become global workers and consumers (Spring, 2007). Banks (2004) also disagreed with the neoliberal assumption since literacy skills-centered global education sustains the assimilationist citizenship education, which has been challenged by the philosophical support of the right of ethnic and cultural minorities.

**Radical discourse.** Significantly different from the neoliberal approach, radical global educators define cross-cultural communication skills as critical thinking abilities rather than basic standardized skills. Instead of basic literacy, Banks (2004) suggested multicultural literacy, referring to skills for identifying the creators of knowledge as well as the ability to appreciate knowledge from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives. Merryfield (2006a) also voiced her opinion that cross-cultural skills should be an ability to see one’s world from both mainstream
and marginalized groups. Similarly, for radical global educators, cross-cultural skills mean the possession of multiple and conflicting perspectives of culturally marginalized groups, such as non-mainstream, non-American, non-Western, and non-elite (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011). It is interesting that the capability to imagine multiple realities surrounding an event could be easily developed by marginalized and oppressed students because they already have many experiences with multiple perspectives when they see people in power justify inequity and injustice (Merryfield & Subedi, 2006). In contrast, radical educators assert that privileged students, who have never experienced double consciousness, need to put far more effort in developing a perspective consciousness through the viewpoints of people different from themselves.

**Transformative discourse.** While the radical approach concentrates their energies on the development of the ability to see the above unequal structures or relationships caused by globalization with critical thinking skills, the transformative approach exerts their efforts to help students develop the ability to see more complex and triplized—individualized, localized, and globalized—structures of globalization. In other words, in this transformative discourse, cross-cultural communication skills are based on an ability to see flexible and dynamic interactions between global structures and local people. For example, Yin Cheng (2001) defined triplized thinking skills as an ability to see values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms, through not only by individual need but also the need at the society or community level, and, at the same time, a global level across countries.

In addition, transformative global educators focus on training students to develop innovative categories about different cultures and to find commonality among the differences by means of cooperation skills. In this approach, cooperation skills basically refer to an ability to get along and to work together to solve the world’s intractable problems (Banks, 2004). For these
kinds of cooperation skills, students need to have both conceptually broad and emotionally strong bonds with people. As the sign of the successful obtainment of these skills, students should be comfortable with notions of multiple identities and with uncertainty and fluidity (Davies, 2006). Another cooperation skill in the transformative approach refers to an ability to find shared aims among the differences and uncertainty (Davies, 2006). The need to build environmentally sustainable systems in the Earth’s ecosystems that are threatened by human actions could be a good example of such a common global goal (Sleeter, 2003). To sum up, the three discourses require students to be equipped with a great variety of cross-cultural communication skills, and cooperation skills in this global era, and, at the same time, these are fairly contested concepts of skills.

**Competing meanings of a “global citizen”.** As the last general category of global education, this section deals with the action-based approach in light of the three discourses. The action-based approach is deeply connected to citizenship education. The goal of citizenship education consists in helping children to take their place in adult society as citizens. In his comprehensive chapter “The Moral and Epistemic Purposes of Teacher Education,” Sockett (2008) pointed out that general education purposes are laid not only in the individual’s development and knowledge, but also in the social life and citizenship in a democratic society. Moreover, Robertson (2008) argued that after developing deliberation, negotiation, and bargaining abilities, the final practice of democratic citizenship should be activism that pursues structure-changing, fostering a strong commitment to social justice. In other words, citizenship education expects more active roles for students and adults in their societies compared to knowledge-based and skills-based approaches.
Global education does not take exception to the active roles of students in the global village. For instance, according to Heilman (2006), global education is “education for global citizenship” (p. 193) under two assumptions: First, “all people are equal,” and second, “citizens have the capacity, right, and duty to examine the appropriateness of all public policies” (p. 194). For her, citizenship exists not as a status, but as a democratic practice. In addition, some global educators define the global citizen as one who see himself as a member of the human race, one who is responsible for the condition of the planet, and one who is aware of both national law and international law (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005). Davies (2006) also regarded global citizenship as understanding and being able to influence decision-making processes at the global level. In short, global education with a combination of citizenship implies a more active role to change the global world.

However, Banks (2004) argued that the assimilationist concept of citizenship education has been challenged by the civil rights movement and the request of marginalized people. Also, drawing on Ong (1999) and Colhoun (2002), Rizvi (2008) pointed out the dilemma of flexible notions of citizenship as strategies to accumulate capital and power as well as the potential conflict between cosmopolitanism and global capitalism. These examples lead to an assumption that the action-based approach to global citizenship education is also influenced by contested social discourses.

**Neoliberal discourse.** What kind of visions does the neoliberal discourse provide in terms of students’ current and future active roles in their communities and global societies? The approach underscores individual acts of consumption as a citizen’s role, and the individual acts as an entrepreneur in the background of the government, which acts as a creator of space for free market expansion (Friedman, 2006). In the definition of citizen’s role as a consumer, a global
citizen is freely moving across time and space without being encumbered by national boundaries and just consuming foreign cultures as exotic commodities without understanding foreign people and societies. Regarding entrepreneurship, there are two citizenship responses to access free markets: First, liberating a place from traditional boundaries and local restrictions through participation in business, and, second, ameliorating the disordered fault of capitalist progress through participation in an instrumental interventionism that mediates the uneven effect of global economic participation (Shultz, 2007). For example, according to the discourse of global citizenship that NGOs and INGOs have been bringing to the community level along with their development agenda, the global citizen is someone who strives to create a place beyond traditional boundaries and local restrictions in order to participate in the global marketplace. However, the global citizen as a consumer or entrepreneur does not focus on the issue of power and access in the globalized world. Rather, considering their privilege a natural position and a sign of success, neoliberal global citizen disregards and opposes any need of structural change.

**Radical discourse.** Radical discourse among the three discourses has strong support for the action-based approach in global education based on their clear vision of the citizen’s role. For example, O’Connor and Zeichner (2011) insisted that “action is central to the goals of critical global education and solidarity building is a requisite component of this action” (p. 31), and Apple (2000) also stressed active citizenship as the radical force necessary to challenge the hegemony of the market and to protect the environmental and social well-being of society. This approach expects students to apply their knowledge and skills to challenge the structures that globally perpetuate oppressive social orders and systems as well as to address urgent global issues by engaging in direct actions aimed at forcing radical economic, political, and social change (i.e., World Bank Boycott) (Shultz, 2007). The fuel of these actions is “outrage” against
social injustice towards the disadvantaged or oppressed, and their ideas about possible and probable futures and counterfactual history (Davies, 2006; Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005).

In order to encourage students to take active roles, the radical action-based approach follows the process of recognition of global human tragedies, self-confrontation, and awareness of human choices at the global level. Instead of a “happy global multiculturalism” (Heilman, 2006, p. 195), which simply celebrates cultural differences, this action-based global education lets students know the difficult, tragic, and frightening knowledge (Merryfield, 2006b). Therefore, in this approach, tolerating another culture does not mean nonjudgmental acceptance or blind celebration. Student self-confrontation follows the recognition of global human tragedies. Going through a stage of confidence-shaking and a stage of developing agency for action, students experience the repositioning of both their psychological and political foundations as well as their stance of education (Heilman, 2006; O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011). Furthermore, this approach adheres to their awareness of human choices. They agree with Freire’s (1970) concept of “reality in process”, which conveys “the reality of oppression not as a closed world from which there is no exit, but as a limiting situation which they can transform” (p. 83). For this reason, this approach encourages students not merely to oppose univocal histories and literature, but also to examine alternative histories and contrasting experiences in order to decolonize their minds (Merryfield, 2006a; Merryfield & Subedi, 2006) as well as to exert themselves to redirect the economy toward the common good (Vavrus, 2002).

**Transformative discourse.** Lastly, the transformative discourse also emphasizes the action-based approach to global education, yet their interpretation of the citizen’s role slightly differs from the radical discourse. Two approaches share the same citizen’s role as someone who is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place and as someone who
participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from the local to the global (Oxfam, 1997, as cited in Davies, 2006). For creating environmentally sustainable systems, the transformative approach teaches students environmental issues and actions that young people can take to address them (Sleeter, 2003). In particular, the transformative discourse concentrates more on a citizen’s role in connecting all other people in order to create local and global communities that are democratic and sustainable. In order to include and engage others in these communities, transformative citizenship seeks a more common humanity, a shared environment, and shared interests and activities rather than, as in the radical discourse, discovering global discrimination or tragedies (Shultz, 2007).

For the purpose of resolving the world’s intractable problems, the radical discourse and the transformative discourse stand in similar positions to each other in the sense of joining together to create social justice through deep compassion and accompaniment, and in trying to create democratic spaces as well. Nonetheless, for building an inclusive community, the transformative discourse values the transformative roles of citizens more in terms of linking the local experience with the shared global experience. For example, this approach is interested in some legal knowledge, such as international human rights declarations, in order to be aware of how global conventions are translated into various national acts and where the gaps might be (Davies, 2006). Throughout this process, students become conscious of their multiple cultural identities and loyalties as citizens as well as an understanding of commonality with people in other places. The transformative discourse rejects existing fear of overburdening schools with this global citizenship education. This is because they believe the constraints of global citizenship education do not lie with a lack of resources, but in the lack of awareness of the
available resources and the confidence to tackle global issues within the classroom (Y. Cheng, 2001; Davies, 2006).

As with the knowledge-based and skills-based approaches to global education, this action-based approach also provides disparate visions of the role of active citizens. Through examining all these competing elements of global education from the neoliberal, radical, and transformative discourses, specific tensions are observed surrounding global education. Based on these tensions, more specific research questions and tentative issues are as follows in table 1.

**Table 1**

*Research Questions and Competing Issues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Social Discourses</th>
<th>Competing Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do a teacher education class and its students define the globalized world?</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>the global competitiveness in the gigantic market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>the global inequality between privileged societies and underprivileged societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>the global differences in the economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically, and environmentally interconnected world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What assumptions are made about foreign people, in particular, non-Western people in the global era by the class and the students?</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>trading partners or hegemonic rivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>oppressed neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>solidarity partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of cross-cultural and cooperation skills does the class and the students try to develop?</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>basic literacy skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>triplized thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the class and its students define a citizen’s role in the classroom or in the future?</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>a consumer/entrepreneur or a traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>a social reformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>a community-builder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Implementation of Global Education

This section examines how these tensions are addressed in specific contexts. The empirical literature illustrates what global education looks like and what practical strategies may be like, if one facilitates the development of global education programs in classes or institutions. Boston (1997) provided practical strategies such as assessing the strengths of individuals and institutions, selecting resources, defining global education in each context, identifying the goals of the institution, and establishing relationships with collaborative partners by reflecting on his experience in the Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE). Boston (1997) addressed three classifications among various approaches to global education, something that is useful in understanding how to incorporate global perspectives into teacher education. In my opinion, the “area-based approach” may be an appropriate approach to deal with diversity issues, but it is difficult to solve the common preconception of teachers that teacher education is already overcrowded with so many other issues to deal with besides the global issues. The “relation-based approach” could be helpful in dealing with transnational, interconnected, and equity issues. Thirdly, the “theme-based approach” could be a realistic approach, making it easier for teachers to combine global education with the existing curriculum.

Merryfield (1997) introduced more concrete examples that she has implemented at Ohio State University for the purpose of developing cross-cultural experiences for teachers. This global education course aims to help teachers effectively teach K-12 students of diverse cultural backgrounds, encourages teachers to construct bridges between their students’ lives and the wider world, and makes teachers use cross-cultural experiences as an instructional strategy in their teaching. In order to meet these goals, “field professors,” who are classroom teachers and have extensive cross-cultural experiences, have cooperated with the author from planning to
publication. International students and “African consultants,” provided by their Center for African Studies, have also been helpful for this course because they played an important role in examining conceptualizations of personal and group identity, and teaching different perspectives. Additionally, Merryfield (1997) suggested that if teachers are provided with study tours overseas or internships in local international organizations, it will provide great opportunities for them to learn cross-cultural skills and gain insights into other cultures. This example showed concrete and various resources within an institution that teacher educators can use to equip teachers for cross-cultural experiences.

In addition, in the “Report on the internationalization of teacher education at UIUC” Rizvi (2003) discussed what happened\(^1\) and what the goals should be at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) regarding global education. The author described “the internationalization of the curriculum,” which aims to provide students with “knowledge of other cultures and nations,” “cross cultural competences and cosmopolitan attitudes,” and “skills of critical engagement with issues of global interdependence” (p. 2). In order to achieve these goals, teachers should integrate global issues in their classroom activities through the curriculum. According to the author, global issues have been addressed in social studies education in terms of “a global perspective, the issues of identity, citizenship and culture” (p. 4). However, he argued that the incorporation of international components in the College of Education at UIUC is largely \textit{ad hoc} because Illinois standards and certification requirements for teacher education are not

\begin{footnote}
\footnotetext{1} As an effort to support teachers in the internationalization of the curriculum, there have been various university-wide initiatives (i.e., the Center for Democracy in a Multicultural Society), especially initiatives designed to internationalize schools (i.e., Illinois International High School Program), course developments with global perspectives (i.e., foundation courses in EPS and EPSY), and an on-line graduate program in Global Studies in Education in Illinois and at the University of Illinois.
\end{footnote}
only “overcrowded” but also “highly localized” for “job relevant skills” (pp. 4-5). As future steps, he suggests adding more internationally focused topics, funding research projects on issues of internationalization of teacher education, and advocating revisions to State standards and certification requirements.

Although I dealt with only couple of examples from empirical studies, it is apparent that these works mainly focus either on institutional tensions when trying to internationalize teacher education programs, or on exemplary works when implementing global topics or perspectives in a graduate program. However, this literature does not address the conceptual and pedagogical tensions likely found in teaching contents or methods themselves when teacher educators or teachers try to internationalize teacher education program or in their actual classroom teaching. Furthermore, how these tensions are interpreted by teacher educators and teachers and how their interpretations influence their lives and teaching practices are underdeveloped or ignored in the literature.

Final comment

In the previous literature review section, the first section was focused on the theoretical conceptualization of internationalization of teacher education in light of three social discourses and of global education placed under the category of knowledge, skill, and action. The second section identified some practical strategies, including existing resources and problems, and further steps in empirical research. The latter section demonstrated that empirical works on global education in teacher education settings are scarce compared to the theoretical research. Even insufficient empirical works focus on issues and strategies based on only exemplary cases rather than on ordinary cases. Furthermore, it was even more difficult to identify the ways in which global education is incorporated into a preservice teacher education program. Although
these good examples provide a great deal of useful strategies, it cannot replace an in-depth case study, which reveals not only possibilities but also difficulties and limitations in ordinary education settings.

For these reasons, I want to conduct on a qualitative case study on the incorporation of global perspectives into a preservice teacher education class. In this study, I highlight the conceptual and pedagogical tensions interpreted by teacher educators and preservice teachers when they try to internationalize teacher education programs or their actual teaching practices. Furthermore, I concentrate on the ways that these tensions are interwoven with competing conceptual categories of global connectedness and teaching global contents discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 3

Methodology

The issues surrounding internationalization of teacher education discussed in chapter two played as an important role in finding tentative research questions. This chapter connects the broad research questions formulated by the literature review to my research field. As a result, more concrete/detailed research questions and methods are addressed in this chapter.

This chapter first discusses the research framework interweaving the issues of a large research community, the people studied, and my pilot study. This research framework leads the focus of this study to the narratives of global experience that student teachers and teacher educators bring into their preservice teacher education course and the tensions and conflicts that they experienced in the course and in their practicum school. The next section addresses research questions as well as the research method employed for the case study. Then, I briefly described participants and study location, which is followed by discussing the data collection process including data source, data analysis, and triangulation from informants into the study. Lastly, I conclude this chapter by addressing the limitation of this study.

Research Framework

According to Stake (1995), before gaining research experience with case studies in the field, it is important to acknowledge that some outside issues are brought into the study by the researcher. These outside or etic issues are “the researcher’s issues” (p. 20), which can sometimes become the issues of a larger research community, colleagues, and writers. The purpose that I outlined earlier of addressing three elements of internationalization of teacher education (knowledge-based, skills-based, and action-based global education) in light of three social discourses (the neoliberal, the critical, and the transformative) was to find such etic issues
in a larger global education research community. The etic issues in global education resulted from tensions among the three disparate discourses.

As seen in the literature review chapter, this study mainly depended on the categorization of global discourses and global education by their theories, concepts, and elements. The categories that I found through literature review (See table 1) are also applied in order to understand my research topic and field, a preservice teacher education course, in the next chapter. The first reason that I use the categories is because global education elements categorized by the neoliberal, radical, and transformative approaches provide more a comprehensive descriptions about global perspectives. Since one of characteristics of categorization is collectively being exhaustive, these categories could not only open up spaces to reveal various goals of global education, but could also show what is missing in my research. The second reason for using these categories is because they could highlight tensions existing within global education. Since the second characteristic of categorization is mutually being exclusive, I discussed how one discourse differs from another discourse and how global education elements could be exclusively categorized by the three discourses in chapter two. As a result, the discussion also showed disparate views on the global world, non-Western people and citizenship education by comparison and contrast. The competing views generated by the literature review revealed another advantage of using these categories, which is disclosing numerous tensions surrounding internationalization of teacher education. These tensions were also found in the social studies methods class and in the preservice teaching experiences that I studied. These tensions found in the literature review were applied to my research questions in the following section.
However, the exhaustiveness and exclusiveness of categorization reveal the disadvantage of using categories. First, even though I tried to conceptualize global theories and global education by a thorough review of the related literature, it is possible that other, newer characteristics were present in literature I did not use in my research. If I tried to see this field only through the categories I examined, I might have missed other important phenomenon that the categories could not capture. So while I used the diverse and competing categories as tentative ones to understand my field in a more comprehensive way, I also kept an open mind to the possibility that there were other categories that could be used in the research field.

Second, even though two different categories are mutually exclusive in theoretical concepts, the categories based on social phenomenon such as globalization might not be completely exclusive in reality. For example, as I discussed in the previous chapter, the radical and transformative approaches shared some of the same images of the globalized world and of a global citizen. For instance, the radical and transformative discourse sometimes seemed too difficult to separate into two distinct categories, having several points in common. In this situation, the effort to find contrasting points in order to categorize the various readings I used might be considered meaningless attempts at classification.

Nonetheless, this study used the radical and transformative approaches separately in spite of this disadvantage for two reasons: First, this is because of all the conceptual differences addressed in the literature review chapter regarding views on the globalized world, ‘others’ in ‘other societies’, cross-cultural skills, and the global citizen (see table 1). Second, it is also because both the radical and transformative approaches are important to understand the preservice teacher education course I studied. The social studies methods course is a representative class addressing social justice issues among teacher education classes (Rizvi,
By using ‘social justice’ as one of the course’s frameworks, the instructors and students dealt with controversial issues, addressing unequal power relationships within their school community (see table 4). However, the ways that student teachers understood the weekly topics and their assignments often remained unchanged in that they partially understood the topics through the lens of simple cultural differences or through economic poverty issues without connection to the cultural formation of these issues. In other words, the radical and the transformative approaches were both important for my study in understanding what the student teachers learned or did not learn in the social studies methods class.

The last reason to use three social discourse categories as the theoretical framework in this study is because this general approach to globalization and global education is often found among numerous categorization work in this field. Along with Spring’s (2007) categorization of research on globalization and education and Sleeter’s (2003) categorization of ways of teaching globalization, the previous chapter showed how three different discourses on internationalization of teacher education aligned with three or four teacher education reform traditions and agendas. Although they use different nomenclature, McGrew’s (2000) neoliberal, radical, and transformative schools have a thread closely connected to Liston and Zeichner’s (1991) academic, social-reconstructionist, developmentalist, and social-efficiency traditions, and Zeichner’s (2003) deregulation, social justice, and professionalization agendas. Interestingly, a similar approach is also found in the purposes of social studies education. Martin (2011), borrowing names from Hans Slomp’s European political spectrum, suggested three categorizations of social studies education — the conservative, the social liberal, and the social democrat (Slomp, 2000 as cited in Martin, 2011).
The conservative school of thought argues that the purpose of social studies includes (1) transmitting cultural norms of American society and (2) teaching the same stories to maintain this country and its political system by teaching Westernized history as the world history. In that its teaching content does not go beyond Western civilization and the Western model of globalization, this perspective is quite closely connected to the academic tradition and the neoliberal standpoint (See chapter 2). In contrast, the social liberals’ purpose of social studies leans more toward developing critical thinking skills in students by using multiple perspectives and different voices in cultural history, as well as by developing competent inquiry skills, which aligns more closely with the developmentalist tradition and transformative approach. In addition, since social liberals are driven by the purpose of preparing students for their work, and not with an emphasis on improving the world, this school is connected to the social-efficiency tradition. The last category, social democrats, a radical or social justice group, share many common points with the social-reconstructionist tradition and the radical approach in that they focus on social inequalities, try to aid the poor and hold common good over individual gain, and teach critical thinking skills for making changes in society. When the three above purposes of social studies education were used to shed new light on the social studies methods class, the weekly readings and assignments of the social studies methods class were shown to be influenced not only by the social democrat perspective, but also by the social liberal view point, which meant that this course was not merely a social-justice-oriented course. In addition, from the social liberal standpoint, it is possible to say that allowing multiple perspectives and different voices to be used in cultural history would not necessarily mean a social justice agenda was utilized in the classroom.
Of course, a category in one area does not share the exact same meanings with another category in another area because each categorization was formulated for a different field of study. For instance, the transformative discourse, as raised in the internationalization of teacher education, is difficult to find in teacher education reform traditions, since the latter mainly concerns the American teacher education system. However, numerous repetition of similar categories in related fields show how large research communities have similar concerns regarding globalization and citizenship education. For this reason, I used three approaches as the main theoretical framework to analyze and interpret my research field and showed how these three categories fit or did not fit within the field.

Along with etic issues, emic or participants’ issues are another important framework of this study. While etic issues are revealed in a larger research community, emic issues are found in research participants’ behavior and language (Stake, 1995). As global discourse is accepted by local people based on local or individual needs, the above tensions are also understood based on the lived experience by the people being studied in a research field. For this reason, a teacher’s understanding of tensions surrounding a globalizing curriculum can be deeply involved in teaching practices (Gaudelli, 2003). Nonetheless, there are extremely few empirical studies revealing their interpretation about the tensions. Instead, most studies only focus on theoretical approaches on how to borrow new theoretical concepts in different epistemological traditions such as postmodernism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism. Understanding their interpretation of these tensions and drawing on their experiential knowledge through empirical research, however, is essential to incorporate global perspectives into not only preservice teacher education classes but also pre-K-12 classes. Therefore, based on this need for empirical work and the lack of existing case studies, this study used a qualitative case study as its research method.
Originally, this study planed to focus on the tensions among conceptual categories about the global community that preservice teachers and teacher educators bring into their class and the ways that perservice teachers represent the categories in their own teaching practices. Yet, after encountering emic issues of participants in a preservice teacher education class called Teaching Elementary Social Studies, I realized that student teachers neither had the conceptual categories, since they did not know there are multiple competing understandings about globalized world, nor did they reveal their thought about the global community because most of them did not perceive the globalized world as an interconnected community but only as studying the world as having potential to expose people to other societies. Therefore, based on the emic issues evolved in the field, this study focused their image about the globalized world rather than conceptual categories about the global community. In addition, another original focus was tensions in competing knowledge about the globalized world and ‘others’ in the global era, especially in cross-cultural skills and in citizen’s role that student teachers learned in their social studies methods class. However, it was hard to find explicit contents in the preservice social studies class. Instead, I found ‘inexplicit’ contents called global perspectives, and a great deal of difficulties that students and instructor had in order to implement global topics/issued. Thus this research focused on the global perspectives that participants experienced in the social studies class and tensions that prevented them from learning and teaching global topics/issues in preservice teacher education course and/or in student teaching class.

As part of my research assistantship, I conducted a pilot study through classroom observations and interviews with the instructors and students in this class during the 2007-2008 academic year (see details in the Appendix). The purpose of the study was to examine the general nature of a preservice teacher education class. The nature of this class was examined in
terms of their ‘multiple perspectives-conscious,’ ‘community-engaged,’ ‘method-oriented,’ ‘daily life-connected,’ and ‘overcrowded’ characteristics. Also, by addressing how these characteristics connected to, or was disconnected from, existing global education as defined by scholars in the literature review, I argued that this class follows the tradition of multicultural education in that it is aware of racially marginalized groups within the U.S. Although this pilot study was a good way to examine the possibilities and limitations of this class regarding incorporating global perspectives, this study neither looked into the specific tensions within the teacher education class context nor did it examine the connection to global education discourses. Grounded in the above research frameworks provided by academic literature and field work and the pilot study, this dissertation work focuses on tensions made by preservice teachers and teacher educators while teaching and taking a social studies methods class in the context of competing social discourses and the categorization.

**Research Method**

The focus of this study is to embody teacher educators and preservice teachers’ interpretation about globalized world and global perspectives as well as tensions that they experienced to incorporate global perspectives into their classroom. This focus could be formulated at three different levels of learning experience for preservice teachers: First, preservice teachers and teacher educators bring some narratives about globalized world and ‘others’ based on their previous experience, influenced by social discourses (i.e., neoliberal, radical, and transformative stance) and located at the outermost level in their experiential circles, into their class. Second, they learn diverse or limited knowledge about global connectedness and/or some new skills and actions needed in the global era in their preservice teacher education class. Their interpretation on the knowledge, skill, and/or actions in the class is lying at an inner
level of the experience circle, through which the instructor and prospective teachers construct their own social understanding about global contents. Lastly, the constructed understandings are represented by preservice teachers in their student teaching as an external practice. These representation experiences make preservice teachers not only embody diverse or limited values, but also re-construct their image or narratives about global connectedness through interaction with other teachers and their students. In short, throughout these processes, preservice teachers come to know the concept of global connectedness and construct their own narratives about it. Based on my understanding of conceptual relationships between social discourses, teaching practices, interpretation, and representation, I have three main research questions and sub-questions as follows:

1. What images or narratives about globalized world do preservice teachers and teacher educators bring into a preservice social studies methods class?
   i. What values among the neoliberal, radical, and transformative discourses on global connectedness do they bring into their class?

2. What kinds of global perspectives and tensions about global perspectives do preservice teachers and teacher educators experience in the social studies methods class?
   i. In what ways do the instructor and students of a preservice social studies methods class define the globalized world and ‘others’ in the global era?
   ii. What kinds of the cross-cultural and/or cooperation skills do they try to develop?
   iii. What kinds of roles for citizens do they assume?

3. In what ways, if any, do preservice teachers represent their interpretation about the
globalized world and ‘others’ in their students’ teaching practices?

i. In the ways are their representations fixed or flexible, or limited or innovative?

In answering these research questions, I examined how prospective teachers’ understandings about global perspectives are constructed by an assortment of tensions and conflicts in a local preservice teacher education programs and previous experiences within a global context. As seen in the above questions, I expected to study tensions between fixed or flexible image of preservice teachers regarding the world and ‘others’ in the global era, or limited or innovative ways of teaching global contents in relation to the issues that I found in the previous chapter and other issues that I would find while conducting the study. The focus of this study, therefore, is the process of the construction of expanded (or limited) ways of global perspectives and teaching practices. Based on the understanding of a preservice teacher education course, I would find some implications for the internationalization of preservice teacher education.

The research method used for this study is the case study method that provides some effective ways of studying education programs. First, the case study is an effective method for this study since it focused on a preservice teacher education course as both intrinsic case and instrumental case. When the course was given for my research assistantship, I needed to learn about this particular, unfamiliar case thoroughly in particular more than others as an international student. Also, from the beginning and as the study was proceeding, I had specific interests in and questions about the case in terms of internationalizing teacher education. According to Stake (1995), a need for general understanding about specific research question is achieved by one kind of case study called an “instrumental case study” (p. 3). The second reason that this study
employed case study methodology is because it is an effective method for both generalization and particularization, although the main benefit of case study is laid on the latter (Stake, 1995). In a sense that the research about internationalization of education has been portrayed through exemplary cases, an usual preservice education course, as an ordinary case, should be studied in light of its particularity, focusing the tensions and conflicts the participants experienced while including global perspectives. But at the same time, this research needed to be generalized as part of finding effective ways of teaching global contents and internationalizing teacher education. Lastly, the emphasis on interpretation of the case was the reason that this study used the case study method. As addressed in the previous chapter and research questions, in order to draw deep understanding of internationalization of teacher education, this study should examine its meaning of teaching global perspectives in light of competing global education discourses.

In particular, this study focused on qualitative methods like in-depth interviews and participant observation for the following two reasons: First, these questions cannot be answered without a researcher participating in the class and listening to the instructor and students’ thoughts about their class and global issues. Second, as an international student, I was a complete stranger in this class. Traditionally, participant observation and in-depth interviews have been representative methods of ethnography. In particular, ethnography is a useful method when a researcher is unfamiliar with the phenomenon, site, and objects he/she studies (Cho, 1997). This study began while I visited with an unfamiliar senior-year social studies methods class, which is an example of a preservice teacher education in the United States. As an international graduate student, I had little prior information and knowledge about preservice teacher education in the U.S. Therefore, a qualitative method was used this research in consideration of the qualitative characteristics of the above research questions and my lack of knowledge about the field.
Participants and Site

I focused on the aforementioned elementary school social studies course, called Teaching Elementary Social Studies, in the fall of 2009 and I followed an online class called Issues and Practices in Addressing Diversity in Elementary Education in the spring of 2010. These courses are provided for senior-year teacher candidates, as well as some master’s students, by the department of Curriculum and Instruction at a Midwestern university. These courses are part of a block of five teaching methods classes, which deal with almost the same topics and assignments every week, although each class is taught by a different instructor. The students in the class I observed, which consisted of about 28 people, are predominantly senior, white, female students; the number of older, male, and non-white students was small.

I interviewed a total of eight students and an instructor. Eight student interviewees consisted of seven females and one male in terms of gender, and five undergraduate students and three graduate students in terms of their current education, and five Caucasians, two Asians, and one African American in terms of race. Also, among eight students, two students grew up in suburban Chicago, two students in rural areas, two students in mid-sized towns, one student in inner-city Chicago, and one student in South Korea. Their detailed backgrounds were described in Table 2 and in the beginning of Chapter 4. The reason why I described their background in Chapter 4 is because their family and hometown backgrounds were important to understand their interpretation on the globalized world. Then, I interviewed an instructor, who was a Caucasian female teacher educator. The instructor, Hillarie, had diverse teaching experience in public and private, and rural and urban schools. She taught in Elementary school for eleven years, and Middle school for one year. When I interviewed her, she had been teaching the social studies
methods class for four years. Their detailed teaching and personal experiences were also depicted in Chapter 4.

Table 2

*Student Interviewees’ Background*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Grad/undergrad</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Graduate student (Master)</td>
<td>Mid-sized town, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Graduate student (Master)</td>
<td>Small town, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Undergrad student (Senior)</td>
<td>Suburban Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Undergrad student (Senior)</td>
<td>Small town, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Undergrad student (Senior)</td>
<td>Mid-sized town, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Undergrad student (Senior)</td>
<td>Suburb Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Undergrad student (Senior)</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Graduate student (Master)</td>
<td>Inner-city Chicago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection**

Qualitative case study aims at discovering the particularity and ordinariness of a selected case (Stake, 2005). To prove its particularity, case study researchers usually gather data following these categories of data:

1. The nature of the case, particularly its activity and functioning
2. Its historical background
3. Its physical setting
4. Other contexts, such as economic, political, legal, and aesthetic
5. Other cases through which this case is recognized;
6. Those informants through whom the case can be known (Stake, 2005, p. 447)
Although I need to collect information on the historical background, the physical setting, and other contexts and cases of the social studies methods course, I had gathered the information on the above categories through my pilot study and literature review. The core data that I focused on in this dissertation work was the nature of the social studies methods course and preservice teachers’ learning experiences about global perspectives. In order to examine the ordinary happenings in the social studies methods course and in student teachers’ narratives and interpretation of global perspectives, three categories of data need to be gathered as follows:

The nature of the social studies methods class regarding global perspectives:

1. Instructor meetings for understanding the overall structure of the social studies class (2009-2010 academic year);
2. Course materials and activities related to global topics (2009-2010 academic year);
3. Observation of the social studies methods course (2009-2010 academic year);
4. Interview with the instructor of the social studies methods course

The preservice teachers’ interpretation about global perspectives:

1. Lesson plan presentations / book club presentations;
2. Student journals and assignments;
3. Interview with students (2009-2010 academic year from early April to May)

The preservice teachers’ representation of global perspectives:

1. Student teaching lesson plan;
2. Interview with students (2009-2010 academic year from late April to June)

In particular, the selection of student informants was carried out with consideration of not only balance and variety, but also their accessibility and hospitality. I interviewed each student for first interview from April 11th to May 24th, 2010 and for second interview from April 26th to
June 21st, 2010. Most of the interviews were for one hour, while some took more than one hour depending on the interviewees. Most of the interviews took place at student teaching classrooms, and sometimes at coffee shop or community center. G-chat and Skype were also used once for two students when they were out of town. In addition to interview data, their weekly reading reflections and social inquiry project assignments were collected. At the same time, I met instructor interviewees twice each at their office or student lounge/home for about one hour, from May 3rd to May 27th, 2010.

Data Analysis

According to Emerson, Frentz, and Shaw (1996), ethnographers follow a series of methods in analyzing their field notes such as close reading, open coding, writing initial memos, focused coding, and writing integrative memos. I tracked those analytic processes as much as possible. First, I read every field note line-by-line to identify and formulate any ideas, themes, and issues that the field notes, student teachers’ reading reflections, and their other assignments suggested, and second, I analytically coded them while jotting down in the margins whatever codes/themes/issues I found from the reading. After this open coding, I carried out focused coding that integrate these codes with my particular interests such as participants’ image of the globalized world and others and the difficulties and tensions revealed in the social studies methods course on the basis of educational/sociological theories, which I examined in the literature review. As a result, the field notes were reduced to “a smaller set of promising ideas and categories to provide the major topics and themes for the final ethnography” (p. 143). Third, I wrote theoretical memos based on educational/sociological theories. The concepts that I obtained while outlining global education throughout three elements and three social discourses were used in order to discover interpretation tools. Through all these analytical processes of field
notes, I finally found or formulated categories, which are presented in the findings in chapter four and five. The reason that those main themes are not only found, but also formulated, is because ethnography is “a matter not simply of discovering what is in the data but more creatively of linking up specific events and observations to more general analytic categories and issues” (p. 154), such as the precedent concepts of global education and teaching implications. Therefore, precedent concepts of global education that I reviewed became general analytic categories and etic issues of research community to interpret my collected data along with emic issues emerging from my specific field.

The analysis of my interview data also followed similar process. First I transcribed electronic interview files into word-processing files. Even from the time when I made transcripts, I analyzed it since no researcher can enter into the study of an interview data as a clean slate (Seidman, 2006). Second, based on the overall understanding of the data, I marked and labeled the passages that are interesting while carefully reading interview transcripts. Third, using a word-processing program, marked passages on the copy of transcripts were put together in another file based on its labels. In this way, I reduced the text. The fourth step was to read this new reduced version of transcripts with more a focused eye on my research questions and interests while underlining them and jotting down theoretical memos. I was ready to share narratives based on this focused coding and theoretical memos. The last process was to organize excerpts from the selected transcripts into categories, which is described in the next chapter and the chapter five.

**Triangulation**

While considering the tolerance for ambiguity and multiple perspectives in research, the researcher has a responsibility for the validity of his or her interpretation (Stake, 2005).
mention in the next section, I had a concern with the clarity of my own conception and the validity of my own communication from the beginning of this research. Therefore, in order to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, I double-checked the appropriateness of my interpretation through comparison and contrast between my interpretation and my informants’ interpretation when I interviewed the voluntary instructor and students. Also, I sent the final drafts of my writing to two informants, one student and one instructor, and asked for their feedback. Both student and instructor gave me feedback that my data description and interpretation were appropriate without any misunderstanding about their interview and overall the social studies methods class.

**Limitations**

As an international graduate student, I experienced many cultural and language barriers while conducting this study. First, I was unfamiliar with American undergraduate classes. I did not expect such an active relationships between student teachers and an instructor. I was from Asian culture where, for the most part, a teacher talks and students listen to what he or she is taught. Although the chance for students to talk in class strikingly increased, it usually happens in an official student’s presentation time rather than unofficial dialogue between students and a teacher. Hearing many questions and answers between them was both amusing and difficult to understand since, honestly speaking, I felt sometimes those dialogues were not useful for the weekly topics in addition to a language barrier between myself and the teachers and students. For that reason, I may have missed certain cultural and language patterns.

Second, I was also unfamiliar with the American teacher education system. For example, the teacher education system that I trained in completely separated the theory and practice course. Therefore, except for a few practice courses focusing on student teaching itself, almost
all education courses concentrated on social or scientific concepts in each field based on theories. In other words, the main goal of the education courses was to equip student teachers with in-depth subject matter knowledge. When I observed the social studies methods class at the Midwestern university, their foci on pedagogical knowledge was not familiar and I often wanted to listen to their deeper understanding about potential global topics/issues. As a result, this study might not appreciate the meaning of their effort that they always made in order to connect weekly topics and concepts with a student teacher’s current and future class. It was later that I started to understand that each respective teacher education might be based on different teacher education reform tradition, such as academic tradition and professionalization tradition, all of which I addressed in the previous chapter.

Lastly, I had to struggle with my limited language skills while conducting observation of class and interview with student teachers and teacher educators, which resulted in more barriers than the cultural barriers. This barrier led me to depend on in-depth interview more than participatory observation method. Of course, the interview method were effective and valid because the social studies methods class did not teach global perspectives in an explicit way, as the meaning of teaching global topics/issues was revealed while I conducted in-depth interview with students and the instructor who were intrigued by teaching bigger perspectives. In addition, I used the observation data in the last year when I was more fluent in English while conducting three years of observation. However, I might miss the cultural meanings that I could catch if I were a native student. Not only regarding observation but also in terms of interview method, I felt limitations as a non-native student. When interviewing informants, I could not understand the whole interview. It was after I finished making complete interview transcripts for a long time that I understood what students and instructor meant. If I had not have language barrier, I might
have asked clarification questions or better follow-up questions, which might improve the quality of interview data.
Chapter 4

Preservice Teachers and Global Experiences

When participants of the social studies methods class come to the class, they bring different images or narratives of globalized world. Their global experience may come from the impression that they had when they traveled to other countries. In an indirect way, they may be intrigued by exotic gifts along with mysterious stories given by their parent who just came home from an overseas business trip or may listen to strange stories about foreign culture from their immigrant friend. Sometimes they learn how the world is becoming interconnected and fast-changing through technology in their classroom or watch a TV commercial that shows a bushman enjoying video chatting in a remote place of Southwest Africa. All these kinds of experience lead student teachers and teacher educators to certain image of the globalized world or other people living in other countries. These images sometimes result in limitations, and sometimes as find potential to be taught in global education.

This chapter addresses the first research question, ‘What images or narratives about globalized world do preservice teachers and teacher educators bring into a preservice social studies methods class?’ The first section focuses on the ways that student interviewees define the globalized world, including non-Western societies and people, in general. Then next section makes these general global images concrete by specifying their global experiences in their family and home town, extracurricular activities, their relationships with immigrant or international students, and their travel-abroad experience. By doing so, this chapter reveals that although they came from narrowly lived family or local cultures, they also had pretty diverse global experiences in some areas. However, they did not learn global perspectives from those experiences due to the lack of curiosity about other societies or of the various conceptual
frameworks. The third section examines student teachers’ K-12 school curriculum experiences in terms of global perspectives - global topics were almost non-existent in the K-12 schools because the K-12 school curriculum neither supported nor showed expanded global perspectives. Then I conclude this chapter by addressing the connection between global experiences and global discourses in the final comment section.

“Globalization is in my classroom”: Preservice Teachers’ Image of the Globalized World

One of the images of the globalized world that many students had was closely related to the images held by the immigrant students and/or ELL students in their classroom. Since these social studies students were student-teaching when I interviewed them, their lives were connected to their practicum classroom in many ways. Many students were conscious of multicultural characteristics in terms of language, race, original nationality, and economic status of their students.

Actually, in my classroom, we’ve been emphasizing immigrants a lot, so that is the first thing that comes into my head. I have four students who are English language learners. They really identify very strongly with the immigrant discussion and then every kid I noticed has something that they bring to the table. You know we had two students who have Native American backgrounds and I think that globalization is in my classroom. (Esther, first interview, p. 3)

Esther considered that even Native American backgrounds would be one of the global aspects in her classroom, although this culture is not usually considered by many to be a foreign culture. At times, my student interviewees identified multicultural characteristics of their classroom with the global aspects of their classroom. What is interesting is that a lot of students considered this diversity in their classroom as a beneficial resource that is “something that they [their kids] bring to the table,” as Esther said in the above interview.

Also, some student teachers understood the different family cultures brought by their students as another global aspect of their classroom. However, the diverse family cultures were
sometimes depicted based on stereotypes. From their oversimplified viewpoints, cultural variety is merely a difference in itself without any values assigned to the various cultural distinctions. When this occurs, it could be an obstacle to their own teaching style rather than a resource.

I always think of American people and European people [as being] kind of all the same, but … I was thinking of Asian, I guess, kind of people, cause you hear like [the] stereotype, you know their parents make them study and they all, you know, everyone has stereotype like they are smarter than everyone else, and then you go to South American, Latino type of people, you may not have instructed [academically supported] family life. Kind of like, [you can] see those stereotypes even in this classroom. Now we have one Asian student, and his dad, I guess, called and said, “Oh he got 80% on his spelling test, and I am gonna start waking him up by 5 o’clock in the morning to study. Do you have any extra homework?” (pause) “No, we don’t do that in second grade.” But I don’t know (pause) just different types of people. (Lina, first interview, p. 3)

This conventional concept about Asian and Latino family cultures in terms of education caused by hearsay, formed by unsubstantiated opinion, was assumed and reinforced by the student teaching experience. In their practicum sites, it was difficult for student teachers to make contact with their student’s families, nor do the cooperating teachers require or expect this of them. Thus, the stereotypes that some preservice teachers have are hard to break down and difficult to reform. When these stereotypes are identified with cultural differences, as seen in Lina’s example, culture becomes something unchangeable and an obstacle between preservice teachers and their students’ families.

In addition to their recognition of a globalized world through their clinical experience in practicum classroom, some student teachers highlighted ‘easier accessibility to other cultures through technology and travel’ as well as ‘having more exposure to cultural diversity’ in a globalized world.

Recently the world is becoming so more globalized, so much easier to access everything. I think it is changing for the better, kind of (pause) like people are constantly exposed, like it is a lot easier to be exposed to different cultures and different parts of the world due to technology. I feel like everything is becoming more (pause) closer in a way. I think it is just easier to access. I don’t know [if] it is necessarily closer or more united. I
just feel like we have more access to it and [are] more exposed to [it]. (Eunice, first interview, p. 2)

As with Eunice, many preservice teachers pointed out the shrinking world as one of their main images of globalization. However, their recognition of cultural diversity does not necessarily mean that they enjoy the exposure to diverse cultures. Since certain images they hold of the globalized world often come from the media, it is easy for them to believe those images to be fact. In other words, this image of the world takes on separateness from their own inner world. Interestingly, Hillarie, one of instructors of this course, had more personal connections with her images based on her curiosity and expectations of kids and preservice teachers.

So in my image, it is like kids networking in WHAT ARE THEY NETWORKING IN? all over the world together. … I think kids could be so much more comfortable in interacting with people from different cultures. Even different languages, they can find the translation because already our kids are networking on the Facebook with students that are not in their school, not in their town. They are finding people. I want to extend down to our elementary teachers so that they [our teachers] can facilitate that [interaction]. (Hillarie, first interview, pp. 2-3)

While her undergraduate students focus on accessibility to other cultures and the possibility of exposure to cultural diversity, Hillarie goes further to think about networking possibilities among her students. This is because she believes that the more the world becomes globalized, the more children will be exposed to networking activities. Hillarie built up her connection to different cultures on the basis of her expectations that younger children can be freely “interacting with people from different cultures” beyond linguistic and cultural barriers and that her undergraduate students could help their students to cross any imposing borders. These personal connections were helpful for Hillarie to think of global perspectives as one of the important potential conceptual frameworks they could incorporate into the social studies class.

Considering the above quotes, student teachers seem to connect globalization to the multicultural characteristics of their student teaching classes and also to the differing family
cultures brought into the classroom community by their students. Although some preservice teachers consider the diverse cultural backgrounds of their students as valuable, their understandings of different cultures are either stereotypical or unchanging in nature. In other words, having a multicultural image of their students, the shrinking world image that they show regarding the globalized world, also shows the student teachers’ assumptions of global culture, which is something they see as accessible but static. However, teacher educator Hillarie goes beyond just the possibility of access and encourages her students to network with foreign friends and to cross cultural and linguistic borders. By doing so, students and their teachers might participate in cultural formation. In this image, culture means something dynamic and ever-changing. Therefore, both student teachers and teacher educators talked about multicultural images of the globalized world, yet the meaning of culture was different.

Preservice teachers did not always bring multicultural images of globalization to their class and field experiences. Student teachers sometimes bring neoliberal images of globalization to their course, depending on their other undergraduate class or previous high school experiences. For example, Esther had a homogeneous picture of globalization where countries share the economic benefit of globalization in a gigantic market by sharing their expertise in various capacities with each other (first interview, p. 4). Crystal showed the image of globalized world that American values spread throughout the world by means of multinational corporations as seen in the following example.

It probably sounds strange, but McDonald’s…I went to a seminar between in my junior year and senior year [in high school], World Fair seminar. The topic I attended was globalization and McDonald’s was kind of the analogy of the week. Just how (pause) it started in the United States and all of these different places have adopted it and sort of made it their own like, I mean not all generic hamburgers. (Crystal, first interview, p. 3)
‘McDonaldization’ is one of the typical pictures showing how globalization has made the world homogeneous rather than culturally differentiated. Although the neoliberal image of globalization has dominated the discourse of globalization, this image was not often mentioned by student teachers. It might be because they were focusing intensely on cultural diversity either through their preservice social studies class or due to their culturally-diverse students in their practicum classroom during the time I interviewed them. Yet, their image of the globalized world sometimes resulted in different kinds of converging pictures of the world other than those found in the neoliberal discourse. For instance, Sam imagined “everyone working together for a common purpose” and “everyone is unified, sharing the same values and goals for how we envision the future of our world” (first interview, p. 5). This sort of ‘melting pot’ image where various values are united for the whole of the public good, which is seldom the image produced in their social studies class, remained in some students’ minds probably based in the preservice students’ religious values.

I attended [the] Urbana conference past winter, which is world-wide mission conference. That was, like, a good picture of [globalization] (pause) because [the] Christian value is one of my highest values. When I think globalization, I see like, just everyone coming together. For me the Urbana Conference was a picture of that. Just seeing like, people from all over the world, it’s a lot of Asians, a lot of Caucasiains, a lot of people from Europe, a lot of people from India, everywhere, coming together in one place for one purpose, that would be for me, just whole world coming together despite, like, skin colors, like whatever it is. (Nicole, first interview, p. 3)

Nicole was one of students who openly shared her involvement in her church activities in the social studies class by explaining how she had experienced different cultures in her church community. This convergent image, however, was not shared in social studies class by her.

In spite of these diverse images of globalization, most preservice students had a limited image of the globalized world. They only understood the globalized world in terms of cultural diversity as they experienced in their social studies class and in their culturally diverse practicum
classroom. Yet, they did not see the unequal power relationships associated with the globalized world. For this reason, they did not distinguish non-Western from Western perspectives, nor had they concrete knowledge of the power relationships. The following interview was the only answer in my data that addressed the unequal relationship between Western and non-Western societies made by a student teacher.

When I was in social geography, … I remember we talked about how the time zones started in England. I thought it was so annoying, like, “why are they starting in an arbitrary place?” It would be more… maybe something scientific, based on the sun and water, whatever, but it is based like on someone in Rome or maybe someone in England. Something like that, they decided “well, this is a religious point, so we are gonna start the whole world right here.” And I thought that was kind of inconsiderate and very self-centered…. The fact that whole things are centered around England, I remember it was a very Western-centered society. I thought it was very annoying. … Who choose Western? Western from where? The globe is a circle [a sphere]. (Esther, first interview, p. 3)

In fact, this inequality is not merely applied to the time zone concept. The above economic relationship among countries that Esther herself mentioned can be interpreted not as beneficial cooperation but as an unequal power relationship, such as a ‘brain-drain’ from non-Western to Western societies in the labor market. However, preservice students rarely focused on this asymmetrical structure in my data. These student teachers’ images are differentiated from their instructor’s images in that Hillarie showed more critical ways of understanding. While Hillarie had common images of the interactive world through technology or “kids networking [on the internet] all over the world” (Hillarie, p. 3) with students, she pointed out unequal accessibility to technology among kids. Some students, who made distinctions between Western and non-Western global views, pointed out stereotypes that either non-Western or Western people have regarding other societies and people.

I think the biggest thing of it is that I feel like the Chinese people that I saw when I was there, don’t understand the Western cultural barrier much. Like just they assumed that we are very rich and you know, could give them money and things like that. Or that they would think that we have the values that they would see on television like on TV shows,
we always have lots of boyfriends and girlfriends and always… so they assume that we are like that too, but that’s not always true. So I think it’s probably very true that we have only one idea of what non-Western culture is and they have only one idea of what Western culture is. (Lucy, first interview, p. 3)

As seen in Lucy’s experience and thought, some students were more conscious of how non-Western people recognize the America. Based on their travel experience or indirect experiences they get from the media or from other people, student teachers assume that non-Western people have stereotypes about American society or people in terms of political power, economic richness, or secular values. Although she also had similar concern of her students, Hillarie as an instructor was more aware of her stereotypes regarding non-Western people.

My first impression is “I am just like you. It’s okay.” But my image of non-Western is that the Western world is much more invested than the rest of the world. So it’s double. When I stereotype non-Western people, thinking about United States, I then stereotype myself that I am truly isolated here, then the rest of the world knows things poorly of me for that, even for me as a teacher. When I go back to the [social studies] standards and they are so U.S.-centered, so it’s true. I feel like non-Western people might think that I undervalue who they are. The stereotype that I think I promote in myself and, I worry about other people thinking of me this way. (Hillarie, first interview, p. 3)

She revealed an image of the underdeveloped view of society that people in Westernized cultures could have when they think of the rest of the world. Actually this negative image was often found in students’ reflections on their previous short trips to South American countries. For example, Lina remembered her trip to Honduras made her think, “They seem like kind of poor and it was kind of overwhelming. As soon as you got off the cruise ship, you would be bombarded with people trying to get you to buy their local goods and stuff. … I wondered ‘what are their other means of income?’” (first interview, p.7). However, instructor’s views were not the same as the preservice students in that Hillarie continuously was concerned about whether or not they undervalued who non-Western people were and suspected that these stereotypes were the results from the U.S.-centered curriculum and education.
Even though they are rare, there were two students who are comparatively free from these stereotypes between Western and non-Western cultures.

If we think of Africa, developing governments, they are not as modern, they are not as up-to-date, and maybe they are more, still developing. But if I think of Korea, they are so technologically advanced, they are rapidly developing. That country is so crazy, like so much technology. (Eunice, first interview, p. 2)

I think of a people who are more in-tune with their identity, who have values that have existed for centuries as opposed to ever-changing values of Americans. …The media would lead us to believe that non-Western people are behind Westernized nations, but I believe they are more in-tune with what really matters, as opposed to things of no value that we waste time, money, and energy on. (Sam, first interview, p. 6)

Eunice showed double-sided categories regarding non-Western societies. As long as she mentioned unfamiliar countries in Africa that had no personal connection to her, she followed the existing image of the developing countries instilled in her perspective by the media. However, when she talked about Korea, her parent’s homeland, where her relatives still live, Eunice went beyond the fixed categorizations even though she categorized both Africa countries and Korea as ‘developing countries’. In her flexible recognition, even developing countries could be more technologically advanced than some ‘developed countries’. Besides, Sam criticized the stereotypes of non-Western nations that are provided by the media. Sam, instead, focused on the non-Westerners’ lifestyles and values that have been constantly maintained for centuries, and yet have been underestimated by materialistic Westerners. What is interesting is that his point of view also came from his personal relationship with his Indian roommate in his freshmen year.

**Prior Experience and Global Perspectives**

Previous lived experience that student teachers bring to their social studies class is one of the most important keys to understanding their interpretation of a globalized world. In order to figure out their international experiences, I interviewed them focusing on their learning experience in the K-12 curriculum they were educated in, their connections to immigrants or to
international friends, their foreign travel experiences, and their extracurricular experiences in K-12 school contexts. The more affluent teacher educator’s teaching experiences with immigrant or international students are also described in this section. However, before addressing their global experiences, there was one assumption that the teacher educator Hillarie had. This section starts with that assumption.

“When you see our classroom, it’s not very diverse.” Hillarie often pointed out that one of main reasons she feels difficulty in implementing more global perspectives is the fact that the social studies methods course students have very limited life experience in diversity based on their homogeneous backgrounds. First of all, considering race, most of them are Caucasian except for a few students of Asian, African, or Hispanic heritage. In terms of age, the majority of the education students in this study were senior-year students of approximately 22 years of age, excluding one or two older master’s degree students in each class. According to Hillarie, the student teachers’ Caucasian-dominated race and younger age meant that they were limited in their life experiences and so held more self-centeredness rather than global perspectives. In other words, the younger the education students are, the less they will have had direct/indirect lived experiences within other cultures, languages and societies. For this reason, their limited experience could impact their diversity experiences both in classes and in their travel, as Hillarie points out.

It’s self-centeredness because of life experiences. They have a limited life experience, not that I have this wonderful one or anything like that. I am older than them. If I think back to when I was 22, I had very limited life experiences. That’s why I remember we identified some students had traveled and how they were, maybe, just a little more open thinkers. They had different life experiences. (Hillarie, second interview, p. 12)

Regarding travel, Hillarie believed that limited travel experiences prevent her students from thinking globally as seen in the interview below.
Having travel abroad is really important for our students here. Our students who traveled abroad in the course, they seemed to be more willing to participate in something global. They can connect that little bit. They felt like the outsider as an American. The rest of the students have not felt that before. And that takes a lot of money, not all of them can do that. (Hillarie, first interview, p. 8)

These homogeneous assumptions the instructor has of her students’ characteristics are considered as an obstacle for Hillarie to bring global issues to their students, because her students would not accustomed to going beyond their own cultural contexts. Lastly, Hillarie pointed out that a majority of their students come from suburban Chicago, which has a homogeneous population. For example, in the survey I conducted in 2009, as many as 77% of the students reported that their hometown was in suburban Chicago, 9% came from homes in downtown Chicago, and 14% reported they were from homes in a rural small town or other places. As stated by Hillarie below, their isolated life experiences made it difficult for their students to understand social studies concepts from larger perspectives “across all countries, histories and times.”

White privilege may be a good topic because white privilege would definitely be more globalized, but the students that I currently teach, I feel like for them, it is so much… even… the idea of white privilege that they are just looking at it from their own suburban high school experience. I am really generalizing the students. But you know, then for them to think about white privilege across all countries and history and time and…that’s hard for them. (Hillarie, second interview, p. 14)

Those bigger global perspectives overwhelmed the education students (Hillarie, second interview, p. 18). Their interpretation on the limited experience of preservice teachers had Hillarie sometimes feeling that she was too far away from their students’ experiences and so they were discouraged in incorporating global perspectives into their class. In comparison to the student teachers, the instructor, Hillarie, had an abundance of experiences with immigrant or international students and their families as well as having taught in private and public schools with diverse populations. First of all, she had a close relationship with immigrant or international
students’ families. It was close enough to understand not only their family culture but also their national identity. In particular, Hillarie used a Mexican holiday celebration as an extra curriculum activity in order for her students to get a more authentic cultural experience.

It was nice at the private school because I get to know the families really closely. They would invite us for dinner and their kids and I would hang out away from school. The family from Russia, I got to know them very well and had dinner at their house and got to know more of what they did in Russia and what they do here. ... I can say that same thing about several different countries. And public school made students...I still got to know their families well, but I think it was almost like, people just haven’t had as much time,… But I was always invited to do something in their rooms. Like, I had a family from Mexico or mother from Mexico, and father from Canada. And she came in and did, you know, she wanted to do a celebration with their kids and with the dad and I still remember that. It’s really an important activity for me because I didn’t know as much about the holiday, but it wasn’t just about the holiday. We got into what is Mexican culture, why it is an important holiday, what the people do and value in a lesson. So it’s always nice and children loved it. We did a project around it. They made an altar, sort of Mexican looking, we had lots of paper decoration cut-outs, we made paper flowers and invited other classes to come through and parents came through. I thought maybe parents didn’t want their students to make an altar, but I explained the project. Even my white Christian parents, they were like skeptical, but this is also a Mexican Christian family, so I helped them understand that this is just celebrating their same religion differently. (Hillarie, first interview, p.4)

Hillarie learned to bring different cultures into her classroom based on her relationship with immigrant families even though it was challenging for her to prepare resources other than textbooks in order to learn new things. In addition, she learned to resolve some parents’ opposition to these activities, like the altar her students would make.

However, her rich experience did not always come from good relationships with parents, but sometimes this experience came from the conflicts with immigrant/international families due to the various cultural values. The following case shows how different understandings of how math should be taught between an American teacher and Russian and Korean parents influences Hillarie’s teaching style in math class.

At a previous private school, some of my parents really wanted kids to be more advanced with their math computation. This was a Russian family and several Korean families as
well. They were really valuing computation. And what I was really valuing was “Do they really know what they are doing in math? Can they apply this to their problem, can they think though this strategy with me?” If they couldn’t, then why are we even doing this computation? I didn’t understand the why, but the parents really wanted that part. We just came to an agreement where I recommended some resources for them, and they did the [part they were concerned with] at home and at school I did my part. Then, I really did feel like there was big disparity I had just shared with them. “Okay, your son may be doing pre-Algebra but you don’t understand. He could not do this problem for me. This is a real(Pause) this is a new field, he doesn’t understand what he is doing, that’s dangerous.” So I tried to explain to parents and the parents tried to explain [to me what they meant]. It is a cultural value of the computation, I think. This is important to these four families as a total. But it made me think “Okay, this is gonna be valuable for my other Korean families or my other Russian families.” (Hillarie, first interview, p.5)

Regarding the Korean culture, this “big disparity” that Hillarie still seems not to understand, results from a different cultural understanding of the child’s learning process and the traditional way of teaching younger children. Hillarie believes that her students should understand the computation process first, then they can compute as a result of this understanding, because without understanding, they just repeat their memorization of the facts and lose their interest in math. Korean parents believe that their children can understand the computation process while they are repeating numerous computation and memorization practices. What is interesting is that she did not ignore these parents’ opinion as a misunderstanding of computation knowledge. Rather, she came to an agreement with them, and also appropriated this cultural conflict for her cultural awareness of non-native families.

Besides their relationships with immigrant students and their families as well as with their immigrant friends, the instructor’s trips to non-Western countries also gave her a more serious interest in other countries than that of her education students. On the basis of their diverse experiences through traveling abroad, Hillarie highly prized their student teachers' travel to other countries.

Having traveled abroad is really important for our students here. Our students who traveled abroad in the course, they seemed to be more willing to participate in something
global. They can connect with that a little bit. They felt like the outsider as an American. The rest of the students have not felt that before. (Hillarie, first interview, p. 7)

Although only a few, students’ foreign experiences were treated as “such a gift” to her class. Probably it is mainly because their diverse experiences helped the other students recognize their narrow perspectives based upon their limited life experiences. Also, sharing the different experiences was important in a sense that it made new connections to foreign societies unfamiliar to the majority of students in her class. Hillarie used a specific case of Nicole, who I interviewed, as a vivid example.

In order for something to be done well, you have to have a connection. So that’s why, for example, in the class you attended, Nicole, she was a student that was born in Korea, came here, but moved back to Korea, and then came back here. So she was able to really talk about that experience. I think that helped EVERYBODY in the class connect because they are her friends and know her. I mean if you have a student like that, that’s such a gift to your class if they talk. She didn’t have to talk about that, and I didn’t expect her to. (Hillarie, second interview, pp. 14-15)

However, according to my class observations, her experience in Korea was not frequently mentioned by Nicole, although she spoke English fluently and also actively participated in Hillarie’s class. She talked mainly about her different experiences in the U.S. as Asian American. As seen in the last sentence of the above quote, both instructor and students did not seem to expect to talk about their international experiences in the class. The next section will describe the global stories that student teachers, for the most part, did not share during their class times.

**Untold global stories of preservice teachers.** As Hillarie asserts, student teachers might come to their social studies class with a narrow world view. As seen in Table 3, most of the student interviewees grew up in homogeneous places. In other words, most of them have not experienced diverse cultures until high school or college. However, this narrow view might be compensated for by diverse world travel or by having friendly relationships with international or immigrant members of their community. In order to see what kind of international experience
preservice teachers bring with them to their studies, this section examines student interviewees’ narratives in terms of their family background, the K-12 schools they attended, particular global topics in their K-12 curriculum, extracurricular activities, their relationships with immigrant and/or international friends, and their experiences with traveling abroad.

Table 3

**Student Interviews’ Hometown and K-12 Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Interviewees</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>K-12 school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Northern Suburb of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>private Jewish school (K-8) public high school (9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Small town (Northeast Illinois)</td>
<td>public elementary/middle/high school (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>Small town (Northwest Illinois)</td>
<td>catholic school (K-4) public elementary/middle/high school (4-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Mid-sized town, Illinois</td>
<td>private Christian schools (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Mid-sized town, Illinois</td>
<td>Greenville (pseudonym) schools (K-5) Sunnyvale (pseudonym) schools (6-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Eunice</td>
<td>Northern Suburb of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>public elementary/middle/high school (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Southern suburb Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>Korea (K-1), England (1-3), Korea (3-9), suburb Chicago high school (9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>South Side of Chicago (Inner-city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Christian private school (1-4) Catholic private school (5-8) Catholic private high school (9) Suburban public high school (10-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My first student interviewee, Esther, had lived in a very homogeneous world until high school. She was not only raised in a Jewish family where family events were one of the top priorities for family members, but also went to a private Jewish school from kindergarten to middle school. In fact, she remembered that her neighborhood in a northern suburb of Chicago was composed of diverse ethnic and cultural groups (80% white and 20% diverse cultural groups). However, since her social group was limited to the Jewish community (religious community and schools), she had little connection with her neighbors.
I grew up in a northern suburb of Chicago, …I went to a private Jewish school, so Judaism was part of my life but not so much rule-based, but more culturally so values like you know, ‘do good things to others, study hard, (laugh) education is important, being a good person is important’, (pause) what else, charity is a big deal... And family is also a big deal in my family. That’s just based on my parents. My mom always has valued family and that’s always been a big (pause) you know whatever you are doing, we have a family event. You have to go out after this, you know. So that was big. (Esther, first interview, p. 1)

Ironically, this limited life experience at her younger age made Esther long for diversity and the bigger world. Interestingly, Esther entered a public high school where numerous cultures existed. Within that school, she met a great deal of friends from different cultures from her background and it opened her eyes to the cultural differences within the school.

I was dying for diversity. You know you go to [high] school and we had over 112 languages spoken in this school. You name it, it’s there. It was great also because the school did a really good job in emphasizing respect. … I needed it, that social interaction with somebody who is not as exactly the same person as me. Because going to a private Jewish day school, you know, it’s religious, everybody has the same values, everybody has same (pause) no not same background, but very, very, similar backgrounds. There weren’t a lot of differences that I could explore. (Esther, first interview, pp. 1-2)

Going to a local public high school, she savored the chance to be around people who had different beliefs than her. The communication with diverse friends sometimes helped this student teacher not only to see multiple values but also to respect these differences as seen from the conversation with Esther.

Interviewer: If you have had immigrant or international friends, can you describe your relationships with them?

Esther: Definitely. Lunch table [at lunch time] there were very heated discussions. It was very respectful. Looking back, I am still impressed how we were respectful. We weren’t mean to each other about that because we recognized that was something you were born into. You don’t choose for yourself. You don’t choose your background. You were born into it. And it is more an exploration of how we are the same and how we are different instead of who is better. If it’s who is better, that’s where you run into problems.

Interviewer: What did you guys talk about at the lunch table?
Esther: Everything. Religions, cultures (pause) and there were people who came in different dress. In certain holidays, I would ask them for weeks, weeks and weeks and weeks. I had one friend believe that because I didn’t believe in Jesus then I was going to hell, but we’re still friends. Whatever, she was still respectful of me and I was still respectful of her.

Interviewer: Didn’t you have experiences of kind of, unhappy cultural differences?

Esther: No. Because we are all in honors classes, so we were helping each other out in the class to begin with. This discussion needed to be civil. They needed to be respectful because otherwise, you would lose your friend (laugh). We cared more about our friendships than our differences. (Esther, first interview, p. 7)

The lunch table experiences that Esther had in high school seem to be filled with a very convivial atmosphere with numerous discussions of topics based on diverse cultural perspectives. Unfortunately, she did not remember specific cultural values that she learned in the lunch table discussions, only that she really enjoyed different cultural dress that her friends wore. Yet, one obvious thing is that she has an image of others in a way that other groups of people are valuable because of the diversity that they can bring to your perspective. Another obvious lesson is that she learned to respect different people from different backgrounds. Her thought is that they should not be discriminated against because of these differences that they were born into and that they didn’t choose for themselves. In this way, she could encounter global world within her high school class and learned how to accept differences and how to respect different people despite uncomfortable religious differences.

Lastly, one of the most vivid global experience was overseas’ travel experience of Esther. Esther saw completely different political situations in a foreign country and at the same time saw the economic wealth and political power of the U.S. through her trips to a foreign country. Therefore, her travel experiences not only let Esther create the image of “others,” but also let her see herself in the globalized world. Esther visited Israel four times with a volunteer group. When
she visited the war area of Israel, she observed how the Palestine people lived extremely dangerous lives.

Israel is really small and a dangerous place in very specific places. For the political trip, we’re in really dangerous areas. We had a really armed bus and bullet-proof glasses, but we were fine. Who’s gonna try targeting American tourists? You don’t want that crazy, you don’t want that political (pause) but on the political trip, I was very fortunate, I was able to meet some Palestine students. ... One of the boys, he said to me what I thought as very powerful. He said, “You don’t understand this. When I go home, people threaten to kill me because I am being nice to you.” You know, I can’t even imagine living like that. How could you choose between letting a child learn how to use a gun and shooting other people and having somebody else threaten to shoot your child. I can’t even imagine living in this sort of situation. It was terribly sad, terribly sad. I think it was an experience for me to see (pause) I think people really understand better when they explore different cultures, different religions and different viewpoints. (Esther, first interview, pp. 7)

In this trip, Esther re-identified the political power of America in Israel and the Palestine area. Her confidence that American tourists would not be targeted, even in the war area, came from her recognition of the United States’ military supremacy in the world. This consciousness of her nation’s political power seems to be made stronger by this trip. Simultaneously, however, she saw the people of the politically impotent nation miserably living their daily life. Interestingly, it seems that she thinks that the U.S. political power in Palestine territories was completely separated from the dangerous circumstances of the Palestine area. Without seeing any connection between the two situations, Esther might just consider that the Palestine boy was living by different cultural customs, different religion beliefs, and by different viewpoints. However, unless she reflects on her experiences and understands the Palestine people’s “terribly sad” life with a global connection between the politics in Palestine and America’s political power, she will know only the superficial meanings. In fact, the lack of critical thinking in seeing others and students themselves was often found in the interviews with student teachers.

My second interviewee, Jessica, was also raised up in a town that it was hard to find diversity among their neighbors. Jessica, who grew up on a small dairy farm, described her
neighbors as primarily a white community that is of low to middle socioeconomic status and sometimes are close-minded and unwelcoming to strangers, even though it is case by case. In addition, she had no choice about schools since there is only one elementary, middle, and high school with no private schools available. Along with 54 friends in her graduating class, she graduated from the school where teachers really care about students. Because it was such a small place, the teachers knew all the students and their families. For that reason, Jessica said that she “came to U of I with a very narrow global worldview because of not being exposed” and every year since coming to “this huge university and big city” she kept realizing what she did not know in the context of her family and her hometown (first interview, p. 1). When she took preservice teacher education math class, she realized that even in a math class the students’ racial stereotypes might be reinforced, and so she became interested in the need to be prepared as a teacher to create a culturally inclusive classroom.

Jessica had a very limited chance to meet international students in her high school, but she also had a chance to meet Asian American friends at her college and to work with two Chinese colleagues. However, the more she associated with them, the less she seems to have been sensitive to cultural differences.

I have a couple of Asian American friends. I tried to ask them, but most of them grew up in America and lost their [cultural] identities. I had conversations [with them] and they didn’t even know necessarily what their culture was supposed to be (laugh). … I worked with one man here on campus, who is Chinese, and I also worked with another Chinese. I feel they are pretty Americanized. I don’t feel (pause) the only thing is when I heard them talking on the phone to their parents talking Chinese (laugh). I don’t see any cultural differences. When I get to know someone, race doesn’t matter. It only matters when you don’t know someone. (Jessica, first interview, p. 6)

Jessica thought many of the non-dominant groups of people assimilate to the mainstream culture and lose their cultural identities. As a result, Jessica might have an image of minority groups from different cultural backgrounds as people who have “lost their identity” or “are pretty
Americanized.” The above interview shows that these images of ‘others’ are caused by either of two possibilities: by Jessica’s Asian American friends themselves, who lost their cultural identity or by Jessica herself who might not be sensitive to the nuances of cultural differences or to diverse perspectives that might be found in her non-white friends. However, as long as Jessica did not experience or learn cultural differences that matter, even after she knew ‘others’, she wouldn’t necessarily think about the chance that the differences might be hidden.

Through travel-abroad experience, Jessica experienced some frustration based on the language barrier and had to understand unknown cultures by appearances rather than by listening to others’ opinions. Jessica went on a volunteering trip to Costa Rica sponsored by International Impact for three weeks. While she worked on turtle conservation on the beach, and helped in a daycare center with her team members, she felt how big the language barrier can be with non-English-speaking colleagues.

When I went to Costa Rica, I didn’t speak Spanish there. But there were people from Germany and from a couple of other places, so we were trying to learn more about their culture to make more interconnectedness. I was just frustrated with this because in order to get to this social justice and this peaceful world that we all want to get to, we are gonna have to communicate somehow. If I can’t communicate (pause), [how could I get to social justice?] (Jessica, first interview, p. 6)

In her first trip abroad, she met an International Impact voluntary student group. In the group, she was the only white person and was also one of the linguistic minorities because most people on the trip, seven out of ten, were able to speak Spanish. For this reason, she said, “When I went to Costa Rica, I was the only one who couldn’t communicate very well.” (p. 6). Even though all the group members spoke English, it seems to be very basic English communication. Thus, she was disappointed by the fact that she could not learn their culture and could not make more connections between them and herself, which is essential for the trip’s goal of achieving social justice. This frustration is her unique experience because other student interviewees did
not find the need to learn other languages to make more interconnectedness. Rather, most of students experienced the supremacy of English as an international language rather than experienced disconnectedness to foreign people based on a different language. Jessica’s disconnectedness is due to her experience of traveling to pursue social justice in contrast with students who traveled and just enjoyed exotic culture.

My third interviewee, Crystal, is from a hometown in a small rural area, where diverse cultures are hard to find. She shared common family values with other student teachers in a sense that education is emphasized in ways where she was expected to get good grades and go to college, which was a non-negotiable option. However, she talked about her unique family values. Her parents, especially her mom who was a preschool teacher, highlighted the importance of “accepting others and having an open mind” as seen in the following interview.

Education was always emphasized to all of us, so self-motivation with completing our homework and doing well in schools and getting straight As [was expected]. We weren’t punished for not getting straight As, but that was definitely something they emphasized. What they wanted was honesty. Accepting others and having an open mind was something especially [that] my mom really pushed for us to take people who were different from us, accept them and get to know why they are different. Not necessarily be blind to differences but understand them and realize that we are equal even though we have differences. And also, gratitude was a huge value that they emphasized. Just being appreciative of all of your experiences that you have in your life and all of the people who participate in those experiences and help you through them. (Crystal, first interview, p. 1)

This family value of accepting differences and appreciating diverse experiences was not often mentioned in other student interviewee’s answers on the topic of their family. It might play an essential role in making Crystal interested in diversity in spite of her limited learning environment. However, the most important reason that she became interested in global issues was her participation in the World Fair Seminar.
Crystal had been involved in the World Fair Seminar since her junior year in high school because she received a scholarship from her school and local business groups. The World Fair is a-week-long annual seminar that over 3000 students from all over the world participate in during their summer vacation. Crystal first attended the seminar as a student ambassador and has worked for the seminar as a counselor since 2009. Under the main topic (i.e., globalization, hunger, or water usage and availability), which changes every year, all of the seminar sessions for the week relate to the main topic. The attending students listen to many speakers’ sessions and participate in planned activities.

An example she shared with her social studies methods class was about the 2009 World Seminar topic, hunger. The seminar participant groups were served three different meals at one lunch, each an example of the levels of hunger: The lead group was served a three-course meal, the middle group got rice, green beans and water, and the lower group who just got rice without water and had to eat their meal with their hands. Even though she never traveled to foreign countries except Canada, this activity provided insight into global hunger issues with an intense experience.

I was in shock. Coming from a very small town, that is not at all diverse (laugh), and just being in this place, this campus with all of these different people. I was just ecstatic to meet all of these different people and learn about all of them. There were a lot of social activity opportunities to just get to talk to people as well as I mean, all the meals you eat with them at the dining hall. So we were all together all the time and there were so many experiences and opportunities to talk to all these people. And the dance was (pause) there was a talent show and I danced. I think that was the biggest reality check for me, that they are people that are very different from me and very awesome because we had students from Hungary. … It was interesting to see students from Zimbabwe (pause) I don’t know but the ways that they walk were much more energetic and they danced and sang on the way to the lectures. That was fun and people joined in. I mean, they wanted to learn about it, so that they walked with them and started singing and dancing with them on the way to (pause) so by the end of the week, everyone’s doing it. It was interesting. (Crystal, first interview, pp. 4-5)
Considering she hardly remembered what she learned in her history or geography classes (see next section), she was able to provide a vivid account of the activities of the World Fair, expressed by saying she learned from “awesome speakers” and from “awesome activities” (first interview, p. 3). In addition, she got exposed to unknown cultures she hadn’t learned about in her school community through a non-school event for high school-aged students from around the world. For Crystal, this seminar experience was one of the most important global stories that she can bring to social studies methods class.

Lucy, my fourth interviewee, grew up in comparatively bigger town compared to Jessica and Crystal, yet she also got accustomed to a narrow perspective. It was obvious that she was strongly influenced by the Christian values from her parents and her church that she is still involved in. She went to “a private Christian school all the way from kindergarten to the end of high school” where her teachers “wouldn’t tell us other people’s point of view,” but “would only tell us what they believed politically or religiously” (first interview, p. 1). In addition to this K-12 private Christian school, she also attended a private Christian college in Pennsylvania and her experience with different cultures and people than what she grew up with was pretty limited, even though she learned different points of view while attending her college. However, she had a unique reason why she became interested in diverse cultural values that are important for non-Western people.

I have always, since I was young, I always wanted to go to China. I am not sure why, I don’t know why, I’ve always been interested in it (pause). That was a goal of mine to go to China. So I read lots of books and learned a lot of things about China before I went. Any things that said China (laugh), so I read some non-fiction books about, you know, just facts about the people and…, but then some books was about, just stories about the culture, but they would be fiction books, so it wasn’t completely accurate. It was hard to understand because I didn’t know enough about the culture to be able to know why those things are significant. So I read things and thought, but why do I care (laugh) about this, but then after I went, I thought ‘Oh, okay. I understand why that’s important because that’s an important thing in their culture.’ … I learned very little about other cultures in
my school curriculum. So everything that I learned, I learned by myself. (Lucy, first interview, p. 3)

Lucy, in contrast with other students, had a yearning for China since her time in middle school. Therefore, she read a lot of books about China, regardless if the books were fiction or non-fiction. However, she neither distinguished accurate information from inaccurate information, nor did she understand even non-fiction books because she had no background knowledge about the Chinese culture. She did come to understand cultural meanings of some special events that take place in China while studying in China for three months. As she said, she learned everything about China by herself, and her questions about the Chinese culture were not answered in her schools. In fact, her school library did not own good children’s books about China because all China-related books were “the old fashioned reading books that were just kind of silly stories” that she never liked (p. 4).

Like other student teachers, Lucy also met some immigrant or international friends in her school through a roommate. Her friend was an international student studying in the U.S. In spite of her friend’s cultural differences though, Lucy was not aware of the cultural differences between her and her international friend. As Jessica only saw language differences of her Chinese colleague, the only thing that Lucy got to know about her friend was also more apparent cultural points, such as foods and language, rather than the inner, deeper cultural points, such as religious beliefs and cultural identity.

I had a roommate in college that grew up in Vietnam. I didn’t know her very well before we lived together. We lived together in Philadelphia. So, some of the finest memories I have with her (pause) she would take us to Chinatown and they had a Vietnamese restaurant there that she liked to go to, so she ordered food for us and tell us about her memories of eating that food in Vietnam. She still spoke the language very well and would talk on the phone to people and had very interesting things to tell us, too. She was born in Vietnam and she came to the U.S., I think, in high school, just for school and then stayed for all of college and she’s still here doing graduate school. (Lucy, first interview, pp. 4-5)
According to Lucy, she and her Vietnamese friend were close when they lived together for one year. Probably, while she listened to her friend’s memories in Vietnam, she might have seen a glimpse of the Vietnamese culture which might have been different from or similar to her own culture. However, what she remembered was that her Vietnamese roommate ate different food and spoke a different language, which is very obvious to any student. Even though she had been very curious about China since her junior high days, she did not research anything with the Asian culture, or try to discover what her own and Chinese cultures might have in common. It was only during a period of studying in China that she began to learn about the Chinese cultures and had an obvious global experience.

Lucy had a longer trip to China going there for three months. Since the focus of the trip was learning about the different Chinese cultures, religions, and the people, she learned things that she had never known before she was going to China. She explains of learning about the religions in China.

Lucy: I studied abroad when I went with my undergraduate school, so it was a Christian program. So there were Americans there from all over the country. And I never met any of them before we got to China. But they were all from Christian schools, so we had the same backgrounds and values to start with. And we lived at the university there and we took a lot of classes. That was a lot of studying. I wish I had more time for other things (laugh). But it was mainly a cultural studies program, so we did learn some language, but that wasn’t the focus. The focus was learning about the culture and religion and people.

Interviewer: Did you learn about the cultural backgrounds there?

Lucy: Yeah. I mean the religious differences were very big because the way that they live their lives and going to the temples and always paying the money in. They burned the money in, you know, all those rituals. Those are things that I am not familiar with because of my Christian background.

Interviewer: Burned the money?
Lucy: Yeah. I think it’s kind of like a payment. I don’t know exactly, but it’s just part of the practice of that they think. That’s part of the payment for what they have done wrong or for their ancestors.

Interviewer: What did you do on the weekends or during free time?

Lucy: We spent time with Chinese friends, like they (pause) we went to an English speaking club and lots of people would come because they wanted to learn English from us. So lots of people would come and talk to us and invited us places and took us to see the sites and to experience things. But we took a couple of trips on the weekend just to see other parts, not too far away. I had one friend and I spent a lot of time with her and her home and her apartment. She didn’t speak English that well. Just trying so hard to talk with each other. (first interview, pp. 2-3)

Despite her longer trip, Lucy seemed to see only small pieces of the cultural differences, and did not see cultural value behind those differences. It is probably because her study abroad program was provided by an American Christian organization, so they easily focused on the religious differences between Christianity and Chinese Confucianism or Buddhism. In fact, cultural differences between America and China are not limited to religion. The differences might also be economic, political, or other differences. Even though she lived in China for a lengthy time, her experience in China might have been restricted to looking only at religious ways of life.

And, at the same time, the language barrier could be one of reasons that Lucy understood Chinese culture only partially. She had many chances to meet a lot of Chinese, yet the main purpose of the meetings was to teach English rather than to talk about Chinese culture. Using only English, the conversation between her and others might not be deep enough to understand their culture. She even had a close friend who she spent a lot of time with at her home and her apartment, yet they were “just trying so hard to talk with each other” instead of talking about cultural values behind the act of “burning money.” For this reason, when I asked her about her image of non-Western people, she pointed out the stereotypes with views of the wealth and
secular values of Americans when she was in China. In other words, she focused on how the “Chinese people do not understand the Western culture” barrier (first interview, p. 3) rather than talking about how she did not understand non-Western cultural aspects.

My fifth interviewee Lina deviated from the majority of the social studies methods course students and the homogeneous cultural background of those who grew up in the Chicago suburbs. This deviation is due to her having lived in a campus town for her entire life at the time I interviewed her. In comparison to the suburbs of Chicago, the small/medium towns of Illinois, or inner city Chicago, the campus town she lived in has a marked diverse demography, culture, and many international students due to a large public university near her community. This same diversity was found in her relationships with immigrant/international friends or in her relationships with friends of different ethnic and cultural groups.

As seen in other student teachers, many student interviewees are unconscious of cultural diversity among their relationships with their friends. However, Lina saw significant cultural values behind apparent cultural behavior, and learned how to accept these cultural differences and respected others. In particular, Lina started to understand the existence of different ways of life on the basis of really different religious beliefs.

I did have couple of close friends that were kind of Muslim. I had a girl friend. Her name is A’ishah. I am still talking to her. But that was middle school and high school. We would go out and she wouldn’t eat certain things. She said, “I can’t eat that.” Oh! I realized that I didn’t know anything about her culture. Just little thing like that. She didn’t lecture me about it. They believe something really different, and having not ever really gone to church. We can’t go to McDonald’s because you don’t eat hamburgers or you don’t eat this different (pause) [food]. (Lina, first interview, p. 4)

As examined in her community background, Lina grew up in a less homogeneous place where many international students live together. For this reason, she had met many classmates from different countries, such as Italy and France, since elementary school. However, before she
became close to her Muslim friend, A’ishah, and observed her friend’s inconvenience in an American restaurant, Lina might not have encountered the different way of life that A’ishah follows. Even if it is “just a little thing” as she said, she came to realize how she had superficially understood her friend’s culture and could see the unique religious values behind the forbidden food.

In addition to the relationships with international/immigrant students, Lina’s interest in the global world resulted from being exposed to various multicultural materials during her childhood.

When I was kind of growing up, I was taught to respect everyone even for their differences. They kind of teach that in school, but I think it’s definitely how you were raised. (pause) I think it’s important hearing kids talk about other things. And we looked at the book, I don’t remember which book, that talked about different cultures and they [students] saw someone wearing like, a head-covering and like, “what’s going on with that?” I talked about that’s how they are and how their religion is (pause). So, it’s kind of different things they see in books (pause). Kind of the same thing with me, I grew up reading a lot consistently, so I think [I was] exposed to different things through that, so that kind of influences [me]. I think I am pretty tolerant to other people and differences. (Lina, first interview, pp. 3-4)

As with many student teachers, Lina also was motivated to teach diverse global topics in her student teaching experience. The need to teach students understandings of different cultures helped her to be interested in using global issues in her teaching materials.

Lina was a student who traveled multiple countries. While Esther saw different political situations in Palestine and the political power of the U.S., Lina observed completely different economic situations in Honduras and Puerto Rico and at the same time, saw the economic wealth of the U.S. when she traveled with her family.

I’ve been to (pause) just on vacation with family to Puerto Rico and Honduras. It was kind of a big eye opener traveling there. They tried to put you in tourist areas where everything is big like Gucci and looks like America, but we took a tour around, kind of back end area. [In Honduras] Anything seems (pause) houses that were kind of, just shacks and kids were really barefoot and go like, “Buy this! Buy this! You are American,
you have the money.” So, I couldn’t imagine how their education was. Probably pretty poor, they didn’t have materials. Nothing like studying abroad or anything. … You can kind of tell it was totally different than here in Sunnyvale -Greenville. … It was kind of really dirty. They seem like, kind of poor and it was kind of overwhelming. As soon as you got off the cruise ship, you would be bombarded with people trying to get you buy their local goods and stuff. … I wondered, ‘what are their other means of income?’

[In Puerto Rico] They kind of had the same thing, but that was more (pause) The one thing when you go on cruise, so, those different kinds of countries, is a lot of them try to sell you drugs, which I did not expect. When we got on the ship, they briefed everyone, “This is kind of what you need to expect, keep your things close to you. When you come out the ship and come down to the ground, don’t buy anything, don’t talk to anyone.” That was (pause) my impression was that they were all like, drug lords. I thought it was. I know that it can’t be true, but that was my experience. (Lina, first interview, pp. 7-8)

Lina took her cruise trip with her family to Puerto Rico for two days and to Honduras for one day. However, unfortunately, her trip made either new stereotypes or reinforced her stereotypes about these two countries as poor and dangerous places. Unlike America, the people living there do not seem to have other means of income except tourism or illicit drug sales. The short “tour around back end area” also allowed her to observe a totally different viewpoint of economic situations in the countries. Through these differences, she clearly contrasted the poverty of Puerto Rico and Honduras with the richness of America and its economic power in non-Western countries. However, this travel that is limited to three days and tiny parts of these countries prevented her from penetrating the connections between the poverty of two countries and the wealth of the United States. It is very similar to that of Esther not seeing the relationship between the political instability of Palestine and the military power of the U.S. in her trip.

My sixth interviewee, Eunice, was the only student who recognized their hometown as a town having a diverse population.

Niles is a pretty diverse town. So, there are a lot of Asians, and a lot of different minorities. I never felt, like, not included or discriminated against. Everyone is really inclusive. … Not that many African Americans or Hispanics but Asian, Indian. (Pause) The majority of my school was white and there were a lot of Asian students. I remember
there was me and a Chinese girl and all the teachers looked at me and the girl confused all the time. [They mistook the two of the Asian girls for each other] They always called me her name. We are all Asian, but not the same people. I still remember that. (Eunice, first interview, pp. 1-2)

Eunice grew up in a Korean immigrant family with neighbors of different Asian minorities although the majority of her hometown population was Caucasian. From a pretty young age, she knew of the existence of different ethnic groups and different cultures. However, while she considered her town a really inclusive place, she experienced how teachers put her in a big category of Asian rather than her own ethnic group, Korean. Her ethnic identity as a minority within a diverse town was one of the main reasons that she became interested in diverse stories of different people coming from different cultures in the global world.

I think that especially being a part of like, growing up in a place of diversity I learned about different cultures. I think it is really valuable learning. I think it’s really cool how people from different cultures and all from different places, they all have their own different stories. (Eunice, first interview, p. 3)

Eunice only visited her home country, South Korea, for two months. She was a bilingual preservice teacher who could teach her predominantly white students in English and also teach her ESL Korean students in Korean when they did not understand content or skills. Thus, when she was in Korea, she had a great potential to understand Korean culture effectively since she was fluent in speaking Korean.

I only visited Korea two months I think. We spent time with my mom’s family. One big difference is the education system. My cousins go to school and go to a Hagwon. They went to an English Hagwon, an art Hagwon, so they are really busy. My young cousin, he is 9 years old, but he comes home really late. I thought, “Oh my goodness, it’s so different from here [the U.S.].” (Eunice, first interview, p. 5)

The Hagwon refers to an after school, for-profit private academy, which are prevalent in South Korea for the intense studying of English, math, musical instruments, sports, etc. or more importantly for preparation for college entrance exams. Since it is a unique phenomenon
compared to the U.S., it could be a clue to understand the Korean inner values that are hidden in their extraordinary zeal for education. However, she merely saw the apparent differences in terms of how busy Korean children are due to their having to go to Hagwons. Also, if she knew that most of the Hagwons prepared for the standardized tests of upper elementary school or middle and high schools, she might have seen the connection between the American high-stakes testing and Korean test-driven education. However, Eunice like almost all student interviewees, focused on the cultural differences without an understanding of global connectedness.

My seventh interviewee, Nicole, was a student who vividly showed how a student teacher could personally experience global migration flows before coming to a preservice teacher education program. She was born in South Korea and attended school in England from first to third grade during her father’s time in graduate school, and went back to live in South Korea from third grade to junior high. It was then that it was decided that she could not adjust to the “new” education system in Korea, causing her parents decision to immigrate to the United States so that she and her brother could attend schools there. In 2002, she arrived in Chicago and started to go to a suburban Chicago high school, where she experienced many of the globalized characteristics of an American school (first interview, pp 1-3). When I interviewed her, she was in the last year of the elementary teacher education program and was preparing to be a teacher at a private primary school.

For Nicole, just being in an American school with students of different ethnic groups was a way to have a global experience.

Just the fact that you can just see people with a different color of skin, (pause) that makes a huge difference, too. In Korea, when you are walking down the street, when you see a white person, “Oh my gosh! He is white.” You know. Even just being in school with Caucasian people, African American people. Even that made me feel, like, I was in a global world. But then specific issues (pause) I was in multicultural shows a few times. Even those things like, introduced different cultures to the school. It was like
extracurricular things. You had people from India doing their traditional dance. You don’t see that in Korea ever. For me, too, I sang Korean things for the show. Even through that, I was introduced to different cultures. (Nicole, first interview, pp. 5-6)

Compared to the U.S., Korea is still a very racially and linguistically homogeneous society even though Korean society has experienced an influx of foreigners as a result of the globalization of their labor market. Thus, when looking at classrooms in Korean schools, most Korean students have the same skin color and use the same language almost without exception. Nicole revealed the great advantage of American schools where the diversity of the student population made it possible for her to learn that she lives in a globalized world. In addition, the diversity of her suburban Chicago school led her to participate in special school events, called “Multicultural Shows.” In this way, the multi-ethnic school and extracurricular school environments in the U.S. gave her special global experiences that went beyond her limited experiences in Korea.

Nicole also depended on the same kind of motivation as student interviewees, who felt she the need to teach the more homogeneous group of students in her class about different cultures. However, she focused on Korean culture in order to take advantage of her own ethnic and cultural differences from other teachers by showing that she was not like all Caucasian teachers in her practicum school. Actually, she was the only education student who had experienced both education systems, Korean and American, having moved to the U.S. with all her family when she was in 9th grade. Therefore, she could compare and contrast the Korean education and American education with her personal knowledge of the two different systems.

In Korea, I didn’t care about studying, but after moving to America, I was sort of getting good grades. Within a semester of coming to America, I got like a 4.0. That’s because in Korea, I was just forced to do things. I just don’t work that way. Private teaching, my parents did, but I didn’t care. Coming here, I definitely fit well into the American education system a lot better. I don’t know. I just wanted to try. It wasn’t like I have to go to Hagwon from 4 p.m. to 10 p.m. like I used to in Korea. I studied on my own. I wanted
to get good grades for myself. I needed to be motivated like, by myself not like by everybody telling me to do it. So, the Korean education system definitely did not work for me.

I think here, even in high school, I felt more like an adult because there is a lot of freedom. In Korea, everybody’s always telling me to do something, like always directing you to certain direction, but I felt like, even in high school, you had so many choices to make on your own, which is something that I think worked well for me. Even within the same high school, you have some kids that are going to Harvard, and some kids that are not going to college. I feel like in Korea, even junior high itself is ranked. Some junior highs, only smart kids go there, some junior highs, dumb kids go there. I didn’t like that. The American system, it definitely allows teachers to be independent in academic areas early, which I think is good. I think that’s biggest difference. (Nicole, first interview, p. 2)

Her contrast between the Korean middle school and a U.S. high school might be inappropriate in that she attended neither a U.S. junior high nor a Korean high school. Also, her opinion about the general disparity between the entire Korean education system and the American education system might be over-generalized since she had experienced only one Korean middle school and only one U.S. high school. Nonetheless, her unique experience is worth sharing in a social studies methods class. This is not only because she could explain how differently other schools in different countries educate their students, which often stimulated both instructor’s and students’ curiosity about globalized world perspectives, but this is also important because she could reveal advantages or disadvantages of American schooling itself. For example, although Lina has only lived in her hometown, she addressed a very similar contrast between the Greenville schools and the Sunnyvale schools in regards to Nicole’s observations.

I guess from kindergarten through fifth grade was all in Greenville (pseudonym) schools, so it was very (pause) I wouldn’t say unstructured, but kind of hippyish almost, like, kind of ‘Do what you want.’ I moved to Sunnyvale (pseudonym) and in middle school it was like a lot of kids knew rote memorization like the (pause) you knew all these boxes. I was like, I never learned that. The teachers, we are kind of, we called them by their first names in Greenville and in Sunnyvale you did not do this at all. I mean, elementary school seemed more like teaching you social skills here [Greenville] and then education.
After fifth grade, so from sixth grade into twelfth, we moved to Sunnyvale. That was a lot more structured. It was a big difference. It was more like you have to study, you have to do homework, you have to set test every week. And in elementary schools here in Greenville, you didn’t really have that at all. I mean, it is not bad in either way, but it was just kind of different. (Lina, first interview, p. 1)

Even if Nicole and Lina used different vocabulary, their contrast between two different school systems is very similar. Without the international experience of Nicole, Lina’s experience is just merely a limited experience within Greenville and Sunnyvale schools. However, along with Nicole’s contribution, students could understand Lina’s comparison in depth through more global perspectives on “structured” versus “unstructured” or directed curriculum and instructions versus a more open curriculum and pedagogy. For this reason, Hillarie considered Nicole’s international experiences a gift for her class, as seen in the earlier excerpt from her interview.

As one of the Korean immigrant students, Nicole reveals that she had limited relationships with Korean immigrants:

I met a lot in high school. At school, I hung out with a lot of FOBs [Fresh-off-the-Boat]. I mean they were immigrants and first generation. We talked in Korean in school, but they weren’t my main group of friends. I just talked with them in Korean and my main group of friends was from my church. That’s why I am good in English. Even here at U of I, there are so many international students here. … I guess in high school, some of my friends were from the Philippines. I guess cultural differences like, they are so big on family. Yeah, Pilipino immigrants are so big on family like, always having BIG family gatherings. With Korean immigrants, you don’t really see that because not all relatives are here. That’s one cultural difference. … I don’t think I was like, that close to a lot of them. If I was close, they were all Korean immigrants. So, there weren’t a lot of cultural differences there. (Nicole, pp. 4-5)

Since Nicole had some friends from the Philippines, she knew cultural differences between Filipino immigrant families and Korean immigrant families. However, except for the family size, Nicole did not look curiously at other cultures, especially if it was an Asian culture. Thus, she could not see unique cultural values that her Filipino friends had behind big family gatherings. Rather, her relationship was confined to friends coming from the same cultural and
national background until high school. However, her assumption that there is no cultural difference between Korean immigrants and herself made her ignore another potential for multiple realities that might exist in the second generational Korean cultures. In this way, cultural diversity became blurred with limited relationships with their international/immigrant friends.

Nicole grew up in a family whose “parents were really big on travel” (first interview, p. 6). Thus, she actually traveled to almost every continent except for Australia. When she was in England, she took a family trip to all the countries in Europe for one month and each country for 3-4 days. Also, she went to Costa Rica for a spring break for a missionary trip in high school and also visited Thailand, Jamaica, Spain, and Tanzania.

I guess [I had a] kind of cross-cultural experience. I remember we went to Tanzania, a country of Africa. This was when I was young. I felt that experience was really special because I saw elephants and people walking barefoot. I don’t know why that was so memorable for me. “Wow, people are walking without shoes!” (laugh) I remember people were eating without utensils. That was really interesting. At that young age, it was weird. I mean that was like a very cross-cultural experience. That is why I remember it definitely. I went to Jamaica a few years ago, actually 2-3 years ago. Everybody was very welcoming like, happy. I don’t know, they were happy all the time. I do understand it’s a tourist country, but they were just very welcoming and they wanted to have a good time and they want you to have a good time. I feel like their personality is very different. But some European countries, they don’t even recognize you were there (laugh). They can be very closed off, not welcoming, I guess. Some countries I definitely liked. It was because of the way that people treated like, the tourist, but then other places, liked the sightseeing and places to go, things like that. But generally Jamaica was fun. Europe, I saw different things. (Nicole, first interview, p. 6)

By her “cross-cultural experience,” Nicole found different lifestyles in different countries in a deeper way than the other students. As much as she had abundant travel experience, she could reflect why it was weird to see some African people who walked without shoes and ate without utensils and could also compare the personality of the Jamaican people and of European people by observing how they treated tourists, although she seemed to over-generalize their
personalities. However, her travel-abroad experiences did not help her to understand global issues or global connectedness.

Interviewer: Do you think all your travel abroad experiences made you become interested in global issues or connectedness?

Nicole: Honestly, I don’t think so. The reason why I would be interested in global issues, I mean, honestly speaking, it is because of my Christian background. I think traveling, you know, a lot of that, when I was younger, I think it was just, like, a fun time with my family. (Nicole, first interview, p. 6)

In spite of her abundance of global experiences, she did not become interested in global issues. All the travel experiences were merely fun times with her family. For this reason, she could only see apparent cultural differences rather than the concerns about the inexplicit ways in which other people live and in which they are influenced by others, even by her family.

My last student interviewee Sam seemed to be one of students who experienced diverse cultures in a sense that, first, he was the only male African American interview; Second, he had been going to private schools until 9th grade instead of neighborhood public schools; And third, compared to other interviewees, he frequently transferred to new schools. However, he grew up in the south side of the inner city of Chicago, where over 98% of residents were African American. For this reason, all of the three private schools he attended, from elementary to high school, had populations that were composed entirely of African American students. Even the suburban high school he attended had a population consisting of 80% of African American students and 20% of White students. This homogeneous environment caused him to have only African American friends until high school and even in college he had few friends from other ethnicities because he found it very uncomfortable and difficult to befriend people he viewed as very different from himself (first interview, pp. 1-4, p 7).
However, in spite of his very limited life experiences, he was a unique student who took not only K-12 education courses, but also undergraduate classes with critical global perspectives. He was highly interested in global issues and viewing new perspectives depicted in different broadcasts, magazines, newspapers, etc. Even dialogue exchanges with different people that he met over time, where his and others ideas were discussed with multiple perspectives, proved interesting venues for him. Along with Jessica, Sam was another student showing that students in the social studies methods class were not always from wealthier families:

I was in a private school for 1st-9th grade and in public from 10th-12th. … The community schools were terrible and my Dad, although he didn’t receive a good education, valued it [the private school] and saw it as a means to an end. This was because the community schools were terrible. If we stayed in a suburban area with better schools, they probably would have sent us to the neighborhood school. They really struggled to keep up with tuition payments over the years, but saw it as being well worth it. … The biggest challenge was coming from wearing a uniform in school every day to trying to find outfits that matched, so I could keep up with the coolest attire amongst high school students. And this was when my Dad got laid off, so it was kind of hard. I worked in the neighborhood raking leaves, cutting lawns, shoveling snow, etc, to make some extra money. (Sam, first interview, p. 4)

Since his parents, whose dad was a bus driver and mom, a tax collector, did not have enough income to send their children to private schools and a more affluent suburban public school, both their parents and Sam endured difficult financial times until he graduated from high school. Considering how her parents did not earn a high income from their dairy farm, Jessica also did not grow up in an affluent family. As with Jessica and Crystal, Sam was taught in a small school where “they did not have much funding for extra-curricular activities.” (first interview, p. 2) One difference between Sam and Crystal and Jessica was that the two women had more financial support, such as school scholarships or NGO scholarships, that gave them a larger variety of international experiences, such as getting to go to summer camps or a trip abroad with leadership roles. By contrast, Sam did not get this kind of support nor did he have
extracurricular international experiences where the focus of the school was on student behavior discipline rather than educational philosophy, as the following excerpt shows:

In a city like Chicago, at least where I grew up, private school education was not necessarily a lot better, but they capitalized a lot more on discipline. That was what my parents really wanted for us. That was an environment where we received discipline and we had to abide by the rules as opposed to public schools where they let the children do whatever they wanted to do. (pause) That was the main reason they sent us to the private school. It wasn’t in terms of like, education. It wasn’t really great. (Sam, first interview, p. 8)

While the private schools Sam went to did not give him diverse global perspectives, the global perspectives were provided by a friendship with an international friend. Sam became interested in other groups of people by seeing disparate cultural values from his roommate’s perspective.

My roommate in my freshmen year was Indian and he talked a lot about how his dad despised many American cultural values. He was very family-oriented and rarely wasted money. He also had a much greater [culture] because of who he was and where he came from with regard to his heritage. We had many discussions about the differences and where they may come from, and this really initiated a deeper curiosity for other groups of people. (Sam, first interview, p. 6)

Sam set a high value on his friend’s life style, that of being family-oriented and rarely wasting money. The reason why he had a very positive image of his Indian friend’s culture is because his Indian friend belongs to “people who are more in-tune with their identity” and who “have existed for centuries as opposed to ever-changing values of Americans” (p. 6). When I interviewed student teachers, Sam was one of the more memorable interviewees due to his insight when he looked at or spoke of other cultures. Considering he had only lived within his African American community until high school, it is obvious that his contact with his diverse friends in college really contributed to initiating a “deeper curiosity for other groups of people.”

As a last example, Sam shows how student teachers could understand other societies with the connection to their nation and to themselves.
I have traveled too much all to Mexico and Jamaica, so I haven’t really been working overseas or anything like that. I went to Jamaica twice for about three days each and I went Jamaica for about a week although it isn’t as though those are Western societies. That helped me to just get a different perspective on just how other people live and how our economy impacts their economy. Let’s say Jamaica, for instance. I know they’re not industrialized at all in terms of, you know, what they just produce. A lot of money comes from tourism and things like that. Also, I visited a small village in Mexico. So my wife and I really got to see really different sides of life for a week. When I think of economy, I think our vision, you know, what economy is in terms of living in more or less in a metropolis where you get less sleep and work more and more. It just told me different from how we live here in America. It was very interesting, very eye-opening to see how they live on a day-to-day basis versus us in terms of other resources that we have. It was a good experience. (Sam, first interview, p. 7)

Even though his understanding might be in the initial stage of understanding global awareness, and he did not share detailed experiences, he showed me what a global-minded teacher looks like. He could see cultural or economic differences from a global perspective or from an entire global economic system and also could freely go and come from concrete experiences to abstract concepts, such as different kinds of economy, until he understood the difference between living in a non-Western European country and living in the U.S. In order for a preservice teacher to develop those perspectives and thinking skills and to teach them to their students, they need essential frameworks to see their global experiences globally and critically.

**Global topics in K-12 curriculum.** Even though the preservice teachers grew up in very homogeneous circumstances, their limited experiences might have been expanded in their K-12 schooling. While the previous section was about the overall impressions of their K-12 school(s), this section focuses more on the learning experiences they might have had through the K-12 curriculum that the student teachers were exposed to in their own studies.

First of all, according to the student interviewees regarding global topics, global connectedness, or the exposure to various cultures and societies, almost all student interviewees said this content was nonexistent in the curriculum they received in their K-12 schools. The
majority of the students learned U.S.-focused history and/or if any global connectedness was covered, it was limited to European or North American perspectives. For example, Jessica and Sam were two education students who learned absolutely nothing in their K-12 schooling regarding cultures other than the European American culture.

In K-12, no, it’s nothing at all. No, never. Literature, it would be literature. My teacher gave me another book. It was called “Sodoko (pause) Sodoka” It was story about a Chinese boy (pause). That was about it. I’ve never seen educational events or anything outside of this country. I hadn’t even learned about the Holocaust until college. I feel every kid should know about it, but history, you know, we were really just (pause) we read textbooks and we asked questions. That was about the extent of our social studies education. We never had experiential like social studies and my teachers had never emphasized history. Like in high school, the football teachers were history teachers. So a lot of time, I was sleeping because they wouldn’t be doing anything or he would have football tapes on (pause) from watching the highlights from the football game. So it was very poor. (Sam, first interview, p. 8)

Sam never saw different cultures or events happening outside his country taught in their class, regardless of any literature he might find or his poorly taught social studies class. Except for one teacher introducing him to a Chinese children’s book, he did not have any direct instruction towards learning global concepts. He had not even learned about the Holocaust, which was a major historical unit that many other students remembered as an important topic in their world history class. His history and social studies classes were not meaningful learning experiences and he felt that his teachers did not value these subjects. His case might be an exceptional case considering his discipline-driven school culture he mentioned in the previous section. Although, he is not the only education student who had this kind of experience.

Different cultures were never really introduced. I don’t blame that on the teachers but (pause) [it] kept us close-minded. I think the system in general, they were never educated [about global perspectives]. That’s the reason I want to go back, but I feel I need to learn more first. I feel like, every year, I didn’t know that, I didn’t know that. (pause) I don’t think I am prepared to teach a culturally inclusive class. (Jessica, first interview, p. 5)
Jessica, taught by teachers who left cultural and global aspects out of their lessons for whatever reasons, also did not study these topics. As seen from small rural community culture, the socioeconomic environment surrounding her school might have been another obstacle to deal with in respect of global issues beyond the U.S., due to not only unprepared teachers but also the lack of resources. However, what is interesting is that Esther, who attended a wealthy suburb school, shared a similar experience.

Not really. I guess in my primary school, up until 8th grade, we did sort of learn about, like, Europe and we learned about history and things like that. We haven’t really learned like, the whole globe. Sometimes something is going on. If an emergency is happening, or there is a charity fund, but a lot of my school was focusing on the U.S. like, races in the U.S. I guess that is sort of global. We talked about African Americans, you know you come from Africa (laugh) so I guess we did have that, but it focused more on the U.S. and Israel because it is Jewish. … We learn history, current events, politics and we have like, celebrations for Israel’s birthday. (Esther, first interview, p.5)

As in the cases of the other education students, Esther also spent most of time in her K-8 classes with a U.S.-focused curriculum. One exceptional thing is that she went to a Jewish school, so she learned the knowledge of history, politics, and current events with regard to Israel and American Jewish culture. Yet she identified Israel as a Western country whose culture is very similar to the European culture. So, strictly speaking, she did not learn global knowledge beyond the U.S. and European perspectives until high school. Fortunately, her high school gave her a lot of opportunities to listen to cultural stories different from her own family and neighborhood cultural stories. Those cultural diversity experiences concerning the globalized world seemed not to come from her formal schooling. In fact, aspects of diversity were taught to her by her international friends rather than by her teachers. The more I interviewed student teachers, the more I realized that, in general, they studied very little content about other societies in their classroom. Sometimes, preservice teachers revealed limited learning experiences even through
their undergraduate courses. Lucy and Sam, as master degree students, expressed their critical opinion about their college education and about the teacher education program they were taking.

In Social studies, we learned a lot about American history a lot a lot (laugh). And we did have world history classes, but every time we had world history, it was always Europe. So it was still Western cultures. … I remember when I went to college, we had to take a class, world culture class, but it was only Europe and North America. And I asked my teachers if they had a class, like, that was not European and North America and he laughed at me. And I was like “Okay. I guess that’s no.” He said “No. We don’t have a class like that.” I always wanted to learn more about it, but there was not a good way for me to learn about it. I’ve been just trying to choose books. …I mean we had little tiny bit about Canada or Mexico, but usually only because they were fighting against the U.S. or something like that. (Lucy, first interview, p. 4)

Lucy was a student who has been especially interested in non-Western cultures since middle school. However, her disappointment in her K-12 education was repeated in her college classes, because even through the world culture class, the content was limited to the European and North American knowledge. As usual and although it was not easy, she had to find her own appropriate readings to satisfy her curiosity. Sam was lucky compared to Lucy because he took a sociology class dealing with the economic structures and poverty issues existing in other countries in comparison to the American economy.

I haven’t had much experience in what you request in terms of being exposed to global issues. In my freshman year, I took a sociology class and my teacher, he, really talked about poverty in different countries, you know, just how other economy structures as opposed to our own, but for the most part, especially in teacher education, we haven’t been exposed too much like, global perspectives and different views on globalization, I guess. (Sam, first interview, p.6)

Actually the sociology class was a very rare case for Sam. Except for the class in his freshman year, he does not seem to have been exposed to global perspectives before studying them in depth in his social studies methods class. College courses focusing mostly on the U.S. were also a point confirmed by Jessica. When she evaluated math textbooks’ use of diverse cultures for instance, the texts were examined based on ethnic cultures within the U.S. (first
Going back to the K-12 curriculum the education students received, Lina was one of students who remembered in detail what she learned related to global topics.

Interviewer: What did you learn from your K-12 classes, for example, world history, or something like, specific subjects dealing with global topics?

Lina: World history (pause) all I remember, we did a big unit on the Holocaust. It seems like we did that almost every year. We learned about different kinds of wars like the Vietnam War and we learned a lot about Pearl Harbor, everything like, surrounding that. Really most of what we did was kind of read different books about cultures and kind of talked about them. I remember the geography units. We would talk about different types of people that lived where (pause) I don’t remember the specifics about it. I remember geography was in fifth grade. We learned a lot in fifth grade about it. World history, we did the Holocaust in fourth grade and fifth grade also.

Interviewer: Did you learn about the Vietnam War at that time?

Lina: That was more like, in the middle school. I think it was sixth or seventh grade we learned, but not whole a lot because by then I was in Sunnyvale and it was more textbook, kind of fill in the blank and find a sentence in the textbook and put it in the blank. We didn’t learn kind of (pause) I don’t remember hardly anything in history. (Lina, first interview, p. 6)

According to Lina, a few global topics in her world history class that went beyond European history centered on some specific events such as the Holocaust, the Vietnam War, and Pearl Harbor. Excluding the Holocaust, these topics were based on wars between the U.S. and other countries such as Japan and Vietnam. As Lucy pointed out, Mexican and Canadian history in social studies were taught due to their conflicts with the United States (i.e. a border disputes). Teaching about Japan and Vietnam was also based on the involvement of the United States with these countries. While I listened to Lina’s answer, I wondered what kinds of images of other countries were constructed through the K-12 curriculum she and others had experienced. Non-Western people might be considered enemies or rivals by these students. However, according to
Lina, the inappropriate pedagogy when teaching international topics kept students from making even these assumptions of ‘others’. This problematic pedagogy will be discussed in more depth later in this section.

It was a rare occasion when the student teachers gained knowledge of non-Western societies’ ideas and beliefs from their K-12 experiences, but sometimes, cultural and religious differences might be represented in the curriculum content. Eunice pointed out that it wasn’t required to take a class where the content included materials and resources accessing cultures other than an American one until high school.

In social studies, a lot of them were more about U.S. history. It is elementary school-wide. It is ELEMENTARY. High school, there was a global studies class like, learning about India, China, etc. That was like, the freshman year in high school. It was required. I remember different religions. We were taught about India, differences in India and their religions. I think I learned about China, like, different cultures, like, what their groups were like. (Eunice, first interview, p. 5)

Her answer seems to justify that elementary students in the school she attended, inevitably did not go beyond the U.S. boundaries in their studies. In fact, the rationale was, the teachers in the lower grade levels should focus more on smaller community units as in the family or the hometown. This was a common answer among some of the student teachers. Probably for the same reason, most global topics seemed to be taught in the high school curriculum, if they were taught at all. For example, while Lina had a project to research the people and traditions of an unknown country, such as Estonia, in her elective geography class (first interview, p. 6), Eunice learned of different ethnic groups in China and their different cultures in her high school class, as seen in the above interview. It is not sure what ideas and concepts they came to have through the classes because they could not retell anything they thought was meaningful when they were asked to retell their learning experiences. The curriculum content in the classes may have had a message that there were numerous unknown ethnic and cultural people living in a
global village who might have quite different beliefs and lifestyles than Americans. From the student teachers’ interview answers, the curriculum content was not clear. It is interesting though, that the K-12 curriculum seemed mainly to highlight the sense of the cultures being separate from one another rather than having diverse connections to the U.S. in a globalized world.

Some student teachers asserted that global topics in their K-12 classroom were dealt with only through an American standpoint. They never had to discuss other perspectives and did not have to think about the existence of other perspectives. An example is Lina’s memory of being taught the history of the Native American.

We really kind of touched on different cultures. We didn’t really go in depth into any sort of issues (pause). We would talk about different cultures and different values, you know, why they wanted this. I do remember talking about the Native Americans coming over and taking over kind of, America, why that wasn’t fair and how all the Indians were pushed onto the reservations. You don’t learn about them and it’s kind of about (pause) it’s more on our perspectives than the Native American perspectives. You didn’t get about perspectives from any other sort of cultures. What I remember was, you never really learned about the Japanese, looking at their hobbies and never really [looking at] about their opinions. It was more our issue. (Lina, first interview, p. 6)

Lina and her classmates seem to get to know others’ viewpoints by studying different cultures and different values of other groups of people. However, even though they were taught about different cultures and different values, the issues were never studied deeply enough to understand the others’ perspectives. Rather, they always saw those cultures and values from their own standpoints. I guess, for that reason, Lina never considered the Japanese to be people who enjoy hobbies or have their own opinions, but instead, were looked upon as only enemies, as when they learned about the attack on Pearl Harbor. To understand foreign cultures only from a domestic viewpoint could be dangerous. This is not merely because foreign cultures cannot be completely understood with an American perspective, but also because it could reinforce the existing stereotypes that Americans hold of other cultures. If American students learn other
cultures or about global issues from only an American perspective, their attempt itself is nothing but a process of alienating people from other backgrounds throughout the world.

Nicole, however, claimed that understanding events from a national standpoint is an unavoidable phenomenon in K-12 schooling, irrespective of Korean or American views. She found this reasoning while comparing Korean-centered to American-centered world history.

In K-8 in Korea, (pause) I guess K-8 in Korea, global issues that were talked about (pause) I feel like, I mean just in the World history class. You know, studying about historical backgrounds of (pause) what I feel is like, it was still so centered on Korea anyway. Things that we learned about different countries were all, like, stemming from Korea somehow and nothing, like current issues. The only thing that I could think about is that, things affect Korea like the Olympics. Overall this was such a big issue for Korea, so everyone was, like, passed America (laugh). During history, I mean studying Japan, but I wouldn’t (pause) I feel like there was big lack of global [study].

High school here (pause) definitely during history class, I took world history class. It was required. You know, World War I, World War II, things like that. I feel like it is unavoidable to take it from an American perspective. You know everyone in Korea, they are obviously gonna talk about Korea. Here obviously they are gonna talk about America, but I feel like, even during those times though, there were more discussions going on about it rather than learning from the textbook, you know. (Nicole, first interview, p. 5)

According to Nicole, even through the world history class, it was impossible to teach more than the national interests. For example, as the world history curriculum in the U.S. selected Japan and Vietnam among numerous foreign countries in the context of conflicts with the U.S., the world history class in Korea also dealt with the connections with different countries based on their national interest such as the Seoul Olympics or different wars. These examples revealed the big gap between the official textbook knowledge and the unheard history caused by national interests. In particular, the above international topics of war seem to be taught from their national perspectives instead of from global perspectives as long as the conflicts are not addressed, for example, in the context of a power struggle under the global expansion of colonialism, but dealt with from the viewpoint of Japan’s seemingly unprovoked initiation of war
against the United States. Considering most of the student teachers remembered their world history class as the main place for dealing with global topics, the fact that the curriculum did not go beyond national boundaries and its lack of global perspectives showed how the student teachers’ education helped to develop their narrow-minded views of citizenship.

I have touched upon this final point in earlier sections, that even if student interviewees studied global topics, they could not remember the particular content their K-12 teachers had given them in their classes regarding those topics; in particular, they couldn’t recall these facts from their social studies classes. As addressed in the first point in this section, one of the main reasons for this was because the curriculum itself only looked at global topics with an emphasis on U.S. history, or if it went further than that perspective, it was to cover a European history perspective. But as the majority of student interviewees pointed out, the problem in teaching global topics was just a problem of pedagogy. For instance, Sam criticized that his private schools never emphasized social studies or history, let alone global topics. Lina also problematized her Sunnyvale schools, which seemed to her to have a test-driven teaching style dominating its curriculum, where the “fill in the blank and find a sentence in the textbook and put it in the blank” was common (first interview, p. 6). Therefore, it is not merely a problem of specific Eurocentric contents in the teaching of global topics, but a general pedagogy problem of unskilled teaching of social studies. Crystal, who took AP history and AP biography in high school (first interview, p. 2), had the same issue even with having had advanced high school history – she could not remember being taught specific global topics.

History’s never been and geography’s never been like, my favorite, my strong subjects. So, I think they were taught in a way that, like, [they] had books that we read in this class that they were taught. I would probably have been interested in them, but just in my class, it was ‘read this chapter’ and ‘answer this question’ and I don’t remember any of it. I was like, at that time, just very, well memorization didn’t have purpose [for me]. We didn’t
have projects, either. No purpose for learning or reading any of those materials. I didn’t hold on to it. (Crystal, first interview, pp. 6-7)

In this excerpt Crystal shows the general way global topics were taught in schools. Even though it is not sure if she took Advanced Placement (AP) World History, AP European History, or AP U.S. History, the methodology of ‘read this chapter’ and ‘answer this question’ did not help her retain what she memorized in her history class. The memorization of global events might be better for obtaining higher scores on certain exams rather than helping students gain global perspectives. Along with a problem of poor pedagogy, Eunice pointed out the course content did not relate with anything in her life.

Interviewer: What did you learn beyond specific cultural facts in your global studies class?

Eunice: I guess not. I can’t remember. I don’t know. If it is a meaningful [fact], I probably remember it. I do remember anything really relevant to us, I guess. [The] only thing I remember in that class is reading a textbook (laugh) and watching a movie about it. (Eunice, first interview, p. 5)

Unfortunately, even if Eunice took a global studies class in high school, she did not remember any meaningful learning experiences associated with the class. It was because, as she said, the cultural knowledge about different groups of people in other countries (i.e. India and China) had no connection to their lives in the U.S. and also because unfamiliar cultures of India and China were taught with inappropriate methodology, such as only reading sections in a textbook or watching a movie on the subject in the lesson. As earlier mentioned, many of the global topics are limited to the unique cultural situations in particular countries, which are completely separate from the American cultural experience. As a result, some student teachers experienced another form of null curriculum in regard to global issues or global connectedness.
The strongest method of learning global issues that remained valuable in the student teachers’ memories was expressed by Esther.

In high school, we learned more because everybody around us was from different countries. So you didn’t ever have a choice (laugh). I had a class, a horrible class. It was called… world something, world history or global history? I don’t know. It was like the worst class in the whole world. It was my freshman year and it was untracked. … But I think after I left the class and had time to process some of the things that we learned, some of things that we learned were really valuable. We learned about different religions. I think that it was my first exposure to, like, real exposure. If somebody who is Jewish is explaining to another a religion, they don’t really understand. It’s not their religion. You can try to explain somebody else’s religion but you don’t live it. It’s hard to explain it. That was my first time my teacher had students who were from that background or were from that religion or whatever, presenting that to the class. It was in that way a great class. But it was pretty much a horrible class every other way (laugh). But in a way, we had a unit on like, personal backgrounds or whatever. Actually that was my first experience to [view] real global issues instead of selective issues. In middle school and in elementary school, it was selective global issues instead of overall global issues. In high school, it was overall because we had everything. (Esther, first interview, p. 6)

In her case, Esther had a chance to connect her Jewish background to other religions taught in the world history class. This teaching methodology looked very relevant to her life because she not only concentrated her efforts on preparing to introduce her religion, Judaism, but also connected her background to other classmates’ backgrounds while she compared and contrasted different belief systems. However, the incorporation of this relevant pedagogy might not have been doable unless the class or school had been composed of a diverse student population coming from different cultures. In that sense, this case could be an exceptional case, yet at the same time, this example showed what kind of pedagogy needed to be developed in terms of relevance to students’ lives in order to give them valuable learning experiences with global topics.

In short, when I asked my student interviewees about how they learned about the issues of global connectedness in their K-12 classes, their answers were divided into four typical responses: (1) they never learned about any issues outside the United States, or all global topics
were centered around Western Europe or North America without any non-Western society included; (2) They learned limited global topics only from an American perspective rather than from a global perspective or from an “others” perspective; (3) Even if they learned global topics, they couldn’t remember those topics because they were not taught in a pedagogically relevant way. In other words, through their K-12 curriculum and teaching practice, they rarely had chances to learn about the existence of “others” or to explore perspectives different from their own American perspective.

In order for a preservice teacher to develop those perspectives and thinking skills and to teach them to their students, they might need essential frameworks to see their global experiences globally and critically. For this reason, my next chapter will focus on how perservice teachers are/are not prepared in their preservice social studies methods class to be a global-minded teacher.

**Final Comment**

This chapter focused on the global images and narratives that student teachers bring into the social studies methods class. The images were based on multicultural characteristics of their student teaching class and on their assumptions of an increasingly interconnected globalized world. As seen in the general image of the globalized world, student teachers’ images were limited to their experiences of cultural diversity in the K-12 schools they attended and the experiences they may have had in other countries, but without noticing global inequality behind the cultural differences. In their assumption of more accessibility to cultural diversity in the globalized world, student teachers considered culture something static and unchangeable. This image of the different cultures contrasted with the teacher educator’s image, that of culture being dynamic and ever-changing, because she believed students could participate in cultural
reformation by networking with others. This finding showed that although student teachers become interested in cultural differences in the globalized world, in their understanding of diverse cultures, they did not consider culture as dynamic and ever-changing, but showed their images are mostly influenced by a very limited transformative discourse and was scarcely impacted by a radical discourse on globalization.

However, once entering from general image to their specific global experiences in K-12 curriculum, developing relationships with immigrant or international friends, and travel abroad experience, neoliberal discourse markedly affected their image on the world. First, global contents in school curriculum were almost nonexistent in many ways. This absence of the knowledge about the global connectedness, global diversity, or global inequality revealed that American school curriculum mainly deals with national interest and leadership and does not go beyond Western civilization. The trend resembles the neoliberal standpoints in that both validates current corporate globalization by omitting critical view on the existing globalization in K-12 school curriculum or by insisting the benefit of the neoliberal approach to globalization to national interests. The nonexistence of other cultures and non-Americans was re-identified in their relationship with their immigrant friends who hide or lose their cultural identity under U.S.-centered culture.

Through their relationships with immigrant/international friends, student teachers had a very different range of perceptions of others. It varied from superficial thoughts that they are just eating different food and speaking a different language without reference to cultural differences, to deeper understandings where different cultures have various cultural values that have existed for centuries and that are precious to them and are worthy of respect. Additionally, in view of
Hillarie’s meaningful experiences with immigrant/international families, student teachers’ experiences were sometimes limited to the relationships with friends of their own age.

In terms of overseas experience, student teachers had diverse travel abroad experiences, which were not limited to Europe or North American countries. However, in spite of their various global experiences, their learning experiences were not enough to expand their narrow life experiences within the U.S. Their travel focused on small cultural differences or on the evaluation of their culture or economic systems by apparent differences rather than by cultural values. These limited experiences sometimes created new stereotypes or reinforced their existing stereotypes. In particular, they reinforced the U.S.-centeredness or West-centeredness by observing the power of English and increasingly Westernized non-Western societies as well as richness of America and the economic and political power of America in other countries. Also, while they often saw the economic wealth and political power of the U.S. in the world, they did not see connections between that power and economic/political atmospheres in other countries. Above all, they did not see global issues or global connectedness through their travels due to the lack of conceptual frameworks and critical analysis of situations they encountered.

The next chapter describes the ways global perspectives are implemented in the social studies methods class in terms of class objectives, pedagogical strategies, and class activities and assignments. It then shows the ways that student teachers represent global contents and global perspectives in their practicum classroom. Through this process, there are tensions and difficulties in incorporating global content in both preservice teacher education course and student teaching class as well as some exceptional experiences of teaching and learning global perspectives in both classes.
Chapter 5

Global Perspectives in the Social Studies Methods Class and Practicum Class

Student teachers’ images and knowledge of the globalized world was limited in terms of both its scope and depth as seen in the previous chapter. However, their experiential knowledge may be expanded and deepened by the social studies methods class and/or by their teaching practices in practicum sites. Or it might remain unaltered or even reinforced. This chapter addresses this issue by answering the second and last research questions discussed in chapter 3. The focus of this chapter is on revealing what kind of global perspectives student teachers experienced within social studies classes and how they represented these perspectives in their student teaching classes. By doing so, I show how both the tension and the potential are woven together within the social studies class atmosphere to help teach about global perspectives and the school environment.

The social studies methods classes and the student teacher practicum experience showed a great deal of tension as well as limited potential to incorporate global perspectives. In order to describe both the potential and limitation, this chapter consists of three components: (1) general components of the social studies methods class, (2) global perspectives in the methods class, and (3) the ways of including global perspectives within student teacher practicum classes. First, this chapter begins with a field note showing routine class activities and discussions and then introduces main components, such as the social inquiry projects and weekly reading reflections. The next sections describe in what ways the perspectives were taught in the social studies methods class and what kind of global perspectives student teachers learned through examining their reading reflections, social inquiry project assignments, and their interviews. While including the difficulties and obstacles stated by participants of the class, I address how global
perspectives were taught in limited ways in the class. Switching from the social studies class to the student practicum site, the last section deals with representative ways that student teachers taught global content in the classroom. Depending on their definitions of school and identities as preservice teachers, the ways that teacher candidates teach global topics/issues were quite different.

Class Overview of the Social Studies Class

Before focusing on some of the more specific global topics of the social studies methods class, this section first provides an overall description of the course by briefly describing a typical day in instructor Hillarie Young’s (this is a pseudonym) class, as it shows the overall philosophical and pedagogical frameworks of this course. Although each week included some important concepts, the first two classes highlighted the overall framework of the course, such as the concept of community, the democratic classroom, and an inquiry-based approach to social studies. Secondly, when I interviewed the instructor of this class, she consistently emphasized that this course does not include global perspectives in any explicit way, but that these perspectives are spread out over time. Therefore, if a typical class is chosen and described, we will see how global perspectives are addressed. For this reason, the second class, which took place on September 3rd, is described below.

At 12 PM, as soon as I entered the classroom, I saw desks and chairs arranged in a big circle and students sitting on the chairs. A teacher’s desk and computer was in the left front corner of the classroom, and, at the desk, the instructor Hillarie² was preparing the class while playing a song. The next thing that caught my attention was the class agenda on the whiteboard along with that week’s topics:

² In this course, student-teachers called their instructors by their first names, whether or not they are professors or adjunct professors. Following their habit, this paper also refers to the instructors by her first name.
Session 2: Tuning into “What is Community”
12:30-12:35 Welcome
12:35-1:00 [3-2-1-Consensus]
  What is Community?
1:00-1:15 My Place PowerPoint book
1:15-2:00 Asset Groups
2:00-2:20 Literature Circle
  Reflections/Responses (Moodle)
  Inquiry1 Detail
[On the bottom]
Concepts vs. Content
Community is a concept
What is community?

Although it had already passed noon, there were no students yet in the classroom. Hillarie explained that, due to a school community meeting for their first social inquiry project (she called it a “pizza thing”), that day’s class would start at 12:30 PM. In the meeting, in order to kick off their first inquiry project called Community Inquiry, her students would be introduced to other student teachers who are taking other sections of the social studies methods course and teaching at the same school. At 12:15 PM, students started to come into the classroom. While the students were waiting for the rest of their classmates, Hillarie was playing a world music CD she had borrowed from the library.

At 12:30 PM, after all of the students entered the classroom, Hillarie started her class by mentioning the class agenda and thanking students for posting their reflections on the weekly readings and responses to other classmates’ reflections on the class webpage. A couple of days before coming in to class each week, students were supposed to read their weekly readings, which included two or three chapters and/or a couple of articles, and post their reflections/responses on the class webpage. Their reflections were then shared in a smaller, on-line/off-line discussion group called the “literature circle.” Each literature circle usually had 4 members whose weekly roles alternated between that of discussion director, literary luminary,
connector, and illustrator. The role of the discussion director is to “develop 1-2 questions per reading that pertain to the conceptual frameworks,” the literary luminary is to “to choose at least 1-2 passages per reading that pertain to some/all of the conceptual frameworks,” the connector is to “to find 1 connection between each reading and the world outside and investigate and critique those findings” connecting the reading to their placement, personal experiences, or teaching resources, and the illustrator is to “to draw some kind of picture or create some kind of graphic organizer (flow chart, cause/effect, web) related to the reading (1 per reading)” (Reading reflection guide, p. 5). Hillarie sometimes had actual literature circle time in her class, which gave students the opportunity to share their ideas with their small group and the whole group. One example of a reflection that was posted by one of my interviewees during the second week of the 2009 fall semester is the following:

This article touches on the importance of social studies for students in today’s society. Social studies can often be taught by memorizing various dates and important geographical regions, however these facts do not make a strong impact in students. Social studies should be a way for students to become valuable and active citizens in society. In order for this to occur, social education programs should include “current and future issues and trends within the global society.” I think that this is especially important for today’s globalizing society. Students should not only learn about American history, but should also be exposed to the differing perspectives throughout the world. Through this, students should be motivated to become a member of society that has a broad and accurate understanding about the world around them (Eunice, reading reflection posted on Monday, August 31, 2009).

This reflection was a response to a weekly reading called, “Integrating Socially: Planning Integrated Units of Work for Social Education” (Hamston & Murdoch, 1996), which addresses the nature of social education in terms of learning for active participation, choosing content for social education, key perspectives, and an integrated way to approach social education. In particular, this chapter included big ideas about the world such as “globalism, citizenship, diversity, heritage, and decision making” (p. 2), as well as the inquiry approach as an
integrated curriculum planning strategy that can “loosen the pressure created by rigid timetables and a stop start curriculum” (p. 8). This chapter is one of the most important readings that influenced the philosophical and pedagogical frameworks of this course, in a sense that it shares both the same objectives of “developing inclusive world views and a greater capacity to live with difference, and challenging interpretations of the world that may be narrow in focus, inaccurate or even discriminatory” (p. 2), but also the same structure of curriculum planning with this social studies methods class such as “tuning in,” “preparing to find out,” “finding out,” “sorting out,” “going further,” “making connections,” and “taking action” (see Table 4, the weekly schedule). Likewise, every week, weekly readings introduced student teachers to big ideas and pedagogies that they could incorporate into their student teaching class. Unfortunately, the students’ reflections (including this reflection) were not shared in the class on that day because the asset group discussion and the inquiry 1 project explanation took more time than in the original agenda.

At 12:35 PM, Hillarie introduced the concept of community, which is a really big idea, and asked students to think about what community is, not what communities are. For the 3-2-1 consensus agenda, she divided the students into small groups of three so that each student could discuss “What is community?” with the other two people in the group. While some groups immediately started talking, other groups wrote down their thoughts instead. Hillarie then said, “Remember, everyone needs to jot down what you agree with” and moved from one group to another in order to participate in the discussions. After about 5 minutes, she combined these smaller groups into two big groups and continued to let them come up with their definitions. I heard the first group near me talking about how to unify different groups of people. After another
5 minutes, the two big groups became one big group, and Hillarie then guided the entire class discussion in order to come up with a consensus.

     Hillarie: What is community?

     Student: Compromising.

     Hillarie: How much compromise?

     Student: Don’t have to think about something really talking about but something about giving a ticket to more people to get involved.

     Hillarie: What else? Can you have something different all the times? A lot of times or some of times? What kind of teacher do you want to be?

     Beginning with one student’s answer, Hillarie shared her thoughts about the democratic classroom. She thought that a consensus makes classrooms democratic, since a discussion allows students to first formulate their opinions, and then allows everyone to express their opinions and achieve a good general consensus. Discussion helps students to take ownership of their own ideas. In other words, it helps kids to think about their own opinions, and it results in them becoming more engaged and more interested in the class. She thought ownership gives people power. Ideally in democracy, people share power and take some balance for some forms of equity, yet, in reality, some power goes to one group. So she encourages students to try to find their voice and to help themselves, and she emphasizes that achieving a consensus is democratic.

     The first group that I listened to shared their consensus about community with the entire class. They started to talk about the organization of the U.S. for a common goal/environment, resources in the United States, and shared a common definition of community that was related to unifying the diversity of people and interdependently working for the common goal. However, Hillarie did not agree with them, because there are always different values. Therefore, she defined community interaction between different customs and institutional systems as being
among a diversity of people working interdependently instead of all having the same values and customs. Finally, she wrote down this consensus on the board: The interaction between different institutions, systems, values, communication, and/or customs that unite a diverse group of people working interdependently towards a common goal. She did not forget to mention that younger students in a student teacher’s classroom do not understand what consensus is and that sharing opinions and learning how to disagree respectfully is really difficult. For her, a peaceful classroom means that no one person has power. Just as there are diverse groups of people in every school community, she said this discussion group is also diverse and the students identify with this group, which is directly related to their community inquiry project.

At 1:10 PM, the class switched gear to a children’s book called, “My place,” written by Wheatley and Rawlins (1994). In going over each page of the book using PowerPoint slides, Hillarie showed how a certain community located at a bay in Australia has changed over time. The book started in 1988 and went back 200 years to 1788, with different immigrant or indigenous children narrating their family stories and explaining their community maps, which they drew. While she highlighted different perspectives in each student’s community, Hillarie asked a lot of questions and encouraged students to think about “How we are going to find the diversity of people in your community, if you say it’s my community?” She then gave her student teachers an example of different ethnic groups, saying that as Mexican families have migrated to a U.S. community currently, Germany, Polish, or Irish people had immigrated to the U.S. 100 years earlier.

Beyond different ethnic groups, she kept asking if they have a different S.E.S, a different monthly income group, different people living in nicer or more expensive places, people who live in mobile homes, or younger and older aged groups. Those different groups are connected to
different research questions she asked, such as “How can you find out where they are and how do they access the resources, librarian, papers, churches, synagogues, and mosque?” Since this class took place at the beginning of the fall semester, she seemed not to expect answers about those questions from her student teachers. They would conduct research on their school community and would report their answers to the whole group. In preparing the first project, Community Inquiry, a lot of questions and opinions regarding community assets such as monetary assets, physical spaces, literacy environments, and institutions, were discussed for about fifty minutes. At 2:20 PM, when Hillarie finished describing how the goal of the first inquiry was to find out more about the connections with the students that preservice teachers were teaching, Hillarie met each group in order to let them ask her questions individually, until everybody left the classroom.

Main Components of the Social Studies Class

In addition to the above “literature circle,” every week’s schedule consisted of social inquiry and weekly topics, as seen in Table 4 (below underlined), which were derived from the syllabus of social studies methods class.
# Table 4

## Weekly Schedule of Social Studies Methods Course, Fall 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Aug 27/28 | **Tuning In**  
*Course Framework*  
Why do we need to save social studies?  
What is a democratic classroom?  
What is social justice?  
Why are controversial issues an important part of social studies? |
| 2. Sept ¾ | Developing community interviews to capture assets and voices.  
Reporting out. |
| 3. Sept 10/11 | **Preparing to Find Out**  
What does it mean to be an American?  
What should be learned in social studies classes? (National standards/state goals.)  
What are enduring understandings and essential questions?  
What is assessment?  
What does the current political context mean for social studies?  
What is inquiry and why is it important?  
Why are critical thinkers important to “active citizenship in a democracy”?  
What is a “concept”? |
| 4. Sept 17/18 |  
Whose story is history?  
How can we use geography to find out about and understand our community inquiry?  
What to look for; how to do research.  
Choosing a border to cross.  
Whiteness studies/white privilege. |
| 5. Sept 24/25 |  
Exploring historical perspectives through inquiry.  
Columbus and global perspectives.  
A grand conversation for crossing borders.  
Presentations of community study.  
Begin to work on listening to children. |
| 6. Oct ½ |  
How do changes in how people perceive their “boundaries” affect their thinking about people “other” than themselves?  
Learning through activism.  
Current events.  
What are “informed decisions”? How are they formed?  
How do changes in the economy affect people’s perceptions of human “borders”?  
Using role play.  
English Language Learners. |
| 7. Oct 8/9 |  
Discussion on the Inquiry 3 process  
Geography.  
Nov 5/6 |  
What does “country”? “nation” mean in this globalized era?  
Economics and political science.  
Can there be economic justice?  
Using simulations.  
Addressing historical perspectives, using fiction/nonfiction  
Nov 12/13 |  
Addressing developmental issues in historical understanding.  
Creating lessons from trade books.  
GLBT issues.  
Nov 19/20 |  
Video: It’s still elementary.  
Family stories/oral history.  
Nov 26/27 |  
Thanksgiving Break  
In what ways did the changing nature of “distances” affect US history in the late 19th and early 20th century? How is globalization a new form of “boundlessness”? For whom?  
Reader’s Theater.  
Using primary sources:  
Teaching with documents.  
Building learning centers.  
Dec ¾ |  
Talking together/sharing Inquiry #4: what have you learned about planning social studies lessons? What do you need in order to further your learning?  
Thinking ahead: continuing our work together on-line. |
Social inquiry is one of the most important components of this class, which engaged student teachers in inquiries in which they observed, talked with people, and sometimes examined artifacts in order to understand the human conditions surrounding the teachers themselves, their students, their schools, and their communities (the social studies methods class syllabus). It was developed by several cooperating teacher educators as a major course assignment during the 1993-1994 academic year. Since 1993, social inquiry projects have helped students make observations and interview people in diverse community settings, encouraged them to cross borders—taking familiar settings with them such as family, neighbors, and the community in which they grew up—and, above all, enabled preservice teachers to see social studies education as an active process of investigation into the social world (Buendia, Meacham, & Noffke, 2000). The reason that social inquiry worked as a central role in the class was because the instructors believed that inquiry not only provided students with the pedagogical knowledge about how to teach social studies, but also promoted student independence, creativity, and problem-solving skills (the social studies methods class syllabus).

In particular, social inquiry projects were designed for student teachers to explore areas important to their practice as social educators. For instance, in the fall semester, this class planned to carry out four inquiry projects: 1) Community Inquiry, 2) Crossing Borders, 3) Listening to Children, and 4) Lesson Planning Project.

The first social inquiry, “Community Inquiry,” aimed to investigate the variety of neighborhoods and important resources surrounding schools where preservice students teach. The “resources and neighborhoods” included the physical spaces of the community (i.e., parks, streams, and building patterns), the literacy environment of the school community (i.e., the room arrangement and the patterns of classroom discourse), the people (e.g., cooperating teachers,
principals, parent/community groups, etc.) and their knowledge, skills, resources, values, and commitments, and, lastly, organizations and institutions, which control and/or interact with the community. Each school group across the cohorts presented their first inquiry project in terms of which assets their school had (or lacked) in the 8th week of class.

The second inquiry, “Crossing Borders,” was designed to explore cultural borders between groups that were familiar to the students and other, non-familiar groups. Students were expected to participate in an unfamiliar event, organization, or activity and share their experiences in crossing borders caused by differences in race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, age and ability. Some students went to an Indian comedy show, a shelter for the poor, a high school football game, or a local café located in an unfamiliar small town while others visited religious institutions such as a church or a mosque that were welcoming to strangers and where they could meet people of a different religion, race, and/or ethnicity. Almost all of the students experienced some form of cultural alienation and gained an understanding of how their students might feel when their identity is neglected.

The third inquiry, “Listening to Children,” was designed for students to gain a thorough picture of a child’s level of understanding about a common concept through interviewing them. To do so, students were asked to choose a common concept drawing from their community inquiry in consultation with their cooperative teacher, in order to share their own understanding of the concept in a small group, prepare interview questions based on their understanding, and conduct interviews with either one child or a group of children. Students that I interviewed chose social responsibility, celebrating Thanksgiving, bullying, cultural stereotypes, family, or community as their interview concepts. Through this inquiry project, these students discovered any misconception(s) they held toward the children and learned that they should be more
conscious of their own students’ backgrounds. Lina, who asked her students about their understanding of community, also learned a valuable pedagogical implication.

To continue the questions I branched off of what they replied to ask about what communities they belong to (USA, America, South Carolina, Russia, Mexico, Springfield, Oakhills (pseudonym), and Mississippi were among the answers)……. When I asked how many communities they felt they belonged to, they all told me 3 and I expected them to say Oakhills, home, and USA. The black boy told me he identified with Springfield because he was born there, Oakhills because he lives there, and Sunnyvale because family lives there. The Mexican student, J, told me he identified with Oakhills, Mexico and Texas because he is from Mexico and travels to Texas to see family. The girl, M, told me she identified with many but her main ones were USA, Canada, because she was born there, and the Youth Center because she helps clean up there. Overall, the information I got from this inquiry was really surprising to me because I felt like I knew what the students were going to say already and I got many surprising answers. …… I had no idea that they would all identify with so many other states, cities and countries. I think this information really impacts my future planning because I feel like I need to take more time to find out more about my students’ backgrounds. I sort of grouped them all together and used my assumptions and my perception of Oakhills to figure out what they would say or know and I was wrong in a number of instances. This makes me feel like I need to try to incorporate their backgrounds into my lessons to make them all feel like a part of the class (Lina, Inquiry 3 reflection, pp. 2-3).

Lastly, the final project, called the “Lesson Planning Project,” was another important part of this class. Since the course was a methods class, all class activities, including each social inquiry activity, should be understood as a practice of unit planning. Although literature circle activities and diverse weekly topics provided students with an introduction to the various content areas in social studies education, the way these activities and topics were dealt with in class always revealed important teaching strategies for preservice teachers. In particular, social inquiry projects offered students pedagogical knowledge and skills. However, while the first three social inquiry projects focused more on the social/political/cultural contexts of school settings, the last lesson planning project concentrated much more on practical methods of teaching social studies in depth. The purpose of this unit planning was to create a set of lesson plans for each small group and to reflect what they learned during the process. Each student teacher was expected to
choose a unit topic, and collect/use background information on the topic from school documents, students, the community, teachers, and/or other non-academic sources, such as academic readings and general resources (e.g., children’s literature, non-fiction resources for students and teachers, web resources, etc.).

For instance, Eunice made a six-day-long lesson plan focusing on the cultural diversity shown in different national versions of Cinderella stories. Through this final project, she not only combined all her research on school community and cultural borders with her children’s backgrounds, but she also concretized all of her investigations and findings throughout the semester in the form of a set of lesson plans.

After taking this course, and throughout my investigations for the other inquiry projects, I developed a strong interest for the importance of valuing cultures and traditions. In order to introduce different cultures, the students will focus on the Cinderella folktale from other countries and go into depth about what makes each culture unique and special. The students will compare and contrast different pieces of folktale literature. By comparing literature with the familiar Cinderella story, students will be able to find commonality between different countries and find a way to connect to an unfamiliar place. Due to the diverse makeup of my classroom, it is valuable to teach the students to learn different cultures. Throughout the unit, some of the countries that are studied will be based upon the cultural background of the students in the classroom. By doing this, each student will be able to make a deeper personal connection to the stories and teach their fellow classmates about their country. Students will also be able to learn about other countries and traditions they are not familiar with by doing an in depth project about a specific country. Through this unit, students will be able to learn from each other, and learn to value different perspectives and cultures (Eunice, Inquiry 4 project assignment, p. 2).

In this lesson, she learned “the importance of developing a lesson that goes beyond just simply teaching a concept” and “went beyond teaching about culture and diversity by implementing ways to get students to think beyond the walls of the classroom” (Inquiry 4 project assignment, p. 14). However, similar to some of the other students, she could not teach this new unit plan because she had to teach a set curriculum.
Finally, the course had another important element: Weekly topics and readings. As shown in Table 4, the Weekly Schedule of the class, after examining overall conceptual frameworks and going over essential concepts for the social inquiry projects during the first four weeks, the class discussed different topics each week, such as history, geography, white privilege, Columbus and global perspectives, informed decisions, English Language Learners, economics and political science, fiction/nonfiction, GLBT issues and family/oral history, primary sources, and American identity. Depending on how this class chooses to deal with these topics, almost all of these topics could be essential means in which to cover global perspectives or knowledge-based global education (i.e., European imperialism, decolonizing colonized minds, etc.) as well as both skill-based (i.e., multiple perspectives) and action-based concepts (i.e., redirection of global inequity). Hillarie kept mentioning that certain topics are more related to global issues or perspectives, as seen in the following quote:

Like pull out the idea of debate to pick the topic of H1N1, World War II, geography, or we did whatever that economic situation simulation were. … Some are obvious like family, economic, or when we’re talking about social justice, we even necessarily talk about social justice and other places. Again, I do think there is something to that piece of START (Hillarie, second interview, p. 20).

Hillarie had some reasons for why she believed that certain weekly topics are relevant for teaching global issues, which will be discussed in the following section. These different opinions on ways to deal with global issues/topics in general, versus how they are related to more specific topics, resulted in tension in how to incorporate global perspectives.

The weekly topics were studied by student teachers in advance through weekly readings and by posting their reflections on the class website. Along with main textbooks such as Doing History: Investigating with Children in Elementary and Middle Schools, A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America, and Black Ants and Buddhists, diverse weekly reading
materials posted on the class website provided student teachers with diverse social studies concepts and a pedagogy for the semester. Reading the weekly reflections and responses that student teachers posted was one of main sources that allowed them to investigate how they learned and interpreted global perspectives in their own ways.

**Global Perspectives in the Social Studies Methods Class**

This section addresses the kinds of global perspectives that were taught and how these global perspectives were brought up in the social studies methods class. From interviews with instructor and students, it turned out that global topics or issues were not the main focus of the social studies methods class. According to Esther, global topics/issues were “sort of main idea but not main focus” (Esther, second interview, p. 20). In many cases, global topics/issues existed (1) in certain relations to conceptual frameworks/objectives of the social studies class, (2) in certain ways of teaching strategies, and/or (3) in certain experiences in weekly readings and discussions, as well as in the social inquiry projects. Therefore, this section looks at the ways that global topics/issues are located in conceptual frameworks, teaching strategies, weekly readings/discussions, and social inquiry projects.

**Course frameworks.** The social studies methods class has four main conceptual frameworks: content, inquiry, social justice, and pedagogy (the social studies methods course Syllabus). However, the frameworks that instructor and student interviewees recognized were not necessarily the same with official frameworks. In fact, there were many different frameworks with connected global perspectives.

Global topics/issues exist with a close relationship to multiple perspectives. Yet, they are not the main focus or the main framework since even the term “global” is not explicitly used in
this class. Nonetheless, students and instructor argue that global education exists in the social studies methods class.

I think it is sort of main idea, but it is not main focus. I don’t know it makes sense. We don’t spend a long time of only thinking about global issues, but in the back of my mind, it’s for everything else. For everything we talked about, it is sort of there. And we are all aware of it there and we bring it in every main topic, but it’s not only main topic. There is like a hierarchy of people under the director at the top (Esther, second interview, p. 20).

According to Esther, global issues are not the main focus, yet they are a main idea that plays behind the main topics. As seen in Table 4, explicit global topics as weekly subjects were only limited to three: 1) Columbus and Global Perspectives, 2) What does “country”/”nation” mean in this globalized era?, and 3) How is globalization a new form of “boundlessness”? However, inferring from the fact that Esther mentioned that global issue(s) are not main focus but main idea, global education exists not in the form of topics or issues, but in perspectives, which exists everywhere to help students see weekly topics/issues broadly. A similar idea is seen in Hillarie’s definition of global education:

I think it’s what our class is all about multiple perspectives, but not naming it global. I think we just need to go that a little extra and be more explicit to ourselves and to the students. So for me, global perspective is taking a topic like war or revolution or something and understanding that not just from American white viewpoint (Hillarie, second interview, pp. 13-14).

Hillarie defined global education as teaching weekly topics beyond the white, American perspective. Based on her definition of global education, the social studies class already taught global perspectives although she did not explicitly name multiple perspectives global perspectives. Eunice recalled perspectives of different ethnic groups as global issues/topics:

I think a lot of it (pause) more than like global, like how, what we learned is actually different from what we have like perspectives. Even when we learned about Christopher Columbus, we always focused on American perspectives like what happened in that context. If we really think of different perspectives, whole story is changed. If we get like Native American perspectives, what we learned in school is not necessarily true. … And in Takaki’s book, how America became America today. Through the sweat and tear from
all these immigrant groups, that is how we became an America and how all these immigrant came, they did so much for us, but in return we didn’t do. I think learning about different perspectives. That is really eye-opening experience (Eunice, first interview, p. 6).

As seen in Eunice’s answer, many students recognized different perspectives of diverse ethnic groups as the global perspectives. For this reason, they were not necessarily interested in other people and other societies outside the U.S. Once they became free from the restriction of their own narrow perspectives, based on their race or their ethnic group, their different viewpoints were considered global perspectives. For example, Sam pointed out that broadening the racial lens through which he saw the world was the most important objective of the social studies methods class:

The main thing that I learned was not to focus on the African American culture. Like when I went into it, I really, really focused on… because that was such avoid in my mind in terms of my own history, I really focused on trying to learn more about how to educate black students about their history. I don’t know, it really changed my mind set in terms of just… there are a lot of stories that they need to be told and I learned about, I guess, what diversity really is. I don’t know I really enjoyed the class. It told me to look at things from… through another lens. You know, take that outside view on an issue or an event. It really helped me to do broaden my perspectives in a way from focusing so much on black and white. I saw the world in black and white for the most part all my life. That really motivated me to get away from that mentality (Sam, first interview, p. 10).

Sam used to only be interested in Black History and ways in which to teach black students their history. However, as Eunice realized that all immigrant groups built America, Sam also recognized the diverse stories of other ethnic groups beyond black and white people within the U.S. The reason that students’ imaginations on global perspectives were limited to diverse ethnic groups within the U.S. might be because this course had another framework based on a pedagogical need: “Understanding your students.”

Along with multiple perspectives of different ethnic groups in the U.S., “understanding students’ background” was one of the most important objectives and the reason for teaching
multiple perspectives. According to Hillarie, learning diverse perspectives in social studies classes is critical because students are bringing their different perspectives to their classroom (Hillarie, p. 8). It seems so obvious, yet it is not obvious for her students because preservice teachers do not have a lot of experience with children. Therefore, she continuously highlighted the need for understanding students through multiple perspectives. In her opinion, the objective of understanding student backgrounds is basically an extension of global perspectives:

I think they would be ready to make a connection. Let’s say that they have student from Thailand in their class and there is another hurricane or tsunami or something like that. I think they are ready to think “Hmm (pause) this student might be affected by the event differently than my students that grew up in Chicago suburb whole life.” I think in that way, they are kind of ready for the perspective (Hillarie, second interview, p. 20).

Hillarie might assume that if her students knew about the existence of multiple perspectives and learned diverse perspectives coming from different cultures, races, religions, and genders, they would be ready to see immigrant or international children’s lives from a broader perspective than local or national boundaries. However, as she did not name certain multiple perspectives or global perspectives but called it something different from the white, American perspective (Hillarie, pp. 13-14), students also hardly imagined stepping out of their local and national perspectives. Therefore, for students, global perspectives are understood in the name of “diverse cultures” or “multicultural perspectives” without any specific values of globalization or global connectedness as the following example shows:

I don’t know her actual objective, but thinking back on that course, (pause) I think diversity. Even if you aren’t in a diverse place like within your school, you should still have a diverse curriculum, you should still teach about all of the cultures and have all incorporated to your curriculum (Crystal, second interview, pp. 14-15).

Compared to the students, instructor Hillarie had more substantive reasons for teaching global perspectives. She thought that a global perspective was important in order to be an active citizen. For Hillarie, a global perspective has a high value in helping students participate in
solving world problems as active citizens. In her opinion, in order to teach students for the next 20 years, learning about what is happening globally and how to think globally in terms of environment issues or economic issues would all become more and more important (Hillarie, second interview, p. 20).

In short, a global perspective is connected to the many objectives of a social studies class such as understanding multiple perspectives existing in American society, understanding the diverse backgrounds of preservice teachers and their students, and rearing an active citizen in an increasingly interconnected world. In other words, these objectives need global perspectives to be achieved. Although getting global perspectives is not an explicit objective of this class and there were many limitations to teach global perspectives within the course, global perspectives were taught in the social studies class. The following sections will address the ways in which a global perspective is taught by instructor Hillarie.

Ways to teach global perspectives. Global topics/issues were taught in the form of a global perspective as part of more diverse perspectives such as historical perspectives and multicultural perspectives, as seen in the above course framework section. However, they were found as examples that show a different or broader perspective than that of student teachers, or taught with a few topics among many weekly topics. There are two reasons that instructor used these limited ways when they taught global perspectives: Students’ narrow perspectives confined to the white, American viewpoint and the instructor’s lack of time due to many teaching topics packed into a social studies class.

As the instructor pointed out the limited life experience of their preservice teachers in chapter 4, Hillarie took her students’ narrow perspectives as an obstacle in incorporating global topics/issues in her social studies class:
American white viewpoint (pause), that’s what our students are typically starting from. So if they have talked about, let’s say, war or revolution from their own viewpoint, then they’re still talking about and they get into a discussion, and then if you switch on them, then it’s like they haven’t had an enough time in even understanding their own viewpoint, and so I feel like some topics that are not familiar with, it is harder to be global (Hillarie, second interview, p. 14).

Hillarie argued that her student teachers found it hard to realize that they were only seeing many topics/issues from their own perspective—a white, American viewpoint—especially if those topics/issues were unfamiliar to them. Therefore, she thought that it might be better to choose familiar topics/issues because they can discuss those topics from a global perspective only after they became familiar with those topics. For this reason, the topics/issues that she taught from a global perspective were limited. However, unless they are relevant in the student teacher’s lives, even for comparatively well-known topics/issues, might not be good global topics/issues for the class.

Like [we] pulled out the idea of debate to pick the topic of H1N1, World War II, geography, or we did whatever that economic situation were, you know, simulation. … Some are obvious like family, economic, or when we’re talking about social justice, we even necessarily talked about social justice and other places. Again, I do think there is something to that piece of START. I don’t know, maybe it should start globally with them, but it is kind of like they don’t connect to the places we are talking about. Therefore there isn’t really a way for them to make relevant to themselves. I think that’s sort of give-and-take. If you pick an issue that should be passionate about and something relevant to them, then they can go back up (pause). Like the student teachers that have with the migrant students, you know, they had different understanding of the issues that those families had, than someone who never worked with migrant students. They won’t have the same understanding. They just won’t (Hillarie, second interview, p. 21).

According to Hillarie, there were many topics or issues that she mentioned from a global perspective such as the H1N1 swine flu virus, World War II, geography, family, economic issues, and social justice. But the problem was that students did not seem to find a relevant connection to the countries in which these topics/issues were happening. For this reason, Hillarie taught the H1N1 flu/vaccine as an explicit global issue based on the concept of “informed decisions”
(10/23/09 field note, p. 4) and found it to be a really good lesson that her students understood other people and other countries struggling with the same issue, because they struggled with the swine flu themselves at that time (first interview, p. 14). In short, a global perspective was taught through specific topics/issues that were familiar and relevant to the student teachers in the social studies class. For instance, one of the most common issues that both instructor interviewee and student interviewees remembered as a global topic was that of immigrant family issues or gay/lesbian family issues. However, many student teachers did not think about the possibility that a global perspective could be taught in every teaching topic. Or maybe Hillarie and a few student teachers knew that every topic can be taught from global perspective but they thought it is impossible. This is because her class is already “packed” with a lot of topics (first interview, p. 13). So even if she wanted to teach global perspectives regarding all teaching topics which might be “intimidating” to student teachers, she would often bring some examples or topics related to certain existing topics (first interview, p. 13). Therefore, she decided to teach global standpoints with specific topics/contents.

The other reason for ignoring the teaching of global perspectives was the problem of a “set curriculum.” The social studies methods class was a preservice teacher education course, which had five sections taught by four instructors. These five sections were not completely separate, but deeply connected through common weekly topics, as shown in Table 4, and through the same assignments under the one syllabus. In order to provide students with similar teaching concepts and pedagogy, the four instructors had a meeting time each week during the semester in which they discussed what they were going to teach the following week. In this process, the instructors came to have a similarly structured curriculum. Hillarie mentioned that this structured curriculum was an obstacle to dealing with global topics explicitly:
We have set curriculum in some ways, and we have set readings in some ways. So I don’t feel that (pause) I know it’s flexible, but it’s flexible in the sense that if I want to do something different, I want everybody to see the value and let everybody do something different that leads me pitch one reading and add different one (Hillarie, second interview, p. 23).

While pointing out the benefits of the set curriculum, Hillarie problematized its disadvantages. In order to teach a global perspective, she needed to change the existing course structure. In order to change the set curriculum and set readings, she needed to show the substantive value of a global perspective to other instructors and needed extra energy and time to add specific readings and materials. For this reason, Hillarie simply added her own examples for certain weekly topics rather than significantly change to course structure.

However, Hillarie struggled with finding relevant examples for her students because some of the above foreign examples would be meaningless for them. For this reason, she focused on using examples that is related to students’ daily life directly (i.e. H1N1 influenza). Unfortunately, the students in her social studies methods class had not had enough experience to understand the diverse perspectives that their immigrant children bring to a practicum site. As seen in Hillarie’s case, bringing up issues around immigrant or international children in student teaching classrooms was the one of the most popular ways of incorporating a global perspective into their social studies class. For this reason, the way that students understand a global perspective was almost always connected to their own diverse children from different family cultures. Many students believed that global awareness is a way of knowing others with different perspectives and it is helpful to know where their kids are coming from.

However, although it is rare in most cases, some students problematized the limited way of teaching global topics/issues in a social studies class.

I feel like (pause) it’s good program, but it’s kind of narrow-minded in terms of the lens (pause). They’re trying but I don’t really feel like we are exposed to global topics that are
really meaningful that I can reflect on. It was very limited, very, very limited (pause) I get tired of learning about how we see ourselves, how we see other people. It wasn’t really (pause) it was no globe. Everything is really focused on Columbus, and slavery, and Native American, and immigration. Those are the primary topics, you know. And I guess it is hard enough to cover up all topics in itself. I do believe that the way that Miranda and the people that design social studies program, I do believe the way that they approached it, it kind of elected door open to really explore global topics if I have questions about what they proposed. But, all in all, we didn’t (pause) it was very one side. It just showed our view, how we view the immigration, how we view revolutionizing in this nation. I love to explore different countries, different dialects, different languages, and different foods, and how other people live as opposed to (pause) just more of what we know about other countries, which are very limited. But, it’s interesting because I don’t know where to start (Sam, first interview, p. 9).

Sam was the student in the previous section who addressed how the social studies methods class really broadened his narrow perspective of focusing on only white and black people within the U.S. In terms of global topics, he also believed that the course opened doors to exploring deeper questions about the weekly topics. However, in his opinion, the social studies class dealt with global topics in a limited way by focusing on how Americans saw themselves and other people. He might not know the restrictions placed on social studies methods classes and might not know that his instructor wanted students to understand multiple views behind the topics of Columbus, slavery, Native American, and immigration issues, yet his need to “explore different countries, different dialects, different languages, and different foods, and how other people live” was not satisfied through the social studies methods class.

In short, the ways of teaching global perspectives in the social studies class limited certain topics (i.e., various family backgrounds), which are both familiar and relevant topics in student teachers’ lives. Global perspectives were mostly addressed in the social studies methods class by adding some international examples without extra focus on global education due to the tightly packed course curriculum. These limited ways of teaching might make students feel
restricted in the classroom setting or keep them from further investigating more diverse global issues.

**Weekly/book-club readings and discussions.** While previous sections focused on the objectives of two instructors and their ways of teaching global perspectives, this section and the next section address what kinds of global perspectives student teachers did or did not experience through their readings, discussions, and social inquiry projects. First of all, with over 160 reflections on weekly readings by student interviewees, it was extremely difficult to determine their assumptions about the increasingly interconnected global world, or their students’ roles as citizens of the world. In general, student teachers reflected big concepts in their social studies education such as history, economics, social justice, race, inquiry, community, family, and so on. While only focusing on the student teaching setting without noticing the broader circumstances their students face, preservice teachers pointed out the importance of applying these concepts to their specific classroom:

After reading this article [Dysconscious Racism], one question I am contemplating is: Is there an appropriate way to challenge students’ dysconscious racism, and what is it? By appropriate I do not mean morally, I mean a way that can be understood. The classroom in which I am placed consists of children from white lower-middle class families--how can I challenge their ideas of diversity when they may not notice the small amount of diversity that exists in their town (from which many of them have not traveled away). The article talks about giving students opportunities to evaluate their world and the social ideas which are in their world, but how can this be done when there is very little opportunity to expose students to diversity except on field trips once or twice a year. (Crystal, reading reflection on-line post)

Crystal had difficulty in learning “how” she could challenge her students’ racism rather than seeing “what” racism her students had. However, in order to apply the concept of “dysconscious racism” into her classroom, knowing this big concept from both broad and diverse perspectives should be prioritized. After gaining a deeper understanding of the weekly topic, she might understand the meaning of “dysconscious racism” within her class, and figure out how to
challenge her students’ racism. Without this prerequisite step, many student teachers easily jump into asking about the practical ways to apply weekly readings to actually classroom settings.

In addition, student teachers usually shared that they were surprised by multiple perspectives behind historical events that they had never heard of before, and how different viewpoints helped them to step outside their ignorance or narrow-mindedness. As stated in previous course objective section, teaching multiple perspectives was the most important way to justify teaching a global perspective in a social studies methods class. However, since their reflections were so brief (one or two paragraphs), it was hard to find students who elaborated on the specific differences between their perspectives and any new perspectives. Rather, they quickly generalized that a different perspective introduced through a weekly reading was evidence for multiple voices, and discussed whether or not they can teach these perspectives in student settings. For example, Lina posted her response after reading an article called “Map as Stories”:

Before reading this article I had never considered how maps were used or ignored in a classroom. It’s been so long since I have learned about maps, and am so used to seeing them that I don’t realize how often they are bypassed. One thing I found really interesting in the article is how the majority of maps that we learn on and see are the ones that put Europe and the Americas front and center. I think it’s interesting that those two places are the focus of the maps and I honestly don’t think I’ve ever seen a map that has had Asia in the center, it’s always split. I think it’s important to have children study maps and recognize that the world isn’t flat with all the focus on the Americas and Europe. Maps and globes give students an opportunity to explore the world without going anywhere. All students should know how to read a map with a key, legend and compass rose as well as be able to recognize continents, countries and states. (Lina, reading reflection on-line post)

Similar to many other student teachers, the weekly reading helped Lina learn that maps could be distorted by the perspective of the map makers. Yet, it is not clear if she realized the unequal relationships between Western and non-Western societies or other distorted relationships represented on the maps. I had a feeling that she did not have that kind of elaborated perspective
and that she did not go further from maps themselves. After sharing what she has never known about maps, she focused on the general benefit of using the map to explore continents, countries, and states without sharing what kind of perspectives she is going to use when she teaches.

Jessica also understood maps in a new way, yet she did not give her own critical understanding about marginalized perspectives in her reflection. As seen in her question, “The article included some critical questions such as ‘whose interest does this map advance?’ and ‘who does it marginalize?’ I am wondering what age it is appropriate to ask such questions” (Jessica, reading reflection on-line post), student teacher reflections are almost always finished by pointing out pedagogical needs in terms of how to teach students the unknown “truth” in a less “shocking” way. For this reason, their interests quickly moved to age appropriateness, as Jessica mentioned, or to the possibility of teaching this shocking understanding in their own student teaching classes, as they consistently said “This won’t work” in their discussion groups (Crystal, first interview, p. 10).

Thirdly, student teachers’ perspectives on weekly readings were rarely expanded to broader viewpoints such as global perspectives. In many cases, they only focused on a local site at which a historical event occurred, or on their own students teaching sites. For this reason, they neither noticed global connections between different events in different societies, nor did they draw on bigger concepts connecting specific concepts or situations.

What I found most interesting about chapter three was the following question that was raised, “Why were so few Africans being imported into Virginia when the demand for labor was so great and constantly inclining?” (52). Takaki presented a reasonable explanation for this saying that the people coming to Virginia were people who were planning on starting a family and a life there. They did not want African people to be integrated into their society. Laborers and land owners would essentially be living and working in the same place. Therefore, it would be extremely likely that the families would become integrated into one society. The story that I remember learning (unless I just didn’t pay close enough attention in history class when I was younger) was that Africans were brought to work on the tobacco plantation with no rights as slaves. I never
knew that white, indentured servants were preferred over African slaves. That concept doesn’t make much sense unless you start to look at the real reasons behind it (as I previously stated). It took a rebellion on behalf of the armed, white, indentured servants in order for the land owners to comfortably except African slaves as field laborers in their community. Of course, the land owners were left with no other choice at this point. It sickens me to think that even the Africans weren’t good enough to be the white people’s slaves. That is sick to think about. (Jessica, Literature circle on-line post)

Jessica’s reflections on chapter 3 in Takaki’s (1993) A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America, started from the author’s question about why few Africans were imported to Virginia where there was a great demand for laborers. She shared what she has never known regarding the reason for that, and finished with her reflections on her annoyance at the fact that white people prepared white indentured servants over African slaves. She only saw this issue as being within Virginia and within the relationship between white and African slaves. There is no broader perspective that connects to other regions in which similar issues might happen, or other ethnic groups that might have struggled with a similar hardship. If she noticed connections between this historical issue and other ethnic groups introduced in other chapters in Takaki (1993), she might have understood this historical event in relation to broader concepts such as “segregation,” or she could have seen another common human condition that marginalized people faced. In addition, the lack of any deeper understanding of the chapter through a bigger perspective might have lead her to anger without a specific realization about her previous experiences or a specific connection to her teaching practice.

Lastly, most student teachers seldom saw global flows or unequal power relations behind the global flows. It seemed that some student teachers reflected on similar human conditions in terms of the struggles that some immigrant groups went through in their home country, and the ways that other ethnic groups such as Native Americans or African slaves were marginalized in the U.S. For example, Eunice saw a similarity in the colonization process in Ireland and in early
America (Eunice, Literature circle on-line post). However, it was extremely hard for student teachers to find international connections in terms of why some immigrant groups moved to the U.S. As seen in Eunice’s reflection below, the reason for migration was understood in a superficial way, such as escaping hardship in their home country or hoping for a better life in the U.S.

Takaki Ch 12
This chapter talks about how Mexicans started immigrating to the United States, and the struggles they faced as they tried to make a living in this new country. Many Mexicans started moving to the United States because other immigrants wrote to their friends and relatives about the great opportunity that had in America. Many Mexicans moved in hopes of a better life, and to escape the hardships that they faced in Mexico. Once they arrived, they were not greeted with great opportunities, but were forced to become tenant farmers and sharecroppers. They received nothing for their hard work. More people started moving from Mexico due to development of transportation. Between 1900 and 1930, the Mexican population increased from 375,000 to 1,160,000. It struck me how all these Mexicans immigrated, just to be faced with even more hardships and difficulty in a foreign land.

Americans took advantage of the hardworking Mexicans. Instead of being presented with opportunities, in 1918 70% were unskilled blue-collar workers and only 5% were in professional and managerial occupations. Similar to other immigrants, they were forced to work in harsh conditions while getting paid very little. They chosen over other racial groups for agricultural labor because of their patience, and because they were “fairly intelligent under competent supervision, obedient, and cheap”.

Reading about Mexican immigrants, I was amazed to see the overlapping struggles that they faced as other immigrants who moved to America. These immigrants move from their homeland in order to find a better life, but they struggle and face even more hardships. However, through their sacrifice and struggles, America is what it is today. It is sad to see that despite their contribution to our society, they were degraded and treated with such disrespect. I think that it is valuable learning about immigration history, so that we develop an understanding of respect for other cultures, and learn to appreciate their contribution to America. (Eunice, Literature circle on-line post)

Of course, escaping hardship in their homeland or hoping for a better life in the U.S. were historically true reasons for why certain groups immigrated to America. Yet if this movement is understood as global flow from a broader perspective, the above reason might be based on a one-sided perspective, since there was also a great need for agricultural labor within the U.S. at that
time. In many cases, the need for immigrant groups was not highlighted in student reflections when focusing on foreign people’s hardship in the U.S. As a result, the phenomenon of global flow was underestimated and each country was understood separately without any connection. This lack of understanding about global connections might eventually make student teachers focus on U.S. society as a separate society, rather than seeing it as part of the world. In addition, this narrow perspective might prevent student teachers from seeing unequal power relations between two countries, which is an important critical thinking skill.

Student and instructor interviewees pointed out various reasons for why they did not understand the weekly readings more deeply or broadly. While instructors recognized that their limited understanding is caused by their students’ disinterest in history, and by the many topics covered within social studies methods classes, students thought it resulted from their busy schedules as well as the age inappropriateness and controversial characteristics of weekly topics. Hillarie attributed this lack of broad and deep understanding of the weekly readings to both student teacher indifference toward historical events and the over-crowded topics in the social studies methods class.

I think they were surprised by Takaki because it is like taking some of different histories than they learned but maybe not in depth, certainly not from a different perspective, which Takaki brings in. I think they were surprised. I think our course is great because it offers them so much, but it is so difficult because we have to move on. … I spent a good amount time in discussion when they want to and I ditch another activity, but I still feel like always pushing them onto the next thing. I think we can speed down a little bit and really digest Takaki. We do a role play. It is sort of getting a start on them. So it’s not enough. It’s so wonderful but so insufficient with what do we do with perspectives now, what do we do with our emotion tied to this perspectives? I think that is something I didn’t explore enough. … They didn’t really tie Takaki as much. Native American study, they tied it a little. They don’t think historical thing, but more current culture, not really what influences culture (Hillarie, first interview, p. 10).

Takaki (1993) is one of the main textbooks in the social studies class that shows various global perspectives by addressing multiple perspectives from diverse ethnic groups immigrating
to the United States. In spite of being full of different perspectives, Hillarie thought her student teachers did not understand those different perspectives in depth because they were not given enough time to digest the book.

Preservice teachers are also not very intrigued by history. In fact, the majority of the student teachers that I interviewed liked and remembered another textbook, *Black Ants and Buddhists*, written by Cowhey (2006), much more than Takaki’s (1993) *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* and Levstik and Barton’s (2005) *Doing History: Investigating With Children in Elementary and Middle Schools*. The reason was simple: They loved reading stories about different situations that teachers go through and also looking at scenarios that can really happen in a classroom (Nicole, first interview, p. 11; Eunice, p. 7; Esther, p. 14; Lucy, p. 13). For example, for Esther, *A Different Mirror* was hard to read although it was meaningful, because of her busy life during her student teaching.

I actually really like the Black Ants mainly because it was easiest to get through. It was like really hard for me to sit down and read when I have hundred thousand other things that I saw doing. I think contents-wide like what was in the book, I really liked the mirror, what I forgot what it is called…Different Mirror, I really liked that one. I thought it was fascinating. But it is drying hard to get through, I think, if you would’ve got more from it, if it would’ve said it more like fun way, I don’t know (Esther, first interview, p. 14).

Student teachers should go through a lot of schedules. Thus, a deeper understanding of their weekly readings, in particular if they are about historical events which do not seem to be directly connected to their student teaching class, might be harder for them even though they can gain much deeper and broader perspectives from it. Lucy found that the reason she was not able to read the weekly readings in depth was due to age inappropriateness:

I remember those [*Black Ants and Buddhists*] more, but even those were really hard for me because a lot of times. There were in very, very young classrooms, so first, kindergarten classroom. So especially that semester, I was in fifth grade, so it was hard for me to connect. I can see having conversation like that with my second graders, but not with my fifth graders because they know how to do schools, like they know school was
about grades and about what we have to do and what’s the minimum that I can do. They already know that in fifth grade, so do sit down and have a big conversation like that doesn’t tend to work very well with fifth graders (Lucy, first interview, p. 13).

Her opinion was actually inconsistent with other students’ assertions that older graders would understand a bigger concept. However, whether or not “big conversation” is appropriate to older (or to younger) students, many student teachers were very conscious about age-appropriateness in teaching their students what they learned from their weekly readings. In other words, it seemed to be more important to teach an unknown “truth” in a less “shocking” way than understanding and teaching the “truth” from weekly readings in a deeper and broader way. Crystal also raised problems of disconnection between what students read and what they teach in current and future classrooms. While Lucy problematized the age inappropriateness of the weekly readings, Crystal pointed out that the readings were too political to be implemented in the classroom, especially due to a disagreement between teacher and parents.

Definitely these students perceive things differently than I read in the readings, which was interesting. But there was one student, in particular, in my discussion group who was consistently saying “This won’t work.” “This won’t work.” “This won’t work.” I mean not aloud, just to our small group. But it was very against what they were saying in Black Ants. There will be parent issues with this as too strong, as too political. It was interesting to...I wasn’t defensive of the book, but did find value on it, so it was interesting to have someone say “No!” and just say back “Think about it this way,” and to have someone did consider other points of view. ... I think those discussions we really had to have, kind of debate about the book, was probably the most valuable of the discussions. I think we took into consideration of other’s opinions and I DID understand a lot of stuff that I work. I also tried to point out “Well, this teacher is experienced teacher. This isn’t something that happens right away.” So I think that is something that is hard to consider when you are in their classroom settings preparing to student-teach and preparing to become a teacher to think “I am learning now, but I won’t be able to use for few years” (Crystal, first interview, p. 10).

Crystal heard different opinions about weekly readings in discussion. Even though she found some value in the readings, she also discovered many limitations. As a result, she drew a line between what she could teach her students and what she learned from her weekly readings.
This conceptual line seems to be fixed and she strongly believed that she could not incorporate too many of the political issues she learned in the readings. This fixed attitude that many of the student teachers had might prevent them from understanding the weekly readings in broader and deeper ways and, accordingly, global perspectives might be hard to learn in this social studies class.

In addition, some student interviewees believed that the student teachers’ negative attitude toward big concepts kept them from understanding a global perspective. Although instructors tried to challenge their narrow-mindedness through broader and deeper perspectives, most student teacher perspectives did not seem to change. According to Sam, it was because “they [classmates] did not really value a lot of what she [his instructor] tried to really cross to us and bring it [weekly reading] back to a broader focus” (Sam, first interview, p. 17). Lucy was disappointed with her white classmates’ disinterest in “White Privilege,” which she believed to be one of the more essential concepts that her instructor tried to teach.

Honestly, I think that is the challenges that she has in teaching this social studies classes. She is trying to teach all these amazing concepts and it’s almost like people don’t believe her because she’s been so much time about White Privilege. The reaction that I notice from people was like “Okay. We already learned about that. I know it exists. Okay, let’s move on” instead of really trying to experience and realize how that affects society (Lucy, second interview, p. 25).

White Privilege, if it is covered with broader and deeper points of view, would be one of the most relevant topics that can deal with global perspectives in social studies classes since the concept could be taught across society and time. Yet, preservice teachers’ refusal to gain a broader understanding about this kind of relevant topic was one reason that the social studies class did not teach global perspectives in an explicit way. In short, along with the over-crowded social studies curriculum, the student teachers’ indifference toward historical events, their assumption that they will not teach what they learned from weekly readings, and their refusal of
a broader understanding about relevant global topics all confined their perspectives within the U.S.

However, some student teacher reflections revealed certain kinds of global perspectives. First of all, in the social studies class, a global perspective was experienced by the shaking of their “clear” foundations of history and by making historical events ambiguous. As a result, students got out of the myth of objective history and learned subjectivity of official knowledge. For example, some students started to understand textbook knowledge from a critical perspective by seeing the distorted or one-sided perspectives behind the official knowledge. Nicole was one of the students who began to have many questions and doubts about history textbooks after reading and discussion.

Doing History Ch. 1 & 2 illustration

After reading these chapters, I was left with many questions and doubts. Reading through text and also discussing in class about how much of the truth behind different historical events are taught in schools are making me wonder if I along with many generations will ever get to know the real issues behind historical events and the truth that only minorities will ever know because of the power of dominant race/ethnicity. With these thoughts in mind, I put the picture of questions marks as my base background and compiled 5 different pictures; a picture of a globe, world history textbook, Native American, corpses from concentration camp, and an innocent child. I wonder if innocent children will ever get to know what Native Americans went through in the past or what kind of disgusting things happened in Asian concentration camps. The textbook that is used to teach children about the world is biased and one-sided and this fact frightens me.
Nicole might not have questioned her world history textbook as the “truth” before being exposed to the weekly readings and class discussion. However, her weekly readings and participating in the class discussion of “Doing History Chapter 1 and 2” raised many question marks in her head about the official history that she had learned before. Shaken by the existence of a different truth that she might never have known about and only minorities will ever know, Nicole might become free from a fixed attitude, an attitude of ‘I know it’ or ‘I got it,’ because she realized the official knowledge was written by dominant race/ethnicity. As a result, it is very difficult to get multiple truths. Eunice also started learning the benefit of studying world history with counter perspectives, which is “a foundation for countering stereotypical thinking and enhancing cross-cultural communication” (Eunice, Literature circle on-line post). She believed the way of “challenging students about their grounded way of thinking and breaking stereotypes” will “prepare students to make good decisions in a globalizing society” (Eunice, Literature circle on-line post). In short, shaking a fixed image of history and making official knowledge ambiguous was one of the main ways that student teachers experienced global perspectives.

Second, global perspectives were understood as a way to see the similarity of the human condition that diverse ethnic groups have commonly faced with some student teachers. In
particular, the realization of common tragedies in different societies not only helps them extract broader concepts behind different historical events, but also makes them develop an empathetic attitude toward marginalized groups in their own society and other societies. By doing so, student teachers developed a deeper understanding of the social issues. For example, Eunice investigated the colonization process that occurred in Ireland and the United States:

Tataki Ch 2 & 3

The Takaki reading was really shocking and eye opening. It made me realize how sugar coated and surface level our history instruction actually is. Even though I learned about American colonization and slavery many times, this book clearly illustrates the truth of what actually occurred during these events. While reading these two chapters, I felt like I was learning completely new material because the events were explained in a matter that I was never exposed to. These two chapters really challenge the readers to alter their perspective on history. One new information that I learned was about the colonization projects in Ireland. It was interesting to see how the conquest of Ireland was similar to the settlement in the new world. It was also interesting to read about the struggles of the white indentured servants. Learning about how the black and white servants worked together to gain freedom alters the perspective some students might have about racial issues during that time period. Most history classes focus just on African slavery, so students often forget about the other group that struggled to gain freedom.

Through this reading, I can really see how teaching children about multiple perspectives and the value learning about different cultures is important. You can really see how through egocentrism and thoughts of people of different cultures as “uncivilized” changed how people were treated. The thought of being superior resulted in horrible acts of violence to the Irish, Indians, and Africans. It is important to teach our students to be open-minded and to treat everyone equally. This reading also made me question the extent to which we should tell the “truth” of history to students. I myself was shocked during this reading because of the lack of exposure to the “truth”. How can we teach history so that it teaches reality and details of an event without over exposing?

(Eunice, Literature circle on-line post)

By comparing an unfamiliar historical event in a foreign country—English colonization projects in Ireland—with a more familiar historical event—the American colonization process—from a completely different perspective, Eunice discovered similarities in the colonization processes in that both Irish people and Native Americans are discriminated against in favor of
the English. In addition, from the readings she extracted common social concepts such as “civilization,” “superiority,” and “inferiority” that have caused discrimination or marginalization in many societies. Actually, these broadened concepts and broadened perspectives created a deeper understanding of the common human condition that dominant groups such as the English have enjoyed, and with which marginalized ethnic groups such as the Irish, Indians, and Africans had to struggle. As another example of a weekly reading, Takaki (1993), in particular, also provided Sam with a broader perspective that connected Mexican immigrants and African slaves through similar slavery conditions that both ethnic groups encountered in America (Sam, first interview, p. 13). Through this broadened perspective, he realized that Africans are not the only ethnic group that experienced serious social injustice.

Esther also broadened her understanding of social issues by seeing the connection among similar tragedies in four different marginalized groups—Irish people, Native Americans, Black slaves, and White indentured workers in Takaki (1993). Connecting all four groups did not only mean an understanding of a common human condition such as hardship and the difficulty that immigrants went through in a foreign land. Yet having a broader perspective led Esther to a much expanded reflection in connecting her readings to her own social inquiry project, her ancestors, her own school community, and some historical events.

Takaki Chapters 2-3

After spending all week thinking about my two inquiry projects, the Holocaust unit that is finishing, and the fact that I know too little about the U.S. history, I was excited to read what Takaki had to say about this land’s history. He always has interesting and new perspectives to give. Reading this week’s chapter, I was really interested in the word civilized. I have always thought that people who think themselves better than any other group are committing a very serious injustice to themselves and to those they are judging. I found myself angry at my historical ancestors who just assumed that this beautiful and well-kept land was a gift from G-d. I found myself thinking about the work that the farmers in my school’s community put into their land in order to ensure that it produces
the correct crops every day. I even found myself going so far as to think of the slave
masters and the Nazis.

I never believe that it is correct to compare tragedies that have happened to one
group of people or another. Everyone has been persecuted in some way, because they
happened to be either the minority or the group with weaker weapons. In the case of the
Native Americans it was also to their detriment that they were mainly an honorable
people who expected the same of their business partners.

They were a people who were discriminated against because they looked different
from those who were fighting against them. Their skills at agriculture, hunting,
community, or even conservation were not taken into consideration when evaluating their
status of “uncivilized.” They only two important things taken into consideration were that
the Native Americans looked different than the invading European countries, and that
they had land which the Europeans wanted. The idea of looking different, having
different customs, and having something that those more powerful want, is a concept that
I have been exploring a lot this past month. It disgusts me that people discriminate
against those they don’t understand, and it makes me feel better that the education
department forces us as future educators to begin breaking down those natural prejudices
through the crossing borders assignment. (Esther, Literature circle on-line post).

Global perspectives were experienced in Esther’s reflection as a way of going beyond the
connections among different historical events. In other words, through this bigger viewpoint, she
examined broader concepts such as othering, discrimination, and the unequal power relationships
behind the colonization process and slavery. In addition, those concepts were applied to her
diverse daily life such as preparing her current unit planning, understanding her current school
community, and evaluating her ancestors. While having a global perspective both expanded her
reflection scope to other groups and shrunk the scope to her personal life, she developed the
ability to share other group member’s feelings and emotions as if they were her own, as she was
sickened by the fact that people discriminated against others just because they were different.
Lastly, another way of experiencing a global perspective with their weekly readings was
associated with certain ways that some preservice teachers see students in their current and future
classrooms. Some weekly readings led students to new understandings about their classroom
from a global perspective, which involved realizing the multicultural characteristics that their
immigrant or international students bring to their U.S. classroom. For instance, Esther learned through weekly readings that more diverse cultural norms coexist at school due to immigrant student family cultures mixing with school cultures.

Families and Discrimination

I thought that it was interesting how both the Black Ants chapter and the Doing History chapters talked about students analyzing their backgrounds in order to learn history. I thought that in an ideal situation, all students will have drastically varying family perspective. Some students could bring into the classroom about being the first generation in the United States, while others could talk about the difference between their cultural norms at home and their cultural norms at school. I’m aware that we live in a world with a high probability of different types of students; however it seems as if the perfect mix of students is always discussed in Black Ants. I personally have really enjoyed writing a lot of the autobiography assignments, but I wish that they had been discussed. I felt as if a lot of the readings were focusing on the differences of students and how they can each bring differences, but never the similarities. After reading the book that Jordan brought to class, and thinking about my own experiences, I would have found it more meaningful if we could draw similarities along with differences.

I thought that the article I read was very appropriate. It was talking about the acceptance of every type of family in the classroom. My interview was about diverse families and the different views that students and society have about families. I think that it is critical for all students to feel validated in their love, support, and respect of every member of their families. (Esther, reading reflections on-line post).

Understanding the existence of different cultural norms in the classroom in the article “Family and Diversity,” was important for Esther because when her Russian student said something she did not expect, she immediately knew that “he is doing this not because he is being annoying, but this is just part of his culture” (first interview, p. 11). In other words, the weekly readings equipped her with a conceptual framework to see different cultural norms and the lifestyles of student families before she met immigrant/international students in her teaching practicum. This combination of a conceptual framework from the readings and her student teaching experience helped her define her classroom as “a world with a high probability of different types of students” and, in particular, let her identify the first generation culture that her
four immigrant students brought with them as “something that they can bring to the table” (first interview, p 3). In this way, the global perspectives that some student teachers might obtain from the weekly readings expanded their concepts of cultural differences to the new cultures of their first generation students beyond the existing second generation or subsequent generation students’ family cultures.

In addition to appreciating the culture of first generation students’, some preservice teachers started to see the concrete meaning in rearing active citizens in a global society through weekly readings, even though they were still in the very initial stage. It meant educating their students within a broad and accurate worldview through diverse perspectives not only within America but also within the world.

Integrating Socially

This article touches on the importance of social studies for students in today’s society. Social studies can often be taught by memorizing various dates and important geographical regions, however these facts do not make a strong impact in students. Social studies should be a way for students to become valuable and active citizens in society. In order for this to occur, social education programs should include “current and future issues and trends within the global society”. I think that this is especially important for today’s globalizing society. Students should not only learn about American history, but should also be exposed to the differing perspectives throughout the world. Through this, students should be motivated to become a member of society that has a broad and accurate understanding about the world around them. (Eunice, reading reflection on-line post)

For Eunice, a way of rearing active citizens in society referred to teaching students “current and future issues and trends within the global society,” which cannot be understood by teaching one-sided American perspectives without teaching “differing perspectives throughout the world.” In fact, as mentioned above, it was very rare that student teachers would teach their students based on the assumption that their students are living in the globalized world.
Therefore, Eunice is an exceptional case, in that preservice teachers were learning certain types of global perspectives in terms of teaching topics and pedagogy.

Generally speaking, in student teachers’ readings and discussion, it was hard to find not only their assumptions on the globally interconnected world and their expectations on their students’ role as a global citizen and not just an American citizen, but also their deep understanding of specific multiple perspectives and especially broad perspectives, such as global perspectives. Also, the global flows and power relations behind the global flows were hardly found in students’ reflections. This lack of a broad and deep understanding of the weekly readings resulted from student teachers’ indifference toward historical events and over-crowded topics in the social studies curriculum as well as the student teachers’ busy schedules and their recognition of the weekly readings as age inappropriate topics and controversial issues. Compared to conducting social inquiry projects and, in particular, creating a lesson plan as a preservice teacher, the reading, discussions, and self-reflections might be a less visible process of cultural formation. However, the result that the student teachers’ discussions and reflections on weekly readings were not deep and broad enough to understand global issues and problems shows the high possibility that the student teachers are not actively bringing global topics and perspectives into their practicum sites and then not actively participating in global cultural formation in terms of creating global citizens.

However, some kinds of global perspectives found in weekly reading reflections show another possibility that student teachers may participate in new ways of cultural formation by teaching global perspectives. First of all, while student teachers were taught univocal and unambiguous perspectives in previous K-12 curriculum, the social studies methods class gave student teachers a chance to hear counter historical perspectives within world history. As a result,
Nicole learned that new global perspectives could shake her students’ myth of ‘objective history’ as it did for her. Second, by reading the process of colonization and slavery in the U.S. and other places, Eunice started to agonize over how to teach her students ‘truths’ that she was never been exposed to in the K-12 schools. Third, readings and discussions about other societies provided some student teachers with a way of seeing similar human conditions that U.S. society and other societies share. Esther, who never saw this similarity in her trips to the Palestine area, began to see and comment on those common conditions and connections that were present in Palestine that she hadn’t noted before. Finally, Eunice started to see her current and future students as active citizens in the global society, not just in the U.S. All these examples show us that student teachers’ reflections help them to think of new ways of teaching that will challenge their students’ perspectives.

Social inquiry projects. While weekly reading and discussion were the ways for preservice teachers to learn big concepts such as social studies, multiple perspectives, the democratic classroom, the social inquiry project was a means of understanding their teaching practicum settings and their students with regards to the big concepts. In addition, it showed the potential for student teachers to influence current and future schools with the broadened perspectives that they learned in their social studies class. In other words, the social inquiry project not only connected their learning experience in their social studies class to student teaching practice, but also let preservice teachers take action in changing their teaching atmosphere and teaching practice. Therefore, examining the ways that student teachers conducted social inquiry projects would be an effective means of seeing their broadened or narrow perspectives on school community, their students, and unit planning.
However, Hillarie was suspicious of the social inquiry projects in terms of their students’ broadened perspectives. Hillarie pointed out that the vocabulary of the social inquiry project itself does not include the words “global perspectives” since it would be too big to handle for student teachers.

I think that is a little more global because they need it, too. But I think when the students think about what is the global, they are like that would be huge itself, and what would you do with that word? We just say cultural education and we say tuning to different cultural perspective. That seems more manageable. That’s why that project is more successful because we kept it a little more or smaller, for them, conceptual. They can see “Okay, I wanna connect this concept to just something in another culture or pointing other cultural perspectives,” but push this out of how this would be from a different culture (Hillarie, first interview, p. 10).

Hillarie believed that the conceptual framework of the social inquiry project was small and that student teachers could successfully connect some concepts to other cultures. Indeed, except for inquiry #4 (Lesson Planning Project), which encouraged student to include global connections whenever possible (Inquiry #4 instruction, p. 1), other inquiry projects did not use the word “global” in their project instructions or project rubric. However, Hillarie thought that inquiry projects included global perspectives even if the word was not explicitly used. The following section focuses on the global perspectives that student teachers experienced in each of the social inquiry projects.

Inquiry #1 Community Inquiry. Community Inquiry is a collaborative and in-depth study of the community/neighborhood in which student teachers were placed for their clinical experience. A total of 21 groups of students across social studies class cohorts, consisting of 5-8 students based on their student teaching school, investigated diverse assets and needs within their school community/neighborhood. Then, each group addressed a focal issue in their community by illustrating it with a lot of diverse performances, such as role play or video clips, for approximately 15 minutes. For this inquiry project, there were seven criteria, as following:
Seven expectations

- Demonstrates an understanding of the assets of the community.
- Demonstrates an understanding of the needs/issues within the school/community.
- Includes multiple perspectives.
- Addresses equity and social justice issues within the school community.
- Uses data collected from your inquiry.
- Connects what you learned with recommendations for your teaching practice.
- Performance Assessment: Organization and time (Inquiry #1 rubric).

When student teachers understood the above two expectations, “the needs/issues within the school/community” and “equity and social justice issues,” most of them defined these issues as only economic issues. For this reason, a lot of groups focused their topic on the economic poverty issue. For example, the group that included Lina and Jessica, addressed diverse assets that low income migrant workers might have in the local community. Lucy’s group and Crystal’s group partially dealt with literacy support issues in low income families figured out ways for raising money for bookmobiles and the ways that children could read books over the summer. Sam’s group also presented a poverty issue by addressing how to enhance school involvement of minority and low income parents in order to utilize school resources equally. Hillarie also pointed out that student teachers often brought up the same poverty issue in the Community Inquiry project.

I think our students really tend to learn more about poverty. The community inquiry project seems to me, but if I had to say common themes, they tend to be more about differences in income and how it has impacts on someone’s ability to access to asset in the community. I can tie and I don’t think it’s global. To be honest, I don’t think it is most global project (Hillarie, first interview, p. 9).

As Hillarie said, student teachers might fail to show global perspectives since the main issue of the project was limited to poverty issues in the small scope of school community. However, poverty issues themselves are good topics for them to show a global perspective as long as they are understood as global phenomenon. For instance, if Lina and Jessica addressed
Mexican migrant workers issues as part of global migration flow, the poverty issue would be a means to show the deeper and bigger picture surrounding the issue. Yet their presentation did not put the focus on global flow, but community resources that the migrant workers can utilize.

Student 1: “We call this City Hall meeting to order at 12:30pm on October 16th, 2009. As you most of you have heard, the Hollister (pseudonym) Air Force military base has just closed cutting our population in half from 18,000 to nine thousand. Much of our economy has taken a hard hit, however there are many things that are looking up, and, if we take the right steps, we can turn this unfortunate situation into a fortunate one. I think Cleo (pseudonym) has some more specific information.”

Student 2 (Cleo): “The Air Force has kindly donated several of their buildings as well as ten acres of land to our city. We can now take advantage of these buildings and this space in order to repopulate and revitalize the area of South Oakhills.

Student 3: “In what shape are these buildings?

Student 2: Well let’s just start with going over each of the buildings individually. First of all, there are three dormitory halls that can currently house 5,000 people. Are there any proposals to utilize this space?

Student 4: Knowing that there are many migrant families coming into this area who often look for affordable housing, it wouldn’t be a bad idea to apply for grants to renovate these dorms into apartment buildings that can house these low income migrant families with flexible leases.

Lina: I’m not really sure why we want to cater to the needs of families that come and go so frequently. Why don’t we just focus on using these buildings improve the community for our permanent residents?

Student 5: Actually, the general trend indicates that 1/5 of the migrant families do end up staying and becoming members of the Oakhills community. Over time, then they will be patrons of our local businesses. We need to keep Casey’s, Save-A-Lot, IGA, and Supermarket El Rey running, so we must create the most inviting housing conditions and community possible.

Jessica: I agree, Not only are these migrant families supporting our local businesses, they are the heart of our farming economy. Without their hard work, our farms would collapse.

Student 3: What are some other ways that we can help welcome the migrant families?
Student 1: We should not forget to direct them to the services of the Oakhills Civic Center. Given that this community will be low income and that they may only have seasonal work, they might be able to take advantage of the food pantry services which they can frequent one a month.

Student 5: We also need a program that will help bridge the language barrier. It’s great that are schools offer bilingual education, but often students and parents need a little extra.

Student 4: Actually, there is a grant available that we can apply for to provide extra language services in the form of after school programs. I know that the community of Plymouth (pseudonym) received a grant through this program a few years ago.

Jessica: Also there is a nonprofit organization called Cultivators that currently works with English Language Learners. Maybe they could partner with the public and school libraries in order to get both parents and children literate in the English language.

Student 2: That brings us to another point. This community needs a library. Reading and literacy is the foundation for all other learning. One of the buildings that was donated actually was a library. The shelving units and supplies have all been left. We could expand our existing Oakhills Library and have two libraries in our city.

Student 3: By doing this, we must be careful not to create segregation among the Latino population and the existing population. I’m not so sure I like the idea of two separate libraries.

Student 5: That’s a really good point. So, no library on the old base?

Student 1: Or, no library in North Oakhills. Here’s what I’m thinking. If we only have one library and we only have this library in the low income area, we will be forcing the existing community to be a part of the developing community.

Lina: Why should my family have to drive all the way to the South Side of Oakhills just to go to the library?

Student 5: While you might be traveling to the South side of Oakhills to go to the library, all the south side residents will be traveling to the north side to go to school, to go to the grocery store, and to go to the park. If we want to weave all our citizens together, everyone is going to have to give in a little bit (Community Inquiry group presentation script, pp. 1-2).

As for the needs/issues within the Oakhills community, the preservice teachers of this group found a migrant workers issue and discussed the ways to help these low income workers
through community resources, such as donated buildings of the Hollister Air Force military base, food pantry services of Oakhills Civic Center, after school programs for bilingual education, or a non-profit organization working with English Language Learners. In fact, it was not a common case that student teachers saw the need of racially marginalized people within their school community, and that they were conscious of the segregation of the marginalized group. Most of them just focused on low-income groups without noticing any race issues (Hillarie, first interview, p. 10). What is interesting is that they saw migrant workers not merely as the receiver of community resources but also as “patrons of our local businesses” and “the heart of our farming economy,” which means they saw the benefits that migrant workers bring to the local community. In that way, they reflected multiple perspectives surrounding migrant workers.

However, the migrant worker issue was not examined from a global perspective. First, the above script does not include broader multiple perspectives. For example, they did not include migrant workers’ actual voices. Rather, they only reported two different voices from a City Hall meeting committee, which are supporting foreign workers or supporting permanent residents of Oakhills. Second, they made the migrant worker issue narrow by focusing only on economic and linguistic needs. Even though these migrant workers mostly came from Mexico, they did not even mention their country and their culture in their presentation. If they could connect poverty issues to race, they would get a deeper understanding of the Oakhills community and the migrant group. Third, they only considered local resources as a means of helping migrant workers. If they wanted to discover the deeper needs of this migrant group, they might have gone beyond the Oakhills community by searching for differences and similarities between their K-12 education systems and the Mexican education system.
Actually, this narrow perspective is not only a problem with Lina and Jessica’s groups, but most of the group projects. One of the main reasons for their limited understanding, as seen in the above seven expectations, is because the scope of this project is limited to the needs/issues within the school or community. As seen in the interview with Hillarie, the social inquiry project did not choose global education as its framework because global education seems harder to manage (Hillarie, first interview, p. 10). The limited scope definitely made the Community Inquiry project doable for student teachers to conduct within a restricted time and with restricted resources. However, if global education could be a good means of understanding community assets and needs/issues in a new way, the scope might be worthy to be expanded. In particular, if the project aims to examine multiple perspectives of community members and address diverse equity and social justice issues within the school community, global perspectives might be essential for including marginalized people as community members and for noticing diverse resources and inequity issues within local community, which is also found in other societies.

Through Inquiry #1, student teachers did not see the global experience that migrant or immigrant families could bring as an asset to their community and it was really rare to observe diverse social justice issues and to listen to differing voices from diverse community members. Hillarie and Lucy brought up similar problems in Inquiry #1.

It is hard for them to say “This economic inequity is tied to race.” They won’t say that. They were uncomfortable saying that, I think. Even they maybe think “Oh, this really tends to be a lot of African American students or Latino students are in this income group.” But they don’t explore that further why is that. (Hillarie, first interview, p. 10)

This interview actually supported the result of the above inquiry project by Jessica’s and Lina’s groups and also other Community Inquiry projects. They focused on a low income group without connecting any racial or cultural differences. This simplistic approach might be an obstacle to understand complicated inequity issues intertwined with poverty, race, gender, and so
Lucy pointed out the problem with the first inquiry project since her groups failed to include differing voices from a bigger neighborhood.

The first one, the community study, I was not at this school. I was in Broadstone (pseudonym) Elementary, which is in Sunnyvale, but it is less diverse than this school. The differences that (pause) they (pause) it’s a very white community and there are African American students in that school, but those students come from elsewhere in the community. So the atmosphere, that is very different than this year. Because here a lot of students live in the neighborhood, it’s very different field to the neighborhood. So when I was doing that project, I really wanted to focus on the whole community because my students came from other places in communities. But, the other people that I was working with only wanted to focus on that neighborhood. So what we ended up doing was just the neighborhood, when I was very disappointed with. But, to me, that actually reflects a lot about the problem in our society because my classmates, it was just easier for them to only think about that white community. That’s WHITE PRIVILEGE! (Lucy, first interview, p. 9).

As addressed by Lucy, when the Community Inquiry project restricts its scope to immediate school neighbors, or, at least when the scope is interpreted by student teachers as a small community adjacent to their school, the project might lose the benefits in include bigger communities, which also influence students’ daily lives. However, if the scope is expanded, as Lucy showed, important concepts such as White Privilege might become visible in the Community Inquiry project.

In addition to the narrow scope of the Community Inquiry project, another reason that student teachers did not gain broader perspectives from the first inquiry project is because the project is not a big and consistent enough project for examining diverse voices surrounding social inequity issues. Seemingly, Inquiry #1 looks like a small project due to its one-month preparation time and 15-minute presentation (see Table 4 Weekly Schedule). With the short preparation and presentation times, it might not be enough to reveal even limited school needs and issues. However, compared to other social inquiry projects, one month does not seem like a very short period. Also, according to the assignment graphic, the Community Inquiry project is
not a separate project but a consistent project influencing Inquiry #2, #3, and #4. Therefore, if preservice teachers have a bigger framework and consistent interests about their school community, their perspectives might connect to more global perspectives.

**Inquiry #2 Crossing Borders.** According to the Inquiry #2 instructions, this inquiry was designed to explore “cultural borders between groups of people” (p. 1). By crossing the borders, student teachers were given a chance to deepen their knowledge of other groups of people within their school community, their current and future students, and, lastly, themselves. Therefore, this inquiry is a good opportunity to see the student teachers’ understanding of others, their students, and themselves. Hillarie evaluated it as follows: “Crossing Borders inquiry is little more global in that it makes them think about crossing cultural borders” (Hillarie, first interview, p. 9). In order to examine what kinds of global perspectives student teachers experience through Inquiry #2, it is important to know the meaning of “border” and the meaning of “crossing” that the student teachers revealed within the act of “crossing borders.”

The Inquiry #2 instructions showed various examples of borders such as “race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, age, ability, or any combination of these” (p. 1). According to my observation of an informal student-led conversation about their Crossing Borders experience on October 9th, 2009, the borders that student teachers experienced were not as diverse as the above examples in the instructions. Rather, they mostly concentrated on race, religion, and/or class as the cultural borders between different groups of people. The majority of student interviewees also experienced racial differences as the most frequent borders in diverse settings such as local restaurants, churches, football games, or comedy shows (i.e., Nicole, Eunice, Sam, Jessica, Lina, and Crystal). Lucy and Jessica saw religious differences in a Protestant church and in a black Baptist church. Exceptionally, Esther crossed a local boundary
set by people in a small town where they had been placed for their clinical experience. While they were in an uncomfortable place for this inquiry project, most of the students realized the existence of boundaries between majority groups and minority groups within the U.S., or the existence of stereotypes about outsiders as portrayed in the dominant American culture. Yet the meaning of “borders” was not diverse in Inquiry #2 because their definition was limited only to such borders as race and religion.

In addition, the meaning of borders was so narrow that student teachers did not recognize the existence of national borders, which can be understood by examining different foreign cultures as opposed to just different cultures within America. One exceptional case was found in Lucy’s assignment, which described her experience in China in terms of different expectations of teacher roles.

Another border I crossed was to study abroad in China. In addition to the obvious language and culture barriers that I struggled with daily, I also experienced a barrier related to schooling. I am used to asking clarifying questions of my teachers when I do not understand something, but Chinese teachers are only expected to explain or teach a concept once. All confusion and forgetfulness is the fault of the student and is no longer the responsibility of the teacher (Lucy, Inquiry #2 assignment, p. 2).

When she reflected on her “crossing borders” experience, she remembered her study abroad experience and described how she struggled with the language and culture barriers in China as an example of crossing borders. Actually, the Crossing Borders project encouraged students to think about the question, “What are other times when you have crossed borders and moved out of your comfort zone?” (Inquiry #2 Crossing Borders project instruction, p. 1) However, even though student interviewees shared affluent travel abroad experiences, or other international experiences within the U.S. in the previous chapter, nobody revealed this global experience as an opportunity to cross national borders except for Lucy. This showed that student teachers did not recognize national boundaries as cultural borders. In short, the meaning of
cultural borders in this project is neither diverse nor broad enough to conceptualize various borders within and outside the U.S.

Next, generally speaking, the meaning of “crossing” was interpreted by all student teachers as “being out of comfort zone” or “becoming an outsider” since many of the student teachers focused on the uncomfortable feeling they had within a culturally unfamiliar setting in the student-led informal conversations. However, some student teachers showed different and deeper meanings of “crossing” in their assignment papers. For Jessica and Esther, crossing borders meant “seeing and breaking stereotypes about marginalized groups.” By following the exact instructions for Inquiry #2, both students described their preconceived notions about the people that they observed in advance, and the ways that the people are portrayed in the media and in dominant American culture as “outsiders.”

The media portrays African Americans in a couple ways. Often, they are portrayed as criminals living in poverty. They are portrayed as having large families without any fathers. Historically, they are portrayed as the bad guy or the poor guy. Over the years, however, this image has improved. Other times, the media portrays African Americans as being the star basketball player or the famous rap musician whose musical talents raise him out of poverty. I say him because if I think about it, I cannot think of many or any black females that are even really portrayed at all in the media. The one movie that comes to my mind is the ‘Color Purple.’ In this movie, the black females are sexually abused and raped by family members. This perpetuates the idea that black males are bad people who abuse their helpless daughters and wives. In the media, African Americans definitely do not consistently portray a positive, successful image.

African Americans are portrayed as outsiders by their lack of representation in the most popular movies, television shows, and advertisements. I always catch myself noticing when a television show is rooted in the lives of a black family. I even catch myself not giving that television show a chance because I just don’t think I will enjoy a show about a black family. I then must catch myself and think about how often black families have no other option but to watch a television show about a white family (Jessica, Inquiry #2 assignment, pp. 1-2).

This assignment vividly revealed the stereotypes of African Americans that Jessica learned from the media, which include bad, poor, musically or physically talented, and, in
particular for women, helpless portrayals of African Americans. Through this process, Jessica realized her preconceptions as well as the lack of presentation about them in the media. She identified not only her own fixed idea about African American adults but also others’ stereotypes of white people—e.g., ignorant, racist, and scared of African Americans (Inquiry #2 assignment, p. 2). However, after meeting an actual African American female and family who were welcoming white people with open arms and wearing beautiful and elegant hats, she realized her stereotypes were not true. The experience of seeing and stepping out of her comfort zone not only allowed her to further her knowledge about African Americans and white people, but it also provided her with an opportunity to understand cultural borders as created by dominant groups as well as minority groups through the stereotyping of others. This is a very meaningful learning for Jessica considering her narrow cultural background as seen in chapter 4.

Esther also stereotyped small town people by the media as being poor, uneducated, manual laborers than skilled laborers, and having a lack of diversity, etc. (Inquiry #2 assignment, p. 1). Yet, after she participated in an annual local festival called Apple Knockers, she could not help but change her preconceptions.

I thought Apple knocker, I thought it was just like festival like run the meal, and there’s gonna be food. But they tried, the school did it and they tried to bring in cultural diversity into their school, so they had like African dancers come from one of other schools and they had a single from India come and they just brought in and I was shocked. I would expect to see this in Chicago suburb because they have lots of resources in whatever, but this was in the middle of nowhere, how do they have these resources? Great. It was an amazing experience (Esther, first interview, p. 12).

Esther never saw this kind of rural culture or the effort of people living in a small town to bring cultural diversity into their community until she did this social inquiry project. However, after this inquiry project, she realized how even this homogeneous town and her students are influenced by diverse cultures from other countries. I think this experience showed her a glimpse
of a global perspective. For this reason, after this inquiry, she started asking her students questions about “what do you know about other cultures?” (first interview, p. 12), and she was really impressed by their parents who were traveling around the world for their work and how well traveled her students are compared to herself as a child. In this way, the Crossing Borders inquiry helped student teachers break their own stereotypes by understanding others from different cultural perspectives.

Second, even though it is at an initial stage, the meaning of “crossing” sometimes referred to “seeing lack of cultural consciousness of student teachers themselves.” This is because the Crossing Borders project, as an action-based approach to cultural diversity and social borders, provided them with concrete experience about different cultures, compared to reading and discussion. Crystal, who grew up in a homogeneous white community, would be a good example.

From this border crossing, I learned that it can be very nerve racking and uncomfortable to be of the minority, especially when in a group with which one is unfamiliar. I was very aware of how different I was from everyone else and how ignorant I was of the culture. I also learned that almost everyone else in attendance had at least basic knowledge of other cultures, while I felt I was even ignorant of my own cultural characteristics. (Crystal, Inquiry #2 assignment, p. 1).

Crystal went to a comedy show performed by an Indian male who made jokes about race. There were only two white people in the audience, as well as one black person, and the rest were Indians (first interview, p. 11). As she said above, she felt very uncomfortable being an outsider since she had always been part of the majority culture without being exposed outside of her comfort zone. However, by crossing a border of majority, she started understanding the existence of boundaries between majority groups and minority groups within the U.S. I am not sure if she values minority cultures, but at least she realized her cultural ignorance, which shows she took a
potential step in investigating other cultures both within and outside the U.S. for if and when she
has a chance to use other societies as her teaching topics in the future.

Thirdly, “crossing” did not mean merely being exposed to different lifestyles, but
“actively appreciating living in heterogeneous culture.” Eunice, after conducting Inquiry #2 in a
local restaurant and a high school homecoming football game, began to see how homogeneous
community creates social borders against outsiders. She was much more conscious of the social
borders than other classmates because she was the only Asian in the mostly (99%) white
population of her practicum site community. Also, according to her, Eunice had never been in
such a homogeneous community before this project.

While crossing some borders in Lusby (pseudonym) put me in an awkward position and
made me feel uncomfortable, I was able to gain a lot of new insight on this small town.
Being such a close knit community, the people of this town may unintentionally create
social borders because they are comfortable and used to the people they see regularly.
Even though initially I felt uncomfortable and out of place in this town, I was able to
become more comfortable because I experienced firsthand how the people of Lusby are
friendly and welcoming to newcomers. Crossing borders was beneficial to me because I
was able to experience a taste of the small town environment my students live in. This is
the town my students cherish and take pride in. I am glad I was able to partake in some of
the popular activities my students enjoy. I am also able to further value my ethnicity and
the diversity I can bring to my placement. I’m more appreciative of the diverse
environment I grew up in because I have newly experienced being in a place that lacks it.
I am able to teach students about my culture and educate them on traditions that are
different from my own due to my ethnic background. (Eunice, Inquiry #2 assignment, p.
4).

Crossing ethnic and regional boundaries helped Eunice to think about the process of
creating unintentional social borders. Then, by experiencing a small town environment, she was
able to highly evaluate her own hometown culture in the sense that diverse cultures coexist
within it. In this way, Inquiry #2 gave student teachers a chance to compare and contrast their
own culture and other cultures and evaluate both cultures from a broadened perspective. In
particular, Eunice’s attitude in valuing her own minority culture and in appreciating learning
about other cultures could be a significant way to learn global perspectives because this attitude gave students the important potential to cross national borders in order to learn about other cultures in other places.

Lastly, the Crossing Borders project gave almost all student interviewees an opportunity to think about a way to teach minority students. This means that when student teachers examined cultural borders, they realized the existence of classroom borders and utilized their own experience of “crossing borders” as a way of understanding their students, in particular isolated students. For instance, this inquiry project affected the way that Crystal will relate to isolated students in her future classroom. As a teacher, she believed that it is her “responsibility to make sure students feel comfortable and welcome in the classroom” (Inquiry #2 assignment, p. 3). However, it was very hard to find student teachers who went beyond feeling the responsibility and imagine school borders from expanded perspectives. Lucy was one of the rare students who addressed the existence of school borders.

I think that most or all of these borders were put up unintentionally. The participants know proper behaviors, and do not even consider the idea that someone else might not know them. Schools create unintentional borders as well. Even seemingly similar groups, such as my parent’s protestant church and my friends’ protestant church are vastly different. We cannot assume that our students will know what to do in our classroom just because they have been in school before. They are experiencing a new teaching style, a new discipline style, new procedures, and new classmates. I need to think about ways that I can give my students information about how they can be successful in my classroom so they do not feel as confused and uncomfortable as I did in a new church. (Lucy, Inquiry #2 assignment, p. 3).

Experiencing a religious border guided Lucy to think about the meaning of school borders. According to her, the school boundary is made by teachers and students because “a new teaching style, a new discipline style, new procedures, and new classmates” could be a border for some students. Then, she arrived at the similar conclusion of creating clear and comfortable classroom environments. I think her recognition of school borders could mean an important
initial step to examining varied school borders within and outside national boundaries and in developing the meaning of teaching as the elimination of school borders. Unfortunately, her assignment ended with the same conclusion without a more broadened understanding of school borders.

In short, along with diverse meanings of “borders” and “crossing,” the Inquiry #2 Crossing Borders project gave student teachers many opportunities to recognize cultural stereotypes created by dominant groups as well as minority groups, to learn global perspectives by crossing national borders, to examine varied school borders within and outside national boundaries, and to develop teaching strategies to eliminate school borders. However, most of these opportunities might be enlarged if student teachers become concerned with national borders and imagine a global influence in creating different cultures. Again, like Inquiry #1, this project inevitably restricted its conceptual framework to a limited scope such as the dominant American culture and minority culture in focusing on school community and students because this scope was a manageable one for student teachers. Without an expanded framework, however, it was hard to see any further understanding of social borders. For example, many student teacher discussions in the Crossing Borders grand conversation session did not include answers about “why and how groups might create cultural borders?,” which was one of the more important reflection questions in this inquiry (Inquiry #2 instruction, p. 1). Also, it was hard to find a better understanding of other groups based on the combination between/among different social borders. Lastly, diverse and substantive borders that students might feel in school (i.e., language borders, different life styles, different school cultures, economic borders, etc.) were not addressed in the Inquiry #2 Crossing Borders project.
Inquiry #3 Listening to Children to Inform Practice. Compared to Inquiry #1 and #2, which focused on school community, Inquiry #3 narrowed down student teachers’ attention to a specific interview concept and the way that their children understand the concept. As a result, this inquiry illustrates how student teachers understand their students and how they will teach a broad concept. Therefore, the two foci of this section, (1) their understanding of students, and (2) their understanding of their interview question(s) as a potential teaching concept, are deeply connected to the purpose of this inquiry project.

This inquiry is designed to give you an opportunity to listen to the voices of children in order to better understand the ways in which they make sense of the social world and to think about how this knowledge translates into teaching and learning opportunities. It also provides you with the opportunity to experience the next phase of inquiry, “going further.” As with the community inquiry, some of this work will happen in class and some of it will happen out in the field. (Inquiry #3 instruction, p. 1).

Some prospective teachers chose their interview concept from an issue that arose from the Community Inquiry or from their student teaching experience. For example, Lucy chose the concept of “social interaction” since the problem of bullying was going on in her teaching placement (Inquiry #3 assignment, 1). Esther picked the concept of “family,” in particular divorced or homosexual families, since the many of her students came from these family backgrounds (Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 1). Others chose an interview concept among their current or future teaching topics and developed the concept as the unit planning topic for their Inquiry #4 project. For instance, Crystal, Jessica, and Lina interviewed and taught the concept of “Thanksgiving” from different pilgrim and Native American perspectives, “food economy,” and “fair trade,” and different definitions and scopes of “community.” By contrast, Sam did not explain why he chose his interview concept—homeless people in the U.S./other countries and social responsibility—although it was likely based on his long-term interests.
Hillarie assumed and suggested a specific way of understanding their students when student teachers conducted their third inquiry, along with the above interview concepts. It was an assumption of a multicultural classroom because she thought American schools consisted of diverse students coming from different cultures.

America is the melting pot of the places of everyone. If American classroom is diverse, they should figure out cultural differences. We could say “Lots of students are coming from different cultures. Think about and include them in your child study.” (Hillarie, first interview, p. 9).

However, in contrast, student teachers were not aware of the cultural diversity of their students when they conducted Inquiry #3. Any efforts to include the diverse students were also difficult to find in their assignments. First of all, student interviewees revealed their lack of cultural consciousness in understanding their students. Almost all student interviewees did not seem aware of their students’ cultural backgrounds, such as their family or ethnic backgrounds. Many of them just did not mention any cultural background or just focused on their students’ academic achievement level or social skills. This might be because they did not feel the need to explain their student interviewees’ background because they believe they interviewed a typical student who was a representative of the majority of the students in their class (Crystal, Inquiry 3 assignment, p. 1). For example, Lucy only highlighted her students’ academic performance level (i.e., performing at grade level or below grade level) along with their social skills (i.e., poor or strong social skills, quiet or manipulating). Although she talked about one female student’s mom in terms of her careless attitude to the school attendance of her children, she never connected the family culture to the concept of social interaction. As a result, student teachers seemed neither to understand their students as cultural beings nor see the cultural meaning of each interview concept.
Second, student interviews also showed student teachers did not expect their students to bring their global experiences into the classrooms. As Hillarie assumed that student teachers had very limited life experiences, student teachers also did not think about the diverse experiences their students had in other countries or through the media, since some student teachers had preconceptions that their students are young and currently living in rural areas. For instance, before Lina interviewed three students living in Oakhills to ask what community they belonged to and how many communities they felt they belonged to, she never thought that her students had multiple identities. However, after this project, she was really surprised that they would all identify with so many other states, cities, and countries (Lina, Inquiry #3 assignment). While interviewing four students about the concept of poverty and social responsibility and by talking about homeless children in other countries, Sam also did not assume that these students might travel to poor countries or get information about homeless people in other countries through the media. In this way, student teachers did not apply the assumption that “lots of students are coming from different cultures” (Hillarie, first interview, p. 9) to the actual interview with their students.

Third, along with the limited understanding of their own students, student teachers rarely focused on the global connectedness inherent in their interview concepts. Depending on the concept, student teachers’ interview topics included the notion of global connectedness. In my opinion, depending on the student teachers’ interests, all interview concepts conducted by student interviewees—social interaction, family, Thanksgiving, food trade, homelessness, community, African culture, and racial stereotypes—could be dealt with from global perspectives. However, most student teachers were not intrigued by the global issues within their concepts. Rather, they doubted their own students’ intellectual maturity to understand global
issues. For example, although Esther learned the concept of family from diverse family stories in other countries (field note on Nov. 19, 2009) and even though she herself was interested to see “how the students’ ideas are broadened every time they encounter a new aspect of diversity” (Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 3), she did not incorporate global connectedness or global diversity issues into her Inquiry #3 project. As her assignment showed, she assumed that her students might not encounter broader issues beyond their family dynamics (Inquiry #3 assignment).

In Jessica’s project, an age issue also came out because she interviewed 5-year-old kindergarteners. Her topic was food economy. She was curious to see “if they had any idea where food comes from, who grows food, and who get money for the food that they eat” (Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 1). However, many misconceptions were exposed. Her students were uncertain where the store got its food and it was hard for them to see that farmers get money from the food because they never paid farmers for their food. As a result, she decided not to teach her kindergarteners how it was unfair that farmers across the U.S. and in other countries get paid less than the store managers who sell their food.

Since I am in a kindergarten classroom, I think that I would need to focus on teaching concepts that are focused and that the children will be able to relate to. Therefore, I do not think that I would go into depth about the fact that some of our fruits and vegetables are grown in other countries and shipped to the United States because it is clear to me my five year old students do not yet understand the concept of a country. I might just say that farmers are all over the United States and in other countries as well. (Jessica, Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 2).

Instead of teaching about food trade between the U.S. and other countries or across the U.S., Jessica decided to teach the process of how food gets to students’ plates within a state where children can relate. For that reason, after the interview, she planned a fieldtrip to a farm, a cheese plant or a corn vegetable canning factory, and a grocery store within the school community. In this way, Jessica gave up her idea of teaching the concept of global
connectedness through food economy in her kindergarten class because she assumed that her student would not know the concept of country as they did not know the concept of food trade. Many students did not include global perspectives within their interview questions or teaching concept for similar reasons.

However, Inquiry #3, “Listening to Children to Inform Practice,” led a few student teachers, such as Crystal and Sam, to globally expand their understanding of their students and interview concepts whether or not they intended to have those understandings. They started to be conscious of the ways in which to include diverse students and their global experiences in their classrooms. In fact, Crystal had a research question about the knowledge of other cultures—“What do children think people from other countries do (do they celebrate? How would they? Immigrants?)” (Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 4). She recognized that even second graders knew that people in other parts of the world celebrate different holidays with different foods. As mentioned before, this inquiry project helped Lina learn about the broader backgrounds of her students beyond their neighborhood, such as Mexico and Canada, because they felt they belonged to the countries in which they were born. This experience not only deepened her understanding of children but also greatly influenced her future teaching practices by incorporating diverse students’ backgrounds into her future lessons.

I had no idea that they would all identify with so many other states, cities and countries. I think this information really impacts my future planning because I feel like I need to take more time to find out more about my students backgrounds. I sort of grouped them all together and used my assumptions and my perception of Oakhills to figure out what they would say or know and I was wrong in a number of instances. This makes me feel like I need to try to incorporate their backgrounds into my lessons to make them all feel like a part of the class. (Lina, Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 3).

Sam also broadened his lesson plan about poverty issues through this inquiry project. At the beginning of his interview with the four students, he asked what they thought social
responsibility meant, and he listened to some narrow examples related to their daily life.

However, when he led the discussion about homelessness, he provided them with a bigger picture by reading a paragraph stating that 200,000 children in America are homeless and by talking about children in other countries who live in poverty. Additionally, he asked more critical questions in order to develop the idea—“What did they do to end up in that situation? Will succeeding in life be harder for that child, as opposed to someone who isn’t homeless? Why or why not? Do we have the ability to impact the homeless or those who live in poverty?” (Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 3). While other student teachers had only some questions to ask regarding the definitions of big concepts or sub-concepts such as “What is a friend? What is a bully?” (Lucy, p. 6) or “What is family?” (Esther, p. 3), Sam’s questions were more engaged in order for students to develop a broader understanding of poverty. As a result, he got a lot of expanded ideas and comments from his interviewees such as “Poverty isn’t fair because some people have more money than they need” or “we can find a website that helps homeless people in another country” (Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 3). In addition to expanding his student’s perspectives, he also broadened his own pedagogical knowledge and skills.

I think it would be beneficial to design a lesson or project where students compare and contrast the poverty in our country alongside that of other countries. Students could research the characteristics of the country that may drive poverty as well. I think it’s important to for them to understand that there are a range of factors that contribute to homelessness and poverty. They could also learn about organizations and initiatives that function to help those in need. Another activity I would like to facilitate would be one where they learn about the distribution of resources in our country and other nations. Similar to the exercise we did two weeks ago in class. This will help them to think about how money and resources are contributing factors to the living situations of many people in this world. (Sam, Inquiry #3 assignment, p. 4).

Even if this is a very exceptional case, Sam showed how a teacher’s intention to expand their students’ conceptual horizons and to let them understand complex ideas could deepen and broaden their own understanding of their students and their teaching concepts. This potential for
the development of global open-mindedness was weaved into a lot of tensions and conflicts revealed in the social studies class and the clinical experience. But before moving on to discussing clinical experience, we need to finish examining the global perspectives developed in the last inquiry project, the “Lesson Planning Project.”

*Inquiry #4 Lesson Planning Project.* Based on their community and listening to their students’ inquiry assignments, student teachers independently prepared a unit plan that addressed an issue or topic that became apparent while they were conducting either their two inquiries or in their student teaching practice (Inquiry #4 instruction). While the previous inquiry projects were based on research of a real school community/neighborhood, different cultural groups, and an actual child (or children), the Inquiry #4 Lesson Planning Project involves the creation of an ideal lesson plan that they hope to teach in the future. For example, this inquiry included the following requirement, “Your class composition must include students with varying linguistic (ELL), cultural, racial, and economic backgrounds. You must also have students of varying abilities. If you have not experienced a diverse class community, you should imagine one.” (Inquiry #4 instruction, p. 2). In other words, through this inquiry, student teachers should ponder how to include all their diverse students into their lesson planning. In addition, this inquiry encouraged them to “include global connections whenever possible” (Inquiry #4 instruction, p. 1). Therefore, the Lesson Planning Project is one of the most significant inquiries that show student teachers’ ideas about global perspectives.

Compared to other inquiry projects, in which most student teachers studied a small community, a specific cultural group, or student(s) in a manageable way, the Lesson Planning Project had student teachers try to implement diverse global themes in a future or present classrooms. While researching diverse global concepts or topics—war, cultural celebrations, fair
trade, folktales, community, the Holocaust and discrimination, or the discovery of America—they incorporated multiple perspectives, and, in particular, diverse cultural perspectives, around those concepts in their lesson plan. Also, the Lesson Planning Project is a comprehensive inquiry because student teachers should use what they had learned throughout the semester, including conceptual frameworks, learning theories, and principles of social justice, along with varying weekly topics to prepare this inquiry. For this reason, I could see not only their knowledge about the world and others but also the skills and attitudes they want to develop through their lesson plans as a way of identifying their global perspectives.

First of all, the ways of dealing with global connections in the Lesson Planning Project was found in the assumptions that they addressed. In contrast to other inquiry projects, the Lesson Planning Project showed the diverse assumptions of other people and other countries, especially non-Western societies. Lucy, in her last project, planned to teach the perspectives of the people living in the Iraq War, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War through reading children’s books. By comparing and contrasting people’s lives under these three wars, she depicted them as “civilians merely involved in war” (p. 3) or “the refugees that have been forced from their homes” (p. 1) rather than people who represent those wars. However, she did not expand her perspectives on these civilians or refugees until going beyond the image of the suffering because she did not consider Iraqi civilians as people who might disagree with the war as the same as her students, or those who could seek a better way of improving human rights in their home country along with her students in her project.

In a sense that non-Western people are described as oppressed or powerless objects, both Lucy and Jessica have a thread of connection. While addressing the issue of non-fair trade on a global scale in her project, Jessica also depicted the Third World farmers as the poor and the
oppressed who are struggling under a free trade system. Under the unfair trade system, according to her, corporations in third world countries that are “either non-existing or not wealthy at all” have “no purchasing power to have a say where resources will be allocated” (p. 27), and the people do not have enough money to buy food, go to school, and go to the doctor. In this way, others in the Third World referred to powerless people in both Lucy’s and Jessica’s project. Yet through her research, she found that the Third World farmers have not merely struggled with conventional non-fair trade, but also have had the opportunity to fairly trade their products. Since Jessica believed that these “powerless people can be empowered through advocating of people with power” (p. 29), she actively found ways of empowering the farmers in her lesson plan. Thus, different people in other societies were sometimes described as solidarity partners beyond merely trading partners or oppressed neighbors in her Inquiry #4 Lesson Planning Project.

While Lucy and Jessica focused on the political or economic powerlessness of others, Crystal and Eunice concentrated on the cultural uniqueness of others. First, although Crystal never used the word “global,” her project included global themes since her topic, diverse celebrations/holidays within the U.S., actually originated in or reflects different cultures from other countries. In order to have her students understand cultural values, beliefs, and ideas behind diverse cultural holidays, she discussed diverse holidays such as Kwanzaa, Hanukkah, and Chinese New Year. Those holidays described others as “people who do not celebrate the same holidays as them” (p. 12). For example, when simulating a Hanukkah celebration in her lesson plan, students would discover that Santa Claus is not present anywhere at any time in the celebration. As a result of this project, students would understand the existence of different religions and philosophies consisting of different values, beliefs, and ideas in which diverse cultural celebrations are grounded (p. 16). Similar to Crystal, Eunice helped her students learn
cultural diversity and acceptance in her Lesson Planning Project as well as cultural commonality between different countries through observing different food, clothing, and locations in various versions of the Cinderella folktale (i.e., the modernized American version, the Egyptian, African, Korean, Chinese, Middle Eastern, and Irish versions) and other artifacts of the last five countries. In her project, each culture is depicted as a unique and valuable tradition that students should respect and accept.

In short, student teacher assumptions of global “others” varied considerably from person to person (i.e., trading partners, oppressed neighbors, solidarity partners, or cultural diversifiers). However, student teachers are not always conscious of the existence of others beyond the national boundaries in their projects. For example, Lina, who chose the concept of the multiple communities to which her students belong as her inquiry topic, restricted the conceptual scope of community to family and the city in which the students were living. Although she found that students’ definitions of community were much broader than she expected, such as other states or other countries, Lina did not aim to expand the concept of community to other societies. As in her previous inquiry, her Latino migrant students probably revealed that they felt a sense of belonging to Mexico or other countries. However, she did not intend to expand the concept of community to show her students that there are diverse communities beyond the local and national boundaries to which they can belong. This is seen in the purpose of her project, “I will connect my student’s lives by talking about the community of the city that we all live in” (p. 65) or in her examples of community, such as her family, her town, and her college, in which she depended on a narrow perspective without assuming the existence of other heritages in her students’ background.
The second way to investigate how the Lesson Planning Project represented global connections is associated with their knowledge about the globalized world. In fact, as with the other inquiries, it was only a few student interviewees who assumed the world was an interconnected system. Lots of student teachers considered each society a separate system. For instance, Lucy helped students understand multiple perspectives on the Iraq War through her lesson planning on the basis of belief: “War is sometimes necessary for the progression of human life, and the progression towards equality and human rights” (p. 2). Yet she neither seemed interested in global connections behind the war as a global phenomenon nor focused on global power struggles behind the war between America and the Middle East. Rather, she introduced the diverse lives of the people involved in the war through children’s books to break student stereotypes of “war is bad” and “soldiers represent the war.”

However, some student interviewees provided their students with varying knowledge about the world as a whole system influencing the local community. As one of the goals for the lesson, Eunice took “Identify how customs and traditions from around the world influence the local community” (p. 50). By looking at how the same folktale of Cinderella had been adopted and changed in different countries, Eunice not only revealed how global culture greatly impacts the lives of individuals around the world, but also insinuated how local culture actively accepted other cultures and created different version of cultures. Beyond cultural diversity on a global scale, Crystal highlighted how and why different cultures have collided in the U.S. in her lesson plan. For example, in the same period, many Americans celebrate Christmas, some African Americans reflect their African heritage through celebrating Kwanzaa, but Jewish Americans commemorate the rededication of the holy temple during the celebration of Hanukkah (p. 18). According to her enduring understanding part for the unit concept in her lesson plan, she would
like students to understand that religion and philosophy play an important role in cultural celebrations/holidays (p. 16). In this way, her project showed how competitive cultures based on different values, beliefs, and ideas come into conflict with each other in the global world. Lastly, while dealing with the issue of economic injustice on a global scale and fair trade, Jessica taught about the asymmetrical power structure behind global trade in her lesson plan. This knowledge about the world was explicitly shared in her enduring understanding part.

Essential Questions/Enduring Understandings of Fair Trade (*Theory 1)

How have competing interests within a society viewed resource allocation? (Doing History 5)

- Since corporations in the U.S. have purchasing power, they use their power to allocate resources to the people of the U.S. While corporations in third world countries are either non-existing or not wealthy at all. Thus, they have no purchasing power to have a say where resources will be allocated.

How and why did some societies develop agricultural economies? (Doing History 5)

- Countries located in certain parts of the world are better suited to grow the fruits and vegetables year round.

How have societies with different economic systems included or excluded people/groups from decision making and the allocation of benefits? (Doing History 5)

- Countries like the United State have extreme economic influence over third world countries. Corporations in the U.S. are able to make trade price decisions that provide a large profit for corporations and leave the farmers who produce the food living in poverty.

Is the free trade system a fair trade system? If not, what are some obstacles preventing it from being so?

- Often in a free trade system (one where there are no rules), the poor and oppressed get left behind as the rich and powerful profits.

How does conventional trade perpetuate poverty?

- By not providing farmers a fair exchange for their products and hard work, many farmers around the world cannot afford food, clothing, education, and healthcare. (Inquiry #4 assignment, pp. 27-28).

As stated above, Jessica problematized unequal economic relationships between U.S. food corporations and Third World farmers, which has created and perpetuated the vicious cycle of the rich-get-richer and the poor-get-poorer. In other words, she would teach students the knowledge of the world from the perspective of global inequality between privilege societies and
underprivileged societies through her lesson plan. In this way, the knowledge of global connection was described in various ways, such as global competitiveness, global inequality, and global diversity in their Lesson Planning Project.

Thirdly, the Lesson Planning Project illustrated a global perspective in the various ways of developing specific skills. Since their last inquiry project included diverse group activities, all student interviewees tried to develop collaborative and cooperative skills. However, it does not seem directly connected to global perspectives, in that those skills are not necessarily needed to communicate with diverse people who are different from the student’s background or to solve urgent global problems. Rather, global skills consisted of special meanings of critical thinking, problem-solving, and cross-cultural skills.

With regards to a global perspective, some lesson planning projects defined critical thinking skills as “triplized skill,” meaning the ability to see flexible and dynamic interactions among global structures, local people, and individual needs. For instance, Eunice tried to have her students see how other cultures were tied together beyond national borders through different national versions of the same Cinderella folktale. As a result, students could develop the ability to connect the global connection to the folktales in their own lives and, at the same time, the ability to connect diversity within the classroom (local) to the rich cultural diversity of the world (global) (p. 53). Jessica appreciated critical thinking skills that connect global to local and hoped to help students develop the ability to “link the idea of fair trade with other countries to the same crisis local farmers are facing” (p. 25) through her Lesson Planning Project. In addition, Jessica tried to develop “problem-solving skills” while brainstorming various action plans with students to support fair trade in their daily life. In connection with triplized skills, problem-solving skills require an ability to situate local problems such as homelessness and hunger in a global context.
Based on critical thinking skills, students could develop problem-solving strategies for linking local activist work (i.e., local stores that sell fair trade products) with global fair trade movement, and working through coalitions and networks at the global, regional, and national levels.

From a global perspective, some student teachers tried to develop another global skill, multicultural literacy or cross-cultural skills. For them, cross-cultural skills meant the ability to see one’s world from multiple and conflicting perspectives of culturally specific groups, such as non-mainstream, non-American, non-Western, and non-elite. For example, Nicole developed the ability to see historical events from both mainstream and marginalized groups by reading a story book describing Native Americans as bad people and showing a picture of what Native Americans had to go through, which involved brutal beatings and being taken away from their homes (first interview, p. 11). The objective of Lucy’s Lesson Planning Project is to cultivate an ability to understand multiple perspectives, such as those of Iraqi civilians, refugees, and U.S. soldiers and their family. Through cross-cultural skills, students could get new perspectives beyond looking upon the world in terms of a dichotomy between good and evil and could see the needs of different people. While understanding multiple perspectives behind cultural holidays, Crystal built up her student’s cross-cultural skills. For instance, by discussing why some people don’t celebrate any cultural holidays and others celebrate more than one, or only one from their own culture, students could recognize the diverse religious and philosophical origins of cultural celebrations and understand others in depth rather than just looking for good guys and bad guys (p. 15).

Lastly, the Lesson Planning Project is a good way to see an action-based approach to global education in terms of how it impacts life inside and outside of school. Somebody might say that it just shows the potential of action, since this inquiry is just an ideal project and student
teachers did not implement their last inquiry project in student teaching classrooms. When looking at student interviewees, we see that some actually taught their Inquiry #4 Projects (i.e., Crystal, Sam, and Nicole). In addition, the Lesson Planning Project is an action-based inquiry in the sense that creating a lesson plan became an effective way of having an influence on student lives both inside and outside of school. Especially, the last part of the lesson among the three-parts of the lesson, or the summative assessment, included diverse inquiries conducted by children themselves as well as various action plans such as writing a letter and creating a website in order to advocate for what they learned. For this reason, this inquiry would be a good means of seeing how students themselves influence the world inside and outside school, as well as what kind of citizen roles preservice teachers assume for their students.

In my opinion, Jessica’s lesson plan was the representative case that considered students as future citizens and performing a role as a social reformer. She started her part three lesson plan from a question, “Did you know that you have the ability to help fight against world poverty?” (p. 36) and let students make their own choices to support fair trading by using their purchasing power. Looking at action plans for advocating Fair Trade products (i.e., buy fair trade products, be a conscientious consumer, talk about fair trade with friends and family, promote fair trade through community events, p. 26), she seems to have an image of active citizen who applies their knowledge and skills to challenge unequal power structures that perpetuate oppressive social orders. To do so, the process of taking action in Jessica’s lesson plan might let students know their future is not closed, but depends on their choice.

However, more student teachers probably assumed “community builder” for their student’s present and future role, in that they connect all other people in order to create school, local, and/or global communities. In the summative assessment part, Crystal planned for students
to create their own holiday that included all their classroom cultures as a way of appreciating their own and other cultures (p. 11). Her action-based summative assessment would directly change the classroom circumstance in more inclusive ways, and, at the same time, would contribute to helping students create schools or local community/communities that appreciate other people’s cultures and expect and solve cultural conflicts later. Although she did not mention what kind of specific action plans she expects, Lucy planned to make action plans that students can take to support both U.S. troops and the civilians living through the war, yet to also end the war (p. 7). These action plans seemed to suggest her hope that her students would become global citizens who cross national boundaries and seek a more common humanity. As another means of summative assessment, Eunice suggested a plan communicating with a pen pal who lives in other society. Through the action, students will apply what they learned about a country/culture and also share things about their own culture with their pen pal (p. 57). Eunice also implied an active citizen’s role that creates a bigger community by understanding global diversity and participating in the global community.

In short, the Inquiry #4 Lesson Planning Project disclosed student teachers’ diverse assumptions and knowledge about the globalized world and other people as well as global skills and a citizen’s role. As it included diverse knowledge, skills, and actions from global perspectives, preservice teachers utilized various resources to teach/develop their students. Although most of the student interviewees used children’s books as their main teaching materials, some students took advantage of the local community by inviting community members and their student’s families to explain their different cultural traditions and the cultural meanings behind them (Crystal), or invited local business owners who have different philosophies in order to show why some are fair trade and some are not (Jessica). Also, they
often used online resources, such as the Global Exchange website and the World Fair Trade Organization Website, for those students who wished to delve further into their topics (Jessica), or they looked for online lessons that relate to culture and gathered online information on different folktales that students would read (Eunice).

However, it was difficult to find cases that actually used various student experiences as their teaching resource. The only example of student interviewees showing that they were actively using students’ experiences was found in Eunice’s case. Eunice planned to ask her students to bring “something special to them that represents one aspect of their culture” such as “a picture of a traditional food they like, a traditional article of clothing, and religious symbol, etc” (p. 53). This lack of awareness about their students’ diverse experiences is associated with their ways of including diverse students in their classroom. Ironically, Inquiry #4 needed more awareness of diverse students in the project requirements—e.g., varying class compositions (Inquiry #4 instruction, p. 2). Nonetheless, few student teachers actively incorporated international/immigrant student experiences of their home countries into their lesson plans. For example, when Crystal asked students to share stories of their celebrations at home, it was not clear whom she asked to share. If her goal were understanding diverse cultures, she might have asked specific children, such as Mexican or Chinese students. Also, when she chose to address diverse holidays in her lesson plan, she might have to select a Mexican holiday if she intended to use the cultural background of the students in the classroom (p. 49). In other words, even though student teachers recognized the diverse cultural composition of their students, they were not conscious of the ways to actively involve their cultural backgrounds as teaching resources.

Unfortunately, the above Inquiry #4 projects were mostly not implemented in their practicum classrooms. Even though Eunice planned to teach her project in a second grade social
studies class that was integrated with language arts (Inquiry #4 assignment, p. 51) and she had a chance to teach fairy tales, it was hard to teach something totally new, such as her Cinderella lesson plan (first interview, p. 7). Crystal taught part of her lesson plan after reducing its focus from holidays/celebration to Thanksgiving (first interview, p. 12). Sam could teach what he wanted to teach from his Holocaust lesson plan after the I-SAT text was over (first interview, p. 14). Actually, every student interviewee informed me that they were teaching in a practicum atmosphere in which it was extremely difficult to teach global topics. In order to examine the reason(s), it is necessary to look at student teaching classrooms more carefully.

In conclusion, while addressing four areas – class objectives, pedagogical strategies to teach global perspectives, weekly/book-club readings and discussions, and social inquiry project – this section revealed that (1) Global education was taught as a kind of perspective rather than explicit topics or foci and as part of a few topics or examples familiar and relevant to student teachers; (2) Reading reflections showed the deficiency of student teachers’ learning about globally interconnected world and about students’ role as a global citizen in weekly reading and book-club discussion; (3) Lastly, most inquiry projects also revealed the lack of expanded and deepened understanding of community, cultural borders, student’s backgrounds, and teaching concepts. Although depending on the social inquiry project such as Inquiry #4 and its broadened conceptual framework, some student teachers explicitly dealt with knowledge of the globalized world and others concepts, such as skills and a citizen’s role in the global era. These findings showed the tension between ‘explicit contents’ and ‘inexplicit perspectives and examples’ in a packed social studies curriculum guided by “set readings” and a “set curriculum.” In addition, this section revealed the tension between ‘manageable knowledge’ and ‘expanded knowledge’
based on the focus of the pedagogical knowledge. These tensions are discussed in the conclusion chapter in more detailed ways.

**Identity and Representation of Preservice Teachers**

Student teachers experienced tensions and conflicts during not only preservice social studies class, but also during their own social studies classes when they represented the global perspectives. Those tensions and conflicts often limited the incorporation of global topics/issues into their student teaching classrooms, but student teachers also sometimes showed potential for learning to resolve the tensions and conflicts. Therefore, this section addresses what kinds of tensions and conflicts preservice teachers experienced and how they represented global perspectives in their practicum practices. In doing so, this section first investigates the global characteristics of their student teaching classrooms and how they defined this globalized and diversified classroom. Along with the existence of a standardized curriculum and high-stakes testing, the next part addresses the ways that they identified themselves as a preservice teacher. The last section focuses on the ways that they represent their broadened perspectives through their social studies class in their student teaching classrooms. First of all, in order to see what kind of diversity student teachers experienced in their practicum sites, it is necessary to examine their practicum schools and the student composition in both the fall and spring semesters.
Table 5

*Student Interviews’ Practicum Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Interviewees</th>
<th>Practicum School (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Sunnyvale elementary (5th)</td>
<td>2 Asian Americans (1 Korean, 1 Indian), 11 African Americans, 9 Caucasians, 1 Mexican</td>
<td>Sunnyvale elementary (2nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>Sonora elementary (2nd)</td>
<td>2 Mexicans (1 ELL), 3 Chinese (1 ELL), 5 African Americans, 11 Caucasians</td>
<td>Sunnyvale elementary (1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Roseville middle (7-8th)</td>
<td>100% Caucasian</td>
<td>Suburb Chicago elementary (4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Oakhills elementary (4th)</td>
<td>Some Latino (migrant), equal number of Caucasians and African Americans</td>
<td>Greenville elementary (2nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Oakhills elementary (K)</td>
<td>2 Mexican Americans Caucasians African Americans</td>
<td>Sunnyvale middle (7-8th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (2)</td>
<td>Eunice Lusby elementary (5th)</td>
<td>100% Caucasian</td>
<td>Sunnyvale elementary (2nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Riverside elementary (K)</td>
<td>100% Caucasian</td>
<td>Pearl elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American (1)</td>
<td>Sam Sunnyvale middle (8th)</td>
<td>50% Caucasian 15% Hispanic and African American 20% Asian</td>
<td>Greenville elementary (4th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Globalized classroom.** As seen in Table 5, preservice teachers experienced both homogeneous and diverse classrooms during their practicum period. For instance, Esther, Jessica, Eunice, and Nicole were teaching in a mostly homogeneous class where there were only
Caucasian students for their fall semester placement. The degree of homogeneity that student teachers felt could clearly be seen in Esther’s interview.

Last semester, they were in rural in Illinois. They were all exactly the same. There was no diversity. 100% Caucasian and 100% they went to the same church or the same two churches. They’ve all been in the same town since 1700s. They are all the same. My teacher was really excited that I was a Jewish because she said I can bring diversity to the school. And I sort of giggled to myself because I am not minority. Like I don’t count as a minority, I don’t get financial aid for being a minority and I am not a minority, you know. But for these students, I was a minority. I had dark curly hair (laugh). They were all black. (Esther, second interview, p. 25).

Regarding the socioeconomic status of this racially homogenous town, student teachers also assumed that almost all their students came from similar family backgrounds of low-middle income households, except for the poor migrant worker families. Many student teachers who taught in this racially and economically homogeneous classroom critically interpreted this uniformity as a school environment where their students were experiencing narrow-mindedness. For that reason, some preservice teachers, such as Nicole and Eunice, tried to bring their personal experiences as Koreans into their classroom. However, in contrast to their assumption, student teachers sometimes experienced global diversity even in such a homogeneous classroom.

After I did that [Inquiry #2 Crossing Borders Project], I started asking them questions about “what do you know about other cultures?” and they all told me “My dad travels around in Japan.” One of them said “My dad is right now in Germany.” You sort of think of these kids very like not worldly because they all… that’s also how they act. They sort of act they don’t know anything besides this town, but a lot of them did. I was really impressed how well traveled they were. They were probably well traveled than I was in 8th grade. We went to Florida every year and we didn’t go anywhere for fun, and I never went outside of country. But these kids, their parents really made these efforts. They said “our vacation will go to somewhere different. We will go abroad because you don’t have exposure to any other cultures.” And I was really impressed. I definitely wouldn’t ask those questions if I hadn’t experienced the crossing borders. (Esther, first interview, p. 12).

Her students seemingly all looked the same without any travel experience. But Esther was amazed by her students’ diverse experiences provided by their parents. In this way, if student
teachers can open their eyes to see the influence of globalization, even in their homogeneous classrooms, their students might be ready to share and bring something new and something valuable to the classroom. Unfortunately, most student teachers focused more on the uniformity than the diversity of their students.

However, Table 5 reveals another characteristic of the student teaching setting, which is that it is pretty globalized. Almost all of the student interviewees were placed in racially and globally diverse classrooms. Of course, immigrant or international students represented by English Language Learners (ELL) were not a majority in their classrooms. However, at least for one semester, all students taught in a classroom that included diverse ethnic groups, or, in many cases, they had a certain number of ELL students. In their globalized classroom, student teachers became more sensitive to the different kinds of diversity that their students showed. These encounters with immigrant and second-generation students gave student teachers a deeper understanding about linguistic differences and economic differences among immigrant or second generation students.

Interviewer: I heard you had Korean, Indian, and Hispanic students last semester.

Lucy: Their parents are immigrants, but I believe they were born in here and they speak, all three of students, speak English as their first language. Comparing two students that I have in this room that are immigrant students, they both know English pretty well and they are successful in school, which is wonderful. But the difference is that these students have accents still. That’s pretty significant with their peers, especially in this second grade. The students that I had in fifth grade [last semester]...it seems like their parents wanted them to have this wonderful education, so they came here [the US] for that and they were very good students and working hard toward grades and education. Whereas two students I have here are not necessarily motivated.

Interviewer: Where are they from?

Lucy: One student is from Vietnam and the other is from Mexico. That’s been interested, too, because she speaks Mexican Spanish and the student in fifth grade, his father is from Spain, so he speaks the European kind of Spanish. It is amazingly
different. Even that small difference, it’s really significant. They are able to go, you know, he travels Spain like twice a year to visit family over there. But these students, they can’t do that. (Lucy, second interview, pp. 22-23).

Lucy had been placed in diverse classrooms in both the fall and spring semester and there she met second generation students and immigrant students, respectively. Student teachers usually distinguished immigrant students from second or third generation students from immigrant families through their English fluency, yet Lucy came to know more than their linguistic differences, such as different educational motivations and different economic resources they possessed. With regards to cultural differences, some preservice teachers might feel more comfortable with “Americanized” second or third generation students and consider cultural differences as difficulties or barriers that they should resolve. On the contrary, other student teachers seemed to regard the differences as a resource that immigrant students or students from immigrant families could bring to other students.

Having immigrants or international students in their classroom often caused difficulties for student teachers. In many cases, the difficulties seemed to result from a language barrier and cultural unfamiliarity. For example, Eunice had been struggling with a Nigerian student since communicating with him was difficult.

Korean students were okay because I speak Korean. The Vietnamese was okay because she was pretty good in English. The most difficult was the boy from Nigeria. He’s very quiet and he had kind a behavioral issues and it was hard for communicate. I think he understand more than he pretends to know. He tried to use language barrier as a way to get away with things. So he pretends he doesn’t understand but I think he really does. In terms of language barrier, it was hard because Nigeria has very strong cultures. Even the cultural differences were kind of hard to get. What really helped us to try to connect with is what he is familiar with. Even like when we were reading a book and talked about like “Oh, is that a way you were doing in Nigeria? How is it different from Nigeria?” He’s really passionate about where he is from. So that kind of spot interested in him and got him talking more. (Eunice, second interview, p. 12).
Eunice was familiar with the Korean culture and language since she herself is a second generation student from a Korean immigrant family. Thus, she was very confident in teaching Korean immigrant or international students. Vietnamese students were not too hard to teach because she considered Asian culture “kind of ‘respect’ culture” (second interview, p. 13). Yet, Nigerian culture was something totally new and hard for her to understand. She recognized it as a “very strong culture,” which is “more straightforward” and having “a lot of pride for where they are from,” and that the ways they interact with others is really different (second interview, p. 12). For this reason, the meaning of the global classroom seemed to be a difficult situation that required more energy and time in order to make a connection between the American curriculum and their own experiences in their own countries. Lucy had a similar communication problem with a Vietnamese immigrant student that embarrassed her:

I see more cultural differences with him [Vietnamese student] because he gets upset about things that sometimes I don’t understand why he gets upset. So then later we talked about it. For example, one day he forgot his homework to bring. Students forget their homework all the times, and I said “Oh, it’s okay. Bring it tomorrow. No problem.” but he really insisted upon calling his dad having his day bring his home to school. And I said “No, you don’t need to. Bring it tomorrow.” Because I told him “No. Don’t call your dad and bring it,” he started crying and crying. And I asked him about it later, he said “I have to have homework here. It’s not okay. My dad tells me that’s just how it is, have to be here. That’s what expected of me.” Even though I was tell him something different, that’s still his perception and his mind pattern. (Lucy, second interview, p. 23).

The above situation showed how an unknown culture challenged student teachers since it required Lucy to have the extra energy to understand a different culture along with her efforts to become familiar with the school circumstance as a preservice teacher. However, since she still did not understand the culture, the cultural differences remained a difficulty. Recognizing an unknown culture as a difficulty might lead student teachers to a stereotype. For example, Eunice might consider Nigerians a peculiar ethnic group who are too prideful of their culture to communicate with others, rather than regard them as people who highly value their cultural
uniqueness in the U.S. Lucy also might create a stereotype about Vietnamese students as those who are only concerned about their grade and staying within their teacher’s favor, rather than understand the respect their culture holds for elders such as teachers and parents.

At the same time, having an immigrant or international student in their classroom meant having a valuable resource for preservice teachers. Interestingly, almost all of them preferred a diverse school community for their future teaching site. The main reason could be guessed from Esther’s answer.

Ideally, I want to work in a very similar place that I student-taught. So pretty diverse, maybe little bit more diverse than this, but like a place that lots of different cultures, there is sort more of mixing pot, but there are still resources. It pains me when I am in a classroom and we have one textbook for the whole class. … I had a student whose father was an immigrant and he came in to talk about being an immigrant. You can’t do that if you were in a classroom where everybody is exactly the same. (Esther, second interview, p. 30).

The reason that student interviewees hope to teach in a school that included a diversity of students is because they believed that this diversity brings many resources and benefits to their future classroom. Indeed, some student teachers experience cultural differences as something valuable, not only for immigrant students but also for other students in their practicum period.

Crystal met an Indian boy in her spring practicum, who just returned from his father’s long sabbatical travel to India.

Yes, he left right before Christmas break started and then he came back in February, I think. So he missed month of school, but I met him when he got back because I was here last semester. So for my first month of student teaching, he wasn’t here. But when he got back, it was awesome to talk about his experiences….He talked about trains a lot. He’s really into that. And he talked about the food like… I guess he traveled a lot. He talked about how he woke up every day and they hang out there little bit and go somewhere else. He didn’t have specific details about India. He’s maybe not able to share. But just whole experience was going somewhere else and seeing trains. It doesn’t look like the train you have here. … Just overall he shared. He raised his hand one day we read about trains and he was like “Trains in India are like this” just little stories he shared. (Crystal, second interview, p. 19).
Crystal remembered that her other 1st graders were all interested in learning about his
teaching experience (p. 19). She believed that this cultural diversity could teach other students about the
existence of other cultures and expand their cultural boundaries. Also, as the boy shared his
teaching experience without the teacher’s request, this kind of sharing time made immigrant children
actively involved in the classroom. Lucy was also surprised that her Vietnamese student, who
was a little further behind in his written language, showed interest in her second grade language
art class after making a connection between a cursive letter and his mother’s tongue when they
were writing the cursive letter ‘t’ (second interview, p. 23). Beyond helping immigrant students,
cultural differences are regarded by Lucy as a benefit that all students take advantage of.

It’s much easier in this classroom than in other classrooms I’ve been in because there
already is diversity here. As in other classrooms, we’re just really talking about someone
else but we don’t know who, you know. But here we can talk about specific people and
where they come from and what values their families have. So it’s easier because it’s so
much more personal to them. (Lucy, first interview, p. 8).

The school she grew up in did not address racial issues and global issues, so she learned
about abstract concepts without any personal meaning. However, she believed that “they [her
students in diverse classroom] have a lot more chance to make a different society because they
actually understand the issues that are faced in our society.” (second interview, p. 25). In this
way, student teachers were meeting their students’ different interpretations on cultural
differences at their first teaching site.

**Competing identities as a preservice teacher.** When I talked to student interviewees, it
was interesting to see that student teachers sometimes showed contrasting attitudes towards
teaching global topics. Some students believed they could teach global issues in their practicum
class; other students considered it an impossible task. Sometimes, mixed attitudes were found in
the same student’s answer. Basically, those competing attitudes resulted from how they defined their student teaching setting, which led preservice teachers to three different identities.

Most student interviewees defined their student teaching setting as a predetermined place that they cannot change and to which they cannot bring diverse topics and pedagogy. First of all, this definition was woven into their interpretation of the set curriculum and standardized tests. Lucy believed that she had no choice in teaching more than the given curriculum.

They literally have curriculum for every subject, so we have a math teaching manual, we have a reading teaching manual, and science teaching manual and social studies…you know, every single subject to include. Even Read Aloud, like we read picture books to our kids, there is a manual for which books to read aloud and what to say before and after you read. You know every tiny, tiny moment of every day, you know, we’ve got manual for. And this district has a curriculum map and they literally tell you what lesson you’re supposed to be on for that day. You know, there is a little bit of flexibility but if you are more than a week off, that’s that…, you know. And we turn in, I turn in all of my lesson plans to the principal even though I am just a student teacher and my teacher that I work with turns in all of her lesson plans, so the principal can make sure that they were following the guideline that they’re given. (Lucy, first interview, p. 15).

According to her, the standardized curriculum is really structuring both her and her cooperating teacher’s daily teaching patterns. This fixed curriculum is implemented exactly as it is under the supervision of a principal. In that situation, student teachers cannot imagine bringing global topics into their classrooms. This structured curriculum is also intimately connected to test-driven instruction, according to Esther.

It’s a lot test-based. You have to have this test after this time. So, if you off course and you have your own thing, you still have to go back and teach the materials that everyone else is teaching while you are varying off the course, you have to have the test at the same time everyone else does. … My teacher couple of times said “we don’t need to teach this lesson. It’s not gonna be tested.” Absolutely it is very test-based. It is because, you know, you want to make sure your teaching is the same as everyone else in the U.S…. It is kind of sad. But there are still fun things you can do, but you have to have your students knowing the same concepts as everyone else. Well, sometimes my cooperating teacher would integrate other things into the curriculum but she said “Now we have to catch up.” and there will be like a very stressful week or two weeks. (Esther, second interview, pp. 17-18).
Esther interpreted the school environment as a place really driven by standardized tests, which is aligned with creating a standardized curriculum throughout the country in order to “have your students knowing the same concepts as everyone else.” The more she thought the standardized test was continuously forming the structured teaching pattern, the more she defined her school as a closed place, where there is no room to try to teach more than what is in the textbook. Of course, it does not matter if it includes global issues. Yet, as she explained again: “In 4th through 8th the only social studies they learn is the U.S. Nothing is global. So if you do global, you have to work it in and you also have to catch up what time you miss for everything else.” (Esther, second interview, p. 17).

In addition, some student teachers believed that the close-minded school culture kept them from incorporating global issues. Esther saw tensions between teachers regarding different ways of teaching in her student teaching school, especially when her cooperating teacher “gets a lot of groaning from a lot of other teachers” after teaching her students about different cultural backgrounds (second interview, pp 18). She found that disagreement comes from team-based and senior-teacher-led school culture.

What happens in most school I’ve been in is you worked on a team, so the whole team of teachers decided we are going to teach this week, this idea, this week we are going to teach this idea. If you are working with teachers who have been teaching for 30-40 years, they know how they want to teach it. They’ve done it same way for a long time. They have certain things they do to make more fun and make interested whatever, but not as open for new ideas. (Esther, second interview, p. 17).

This idea of senior-teacher-led school culture had Esther define school as an unfavorable place for new ideas. Under this exclusive school culture, she might have a fixed identity as a preservice teacher when she said, “I am not gonna tell them I am changing curriculum now. I am a student teacher, I have no power. Even as a first or second year teacher, I am gonna have no
power.” (second interview, p. 15). Sam pointed out another close-minded school culture, which is “historically donominated by white women.”

A lot of...education is historically donominated by White women. So, like their perspective takes up large part of the ultimate product, which is students when they live 12 grades, so the mentality that their students have when they leave, to certain degree, you can contribute to general white perspectives. I am not an official teacher, but even student teaching, I can tell just how other teachers, my cooperating teacher, how she respond to certain questions. It’s not really significant. I feel like a lot of issues we brought up …. I don’t know, people are really close-minded and a lot of teacher from what I’ve experienced, they have old traditional view, I guess, in terms of how students should learn and what they should be learning like the story of Christopher Columbus, what happened there, what they do for Native American was just great. It may be great for the European people. (Sam, first interview, p. 19).

In Sam’s point of view, the white-female-teacher-dominated school culture has continuously perpetuated white perspectives, not merely within the official curriculum, but also with their ways of interacting with students. He believed that their old traditional views have taught teaching topics, as opposed to teaching what actually happened and the truth (p. 20). For this male black student teacher, his definition of school as this close-minded place might result in another fixed identity as a male preservice teacher.

Lastly, a lot of student interviewees interpreted school as a place where they cannot teach what they want based on their concern about conflicts with parents and administrators. This is because they recognized parents and administrators as conservative stakeholders who have very narrow perspectives. Indeed, all student interviewees brought up the opposition with parents and principals as a main obstacle of global education. For example, when she taught the Great Depression from a broader perspective, by describing a communistic solution to economic recession, Lucy was really nervous about the parents because, “they could be someone who would be really angry that I was presenting communism in a positive way.” (first interview, p. 12). Another interesting reason that student teachers worried about disagreements with parents is
because they assumed that a global perspective is basically a controversial topic. For example, Esther believed that “if you’re developing something that isn’t from a textbook, there is more room for criticism…more room for for teachers or parents or administrators or anyone to say why do you think it is important” (second interview, p. 31).

However, some student teachers interpreted their student teaching circumstance as a flexible place in which they could teach global issues. Eunice also recognized the set curriculum and limits of time and energy as obstacles for global education. However, she believed that global perspectives still can be incorporated in some way (first interview, p. 9).

Even if it is not in the curriculum, just exposing to literature, maybe connecting what other students within the classroom and having them show their own experiences, bring them my own experiences, show them how much that affected my life. I think making relevant to the students in that way, maybe showing them pictures, video clips like different cultures. Even if it is not in the curriculum setting, it is not taking that long like reading a book. Maybe like once a week, showing them different cultures, something like that. (Eunice, second interview, p. 17).

As seen in the above interview, Eunice had a very flexible identity, even as a teacher candidate, because she saw many opportunities to teach global issues when she was student teaching. That is because she thought that having an impact on her students was the reason for teaching, and considered teaching global education as a way of impacting her students (Eunice, second interview, p. 11). Sometimes, student teachers focused on the potential of school as an open place by learning how to negotiate with principals or parents. Esther was a student who had a pretty fixed image of school that she cannot change. Yet, her student teaching experience gave her an opportunity to see school as negotiable place.

If I get a curriculum next year, it says you do this, you do this, you do this. I am gonna do like that. It will probably take me two or three years before I feel more comfortable saying to my principle “Can I modify this in this way? I am still reaching the same objectives and my kids are still gonna be testing the same and they’re still learning the same thing. It is more… I feel more comfortable learning. I feel more comfortable teaching this way.” So luckily, my principal in my school was amazing. She said
“whatever you need to do, as long as kids test well, I don’t care. As long as they learn, the key concepts they are supposed to learn, I really don’t care how you teach to them. But you still have to read the story and you still have to seriously take formula. But if you modify it little bit, that’s okay. You can play with little. You can’t completely throw out this story, but you can play little, though.” So that was nice. (Esther, second interview, p. 19).

Esther saw both limitations and the potential to incorporate new ideas and new ways of pedagogy in her practicum site. For her, school is both a close space and an open space. She learned negotiation skills to make a closed school an open space from her relationship with the principal in her practicum site. Crystal also did not want to teach a controversial issue, but she seemed ready to negotiate with her future parents.

Unless there is a controversial topic, I don’t see any parents concern, but I don’t know, may explain if I was more free to choose what I am teaching, explaining this is what I am teaching and why I’m teaching in this way. It probably will be challenging, especially for someone who hasn’t felt same importance towards the issues. (Crystal, second interview, p. 22).

She actually did not face any conflicts with parents when she taught multiple perspectives surrounding Thanksgiving. The reason why she could try to teach those diverse viewpoints might be because she assumed that not every global topic is controversial, and teachers have the freedom to choose what they want. In short, student teachers have two different identities as preservice teachers, which are deeply interconnected with the social and cultural circumstance of schooling.

**Two different representations.** As student teachers acquired different identities through their clinical experience, the ways that they taught were not the same. Student interviewees sometimes repeated “set curriculum” and reinforced U.S.-centeredness within their curriculum. However, if they found a hybrid space to incorporate global topics or perspectives, or had an opportunity to create them, they tried to overcome U.S.-centeredness in various ways.
Repeating set curriculum and white perspectives. As mentioned in the previous section, preservice teachers had a pretty fixed image of schooling due to the standardized curriculum and standardized tests. In reality, it was more than curriculum and tests because even the teaching methods are also standardized. As with Esther, many student teachers probably had been following the given pedagogy below, during every student teaching day.

Especially for literacy, we have a specific story we have to teach each week. I need to teach it in a very specific way. The first day, you read the story aloud and you asked specific questions that are in the book. The second day, you play it through tape and you ask that there are certain questions and certain work sheets you go through. The third day, you started to guide reading groups and during guiding reading groups, there is a choice chart. And in the choice chart, we give our kids like 9 different things, but we ended up adding three more because they were getting bored and not paying attention. So that was nice because we have those extra three so that we can make fun and more exciting things. But really the only way that we had with it was choice charts and that’s not for class. So it’s not something that I am working with them on. It is completely independent work. I don’t even really see half of the things that they do. You know you can never really gaze what you students gain and they aren’t. (Esther, second interview, p. 18).

Structured teaching methods were specified, such as read aloud for the first day, play a tape and use work sheets for the second day, guided reading groups and giving a choice chart for the third day during language arts hour. Even though Esther knew that this standardized pedagogy was unlikely to excite her students, she was following this given method as were her cooperating teacher and other student teachers. Unfortunately, this given pedagogy substituted for the student teachers’ creative ways of teaching in their Inquiry #4 Lesson Planning Projects, such as having a holiday simulation by inviting community members (p. 19) and having a fair trade simulation by using a “Fair/Not Fair” scenario sheet and a “Need Cards” (pp. 32-36).

In addition, most of the student interviewees followed the existing standardized curriculum with no doubt as to their requirements. Therefore, many student teachers talked about the lack of time to cover all curricula, yet few student teachers realized that it depended on the priority of the school district, the school itself, or the teachers, and that they could challenge
what they were teaching. For example, Eunice taught an American Revolution unit for three weeks every day for 30 minutes (second interview, p. 14), which was a considerable amount of time. The time line included fighting for freedom, monarchy, democracy, and, at the end, immigrants, detailing the groups that came to the U.S. Therefore, the main focus was on how the United States as a country was established. In particular, I was interested in how student teachers teach about immigrants because they had learned about immigrant issues and different perspectives throughout the fall semester. However, Eunice, one of the students who addressed many valid points in her reading reflections, also taught this unit as given by the Sunnyvale (pseudonym) School District.

Eunice: The Sunnyvale District has set curriculum, but we were able to change. So we just generally talked about the types of immigrants. We didn’t go to some specific due to at the end…Yeah, we didn’t talk about specific because we were running out of time back then, but when we read a book that talked about what types of immigrants came, like Irish people came from because of their famine. People from Europe all over and why they came and how you feel. We talked a lot about how they feel.

Interviewer: Did you teach any other groups like Asian?

Eunice: I think the focus was on the more European because that’s very first way of immigration. That’s why not that many Asian…I feel like Chinese came little bit later and Mexican maybe came…Yeah we just focused on a lot of the European immigrants. (Eunice, second interview, pp. 14-15).

She believed that the rationale of this immigrant section of mainly dealing with European immigration history is based on an “objective” criterion that they came to the U.S. first. By accepting this time-line-based curriculum, she might perpetuate white privilege and her students might lose the chance to hear stories and perspectives of non-white ethnic groups. Student teachers were following not merely a standardized curriculum but also an official knowledge system. Eunice showed how student teachers only followed the explicit curriculum depending on the official knowledge system without questioning it.
Well, this social studies is more focusing on the U.S., how we became United States. If we guide them to more how the U.S. developed other countries and all the immigrants coming in, then I covered them with more global issues with that. But the curriculum was more set on American Revolution like what happened within America. At that time, that wasn’t that much diversity, so I didn’t include that much about global issues. (Eunice, second interview, p. 15).

Like Eunice, many student interviewees justified why they could not teach broader issues and perspectives based on the above U.S.-focused curriculum, which they believed they were supposed to do as a preservice teacher. However, few students actually reflected this official knowledge from a critical perspective and deliberated on the existence and meaning of a null curriculum behind the explicit curriculum.

**Finding/Creating hybrid space.** Although repeating the standardized curriculum was the dominant way of student teaching, some student teachers found or created a hybrid space where they could teach both existing curriculum topics and global topics. In many cases, finding/creating hybrid space started from observing how their cooperating teachers found those spaces. Their teachers used “reading time for kids” (Esther, second interview, p. 29) or “times for magazine for kids” (Nicole, first interview, p. 15). Esther learned how to discover a hybrid space and time while she worked to have a story about global issues during the time allotted for magazines in her practicum period.

In our literacy block, one of the choice squares was always reading time for kids and filling out a worksheet they came with time for kid’s magazine about it. And my teacher and I made an effort to always have the one (pause) there’s always a story about global issues and that was always the one we chose because they really don’t get a lot of like Haiti or like when all those things happened. We don’t talk about them in class because we don’t have time, so we did it through time for kids. (Esther, second interview, p. 29).

Also, some student teachers seized chances. For example, Sam tried to make a connection across time and place when he taught his Holocaust unit. By connecting the Holocaust unit to the American Revolution unit, he tried to teach students three points: “‘what happened’ from Jewish
perspectives,” “there are a lot of groups of people that were persecuted in history,” and “know your own different perspective” (first interview, p. 15). He was able to lead students to a deeper connection regarding discrimination issues and to help them experience different voices because he tried to tie two separate historical events that are already being taught in the given curriculum. In addition, the more important reason was because he taught this lesson plan after the I-SAT test, when he did not have to follow Illinois learning standards and when he had time to teach whatever he wanted to teach (Sam, first interview, p. 14).

While the above student teachers found an available time outside class to teach global topics, other student teachers more actively created a hybrid space within class. Esther created another mixed space that connected the concept of “fish” in the textbook to new concepts such as “water” and “ocean” as well as to students’ daily life in Chicago. In particular, by introducing a foreign fish from China, she showed the global system based on water and ocean. It was impressive that she made this global connectedness in the existing social studies class.

We learned about Great Lakes and how they are connected to different water ways in the U.S. so that they can travel and then talked about basis fish. When you connect things, you also let animals travel. Lake is not an empty body water, has animals, you know environment in it. You connect them this is what happens and then we talked about three different basis fishes. We talked about the Asian Carp, which is a big concern now because they actually want people to cut off the Chicago River because they’re afraid of Asian Capt is gonna come into Lake Michigan and kill off everything and completely demolish. It’s big deal now only in Chicago area, so all my kids were really excited “Oh I heard about that. My parents are talking about that.” One of my kids is actually very low. She really doesn’t have a lot of backgrounds to connect certain things to. But she was really into it. Next day she brought in three or four books from library. She was really intense and really cute. And the other one was one in the book. It was really stupid, but we had to at least talk about it, if I was going to connect to the book. And the last one, we talked about (pause) I forgot they are called (pause) the shells like clam but not…they are really intense and they multiply crazy. Actually came from, I believe, actually from China area. I forgot, they were like really small pond area and somebody made a canal to the ocean and they multiply crazy. Not there, everywhere. They are really intense to take over the bottom of ships. You know talking about how animals travel really helped my kids understand when you connect the water way, it is not just connecting a water way. (Esther, second interview, pp. 19-20).
This hybrid teaching style revealed its effectiveness even for high stake testing since “they [her students] actually did really, really well part of the test because they had this extra knowledge” (p. 20). In this way, she did not give students a standardized concept, but higher standards to understand the concept of fish. She learned different teaching styles could be more effective through this experience. Another way of creating a hybrid space within class was through bringing the students’ global experiences into the diverse classroom. Eunice, in her class, asked her immigrant students to share their personal experiences in their home countries.

So I had a lot of Korean students and we read books about Korea and asked them to share about their personal experiences because that makes more relevant to all students cause someone that their classmate actually experienced. There’s a student from Nigeria. I tried to have him talk about his own experiences there and through that, our students are more culturally aware of things outside of the U.S. So it is like trying to give them more perspectives. …It really helped me to see a different side of teaching itself, how much impact we can make. So even like familiarizing them with things outside of what they were used to, like exposing them to different (pause) like learning what they go up through connecting that into the classroom like global issues and having them more aware of things going on outside of our bubble like comfort zone, even like exposing them to current issues about how other people live outside of the U.S. I think it helped them to see world global perspectives, like bigger picture of education. (Eunice, first interview, p. 10).

Through showcasing the students’ own experiences, Eunice realized a “different side of teaching itself.” This meant “exposing them [her students] to current issues about how other people live outside of the U.S.” and “having them more aware of things going on outside of our bubble like comfort zone.” In this way, creating a hybrid space that includes immigrant students benefited not only her students but also herself by seeing a “bigger picture of education.”

Lastly, a few student teachers used their minority identity to create a new opportunity to teach topics outside the U.S. For example, Esther shared her personal family stories when she taught immigration topics and explained why she had her last name. While talking about the mistake that her great grandfather made when he went through Ellis Island as a foreigner who
did not speak English at all (Esther, second interview, pp. 28-29), she could indirectly show the
difficulties that immigrant students have with the language barrier, and also effectively
connected students to this topic by asking “If you came through Ellis Island, how would your
name change?” (p. 29). Nicole’s experience was more impressive in that she continuously made
a hybrid space within her homogeneous school in both the fall and spring semesters.

Last semester, I student taught at Riverside (pseudonym). It was all Caucasian teachers
and students and I was like the only Asian. I wanted to do something about Korea, so
they won’t feel awkward around me. When you know something about the other culture,
it starts conversation. So when I saw that I am the only Asian there, okay, I am gonna do
something. I am gonna make it advantage that I am not like them. And I did that and they
loved it. The students loved it and teacher loved it. And this semester (laugh), I was in all
African American students classroom. We have like 5 Caucasian students and the rest
were black. I was like same thing. I am a minority here and I don’t know a lot about their
culture and they don’t know anything about me. So throughout the semester, I tried to get
to know them and I did things that will help them get to know me, too. (Nicole, first
interview, p. 4).

As she shared in her Inquiry #2 Crossing Borders Project, being in a dominant culture as
the only minority person was definitely uncomfortable for her (first interview, p. 10). However,
she actively created a new space by making her disadvantage an advantage. She did a
PowerPoint presentation about Korean history and sometimes brought Korean snacks to let her
students taste foods from a different culture. In this way, a few student teachers actively used
their marginalized identity to create a hybrid space between their culture and the mainstream
cultures.

To sum up, within a globalized classroom, some student teachers considered cultural
differences as difficulties or barriers since experiencing unknown cultures required an extra
effort in order to become familiar with the school atmosphere during a practicum period. Yet for
others cultural differences meant having a valuable resource because they believed that diversity
can bring many resources and benefits for all students. Second, many preservice teachers defined
the student teaching setting as a predetermined place they cannot change and to which they cannot bring new ideas, such as global perspectives due to the standardized curriculum, tests, pedagogy, and close-minded school culture. However, a few students recognized their practicum site as a flexible place in which they can teach global topics and issues by seeing the many opportunities in which they can bring the new ideas that they learned from their social studies methods class, or by learning how to negotiate with principals and parents to teach their students global perspectives. Lastly, as they had different definitions of practicum, school, and classroom, student teachers showed two different representations: (1) reinforcing U.S.-centeredness by repeating the “set curriculum” without asking questions about the official knowledge system, or (2) challenging the existing structures by finding or creating a hybrid space between the U.S.-centered curriculum and global topics and between mainstream cultures and minority cultures.

**Final Comment**

As seen in the first section of this chapter describing a typical class of the social studies methods course as well as in the next section addressing the location of global topics/issues in the class objectives and the ways to teach global topics, global topics were taught not as explicit content but as implicit global perspectives and as a few examples of certain weekly topics which is familiar and relevant to student teachers. This tension between existing topics as explicit contents and global topics as inexplicit perspectives and examples showed the limitation of the social studies methods class, which is already overcrowded with many topics and driven by ‘set curriculum’ and ‘manageable framework.’ The limited global perspectives that student teachers learned through their weekly readings/discussions and social inquiry projects revealed the lack of a broad and deep understanding of the globalized world of student teachers. This narrow understanding of the globalized world resulted from student teachers’ recognition of the weekly
readings as age inappropriate topics and controversial issues in the connection with their student teaching practice. The first three social inquiry project also inevitably restricted its conceptual framework to a limited scope such as the dominant American culture and economic poverty within school community because this scope was a manageable one for student teachers. However, the last social inquiry project, called the Lesson Planning Project, had student teachers try to implement diverse global themes in a future or present classrooms. Those global themes revealed (1) student teachers’ understanding of non-Western people as the politically or economically powerless people or culturally unique people, (2) their understanding of dynamic and competitive relations between global and local culture and asymmetrical power structure behind global trade, and (3) their understanding of triplized thinking skills and multicultural literacy as essential global skills. These assumptions on non-Western people, the globalized world, and global skills showed that student teachers learned the radical and transformative viewpoints through their social studies methods class.

In contrast to the social studies methods class, student practicum classes were mostly recognized by student teachers as a predetermined place where the standardized curriculum, tests, pedagogy, and close-minded school culture influence teachers’ daily life. These findings revealed the disconnection between preservice teacher education class and student teaching school, which leads an expanded tension between radical and transformative learning and a neoliberal environment. The results-oriented school culture perpetuated by neoliberal discourse conflicts with many of the student teachers’ learning during in the social studies methods class, and as a result, the tension forced student teachers to just repeat standardized curriculum and a pedagogy driven by high-stakes testing. Also, student teachers’ fixed definition of school was based on the tension between the traditional paradigm and the transformative paradigm. The
dominant power of the former paradigm hindered new ways of teaching such as global perspectives or perspective-taking from being taught and, as a result, U.S. centered white middle-class perspectives were reinforced continuously. These tensions are discussion in the next chapter.

The next chapter addresses three points: (1) How are images of the globalized world, others, and students that student teachers bring to the classroom connected to the bigger global discourse, (2) How tensions and conflicts that student teachers experienced within their social studies methods class and practicum class are related to the structures of both classes, and (3) How the experiences of student teachers mirrored and challenged the U.S.-centered curriculum.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

This conclusion is divided into four sections. Using the three global discourses I addressed in the literature chapter, the following section explicitly summarizes the assumptions and images that preservice teachers and teacher educators had when they discussed what it means to be global. In doing so, I reveal how the neoliberal, transformative, and radical stances influenced student teachers’ global images and their previous intercultural experiences in dominant, limited, and non-existent ways, respectively. Next, while chapter 5 showed the global perspectives and tensions of the student teachers and teacher educators, the second section of this chapter highlights the tensions more clearly and shows how global discourses regarding the internationalization of teacher education are involved in these tensions. As a result of these tensions, the ways to mirror or challenge U.S.-focused curriculum are discussed. The third section deals with how this study informs implications for internationalizing teacher education. In particular, I address four teacher capacities from the exceptional cases that successfully implemented global content. In the last section, based on the limitations of this study, I make suggestions for future studies in the area of internationalizing teacher education.

Global Images and Global Discourses

In chapter 2, I addressed competing images of the globalized world in light of neoliberal, radical, and transformative stances. The neoliberal approach assumed one dimension of globalization, which described the Westernized global system as a developed model and non-Westernized systems as late-blooming models. In this model, non-Westernized societies have changed their economic and political structures and even their cultures by pursuing the Westernized model in order to survive in the “integrated” global market, where they compete
against each other by exchanging goods (Friedman, 2006). In this sense, the neoliberal stance has one fixed image of the globalized world.

On the other hand, the radical approach recognizes a contrasting image of the globalized world. This stance focuses on the reverse side of the homogeneous images of “developed” and “underdeveloped.” Under the Western-led globalization approach, non-Western societies and people have been oppressed and exploited by Western societies since the colonial era. In other words, while reproducing colonial relations between Western and non-Western entities under profit-driven systems, the production from global networks deepen a ‘North-South’ division as a consequence of uneven globalization (Shultz, 2007; Sleeter, 2003). In examples where the radical stance assumes unequal power structures between Western and non-Western societies, this approach takes on a ‘two dimensions of globalization’ model, which like the above mentioned perspectives, is very difficult to change.

However, the transformative stance has a more flexible image of globalization based on the multiple-dimensions of this globalization model. This approach focuses on a situation that non-Western people do not adopt global discourse as it is, but create their own localized version of global discourse. Thus, the economic globalization trends certainly change the world in homogeneous ways, influencing local culture. Yet, the world still remains heterogeneous while people adopt global commodities for their own benefit or reflect their own cultural values on the global commodities (Breidenbach & Zukrigl, trans. 2003). Under this flexible relationship between the local and the global, globally open-minded people enjoy the diversity of other cultures, which become differentiated and diversified under the multiple-dimensions of globalization.
Chapter 4 addressed the images of the globalized world that student teachers bring into their social studies methods class. In general, student teachers had the image that diverse societies are increasingly interconnected to each other through communication technology, such as the Internet. They believed that communication technology provides people with easier accessibility to other cultures and more exposure to cultural diversity. However, since cultural diversity was recognized as merely an existing fact unrelated to their personal lives, student teachers were not interested in involving themselves in other cultures within a global community nor did they feel their daily lives were deeply involved in the globalized world. Rather, multicultural images of the globalized world came from the diverse students that they met in their student teaching placement, in particular, immigrant students or ELL students in their classroom. Even though their images about their students’ family cultures were sometimes stereotyped, the preservice teachers thought that like their classroom various lifestyles and values exist in the globalized world and that people could enjoy the cultural diversity found within it.

Among three distinguished perspectives on the globalized world in the literature review chapter, student teachers followed the transformative stance in the sense that they focused mainly on cultural diversity in the world rather than homogeneity or inequality in the globalized world. Additionally, some students also revealed their dynamic categorization about Western and non-Western societies. They thought that non-Western societies could be more technologically developed than Western societies, and that non-Western people have maintained more valuable lifestyles (including a higher standard of living, for instance) for centuries. These students also maintained that Western people underestimated non-Western cultures based on their materialistic values.
However, their transformative knowledge of global connections and ‘others’ that they experienced in K-12 schooling was limited. First, their historical and cultural knowledge about different groups of people in other countries beyond Western Europe was almost non-existent. Second, if global topics or various global cultures were taught at all, student teachers found no connection to their lives in the United States. According to a transformative discourse, students could not only enjoy the cultural differences of non-Western societies, but also learn about foreign perspectives that could be an alternative solution to many problems of Western societies (Spring, 2007). Also, the approach provided students with flexible and dynamic relationships between the local and the global which helped students see the various connections the global discourse has to their daily lives. Yet it was hard to find student interviewees who had meaningful learning experiences regarding cultural diversity and global discourse in their own K-12 schooling.

In addition, through relationships with immigrant/international friends and their travel-abroad experience, preservice teachers see only small pieces of the cultural differences in terms of the more apparent cultural points, such as foods and language differences rather than the inner, deeper cultural points, like religious beliefs and cultural identity. The problem with understanding unknown cultures by appearances rather than by listening to the opinions of other people in other societies is that it could reinforce their stereotypes about the different people. In general, neither relationships with immigrant/international friends nor experience in travel to other countries challenged their stereotypes about other societies and other people. This is because prospective teachers were more conscious of the stereotypes that non-Western people have regarding American society and people in terms of political power, economic richness, or
secular values while the teacher educator was more aware of their stereotypes about non-Western
people based on the travel experiences or through her relationships with immigrant families.

Some student teachers showed their partial neoliberal images of globalization. By
pointing out the economic benefits of globalization, they considered the globalized world the
global market, where every country could share what they are good at and get what they want by
trading goods and services. Sometimes their perspectives had a McDonaldization kind of image -
that of global commodities created by transnational corporations making the globalized world
homogenous. What is interesting is that this neoliberal stance was not the major image that
student teachers had regarding their general image in contrast to the mainstream global
discourse. However, in many ways they showed that this neoliberal image was created and
reinforced through their K-12 curriculum experiences, their relationships with immigrant or
international friends, and their travel experiences.

First of all, student teachers were not exposed to global topics, global connectedness, or
various cultures and societies in the curriculum they received in their K-12 schools. All student
interviewees spent most of the time in K-12 classes with a U.S.-focused curriculum. Even
through the world history or the world culture classes, the content was limited to Western
European and North American knowledge emanating from American perspectives. Thus,
understanding events from a national standpoint seems to have been an unavoidable phenomenon
in K-12 schooling, which made a huge gap between the textbook knowledge and the unspoken
knowledge. The non-existence of global connectedness knowledge or of various cultures and
societies shows how the neoliberal view dominates the U.S. K-12 curriculum in the sense that
neoliberal discourse validates the current practices of corporate globalization initiated by
European colonialism and has perpetuated Eurocentrism and U.S.-centrism (Vavrus, 2002). In
the same way, the neoliberal stance also disagrees with how the school curriculum should go beyond a selection of the “great resources” of Western civilization by supporting the academic tradition in teacher education (Kliebard, 1998). In other words, the absence of global topics and various cultures in U.S. K-12 curriculum does not simply mean that the global content was not taught, but reflects that the only curriculum valued and highlighted were U.S.-centered and Western European-centered, which are narrow-minded views of the globalized world.

Second, if they were taught at all, global topics were mostly taught in the high school curriculum based on conflicts with the United States, such as wars or border disputes. Under the curriculum, non-Western people might be considered enemies or rivals by the student teachers. This image of non-Western societies is closely connected to the knowledge about foreign people stressed by the neoliberal stance when the people do not follow Western model of globalization. Paying attention to multiple authorities competing for power and dominance in the globalized world, the neoliberal stance informed students of critical perspectives toward nations that do not follow the principles of liberal economic trade and the existing rule of international law and, as a result, challenged U.S. supremacy (Sleeter, 2003). For this reason, the neoliberal approach describes non-Western countries as either potential trading partners or competitive rivals/敵人 (Vavrus, 2002), which student teachers experienced in their K-12 schooling. In other words, this image of rivals and enemies about non-Western people is caused by the urgent national interest in American leadership and security in the world (Sutton, 1999). This point reflects that global topics in the U.S. K-12 curriculum were taught in ways of alienating the U.S. students from people of other backgrounds throughout the world.

This neoliberal image of the absence of other cultures and other societies in the U.S. K-12 curriculum was also reinforced by the relationship with student teachers’ immigrant and/or
international friends because they did not recognize the cultural differences even from their relationships with their international friends. As a result, mainstream students considered non-White, immigrant/international friends as those who assimilate to the American mainstream culture and lose their cultural identities. However, on the side of minority students, the educational system rarely encouraged them to reveal their cultural or global identities as seen in the above U.S. K-12 curriculum. Another effect of this was how minority students’ cultural diversity became hidden or blurred in their limited relationships with the international/immigrant peers coming from the similar cultural and national backgrounds.

Lastly, student teachers’ travel-abroad experiences also revealed their limited perspectives of other people in other societies. The fact that all student interviewees had at least a chance of some kind of an overseas travel experience redefined them as global beings ready to share these stories and their experiences in other countries with neighbors, in spite of their limited life experiences in their family, hometown, or school. Though, in some cases, this travel experience could provide student teachers with important knowledge that would contribute to the expansion of their narrow perspectives, student teachers viewed other societies and global connectedness as unaltered, which showed their experiences are not influenced by the transformative standpoint. These experiences reinforced what they learned in their earlier schooling.

Some preservice teachers experienced some frustration when traveling based on the language barriers and cultural barriers. They faced some difficulties in understanding unknown cultures. This might cause a negative image of global differences because it seemed that they had no room to accept ambiguous parts of unknown cultures. The instructor had the responsibility of helping them understand these differences as she understood them. Many students, without
questioning this phenomenon, enjoyed the power of the English language as the international language in other countries and the American culture as a global culture that they met, no matter where they traveled. This made them reconfirm their neoliberal image of the global world because through their trips they learned that the increasingly integrated world was becoming more Westernized and so identified themselves as those who are free to move throughout the world consuming global commodities, the epitome of a neoliberal view of the educated person (Shultz, 2007). In addition, student teachers experienced the wealth of America and its economic and political power in non-Western countries. In this way, their travel-abroad experience not only reinforced U.S. self-centeredness, but also provided them with unchangeable images of the globalized world and of themselves as Americans in this world.

In addition, student teachers revealed the most deficient image of globalization from a radical standpoint in the largest way. First of all, deepened recognition of the unequal power relationship in the globalized world was non-existent in their interview responses. Nor did any recognition of asymmetrical global power structures or the colonial legacy between Western and non-Western societies enter into their perspectives. Many of the student teachers did not even distinguish between Western and non-Western societies. Both neoliberal and transformative stances were often found in the interviews with student teachers regarding both their general image of the globalized world and the knowledge of the globalized world and of ‘others’ they learned in their K-12 education. The students rarely took a radical standpoint in talking about their K-12 curriculum, nor did they attempt to critically look at their travel-abroad experiences or their friendships with immigrant/international students. The school curriculum dealt with other cultures in presenting these ‘different’ cultures, for the most part, as being separate from one another rather than having any connection to the U.S.
Last but not least, the student teachers, in general, did not see global issues or global connectedness through having diverse global experiences. For example, in spite of her abundant travel abroad, one student teacher had never become interested in global issues. This example showed that in order for preservice teachers to utilize their global experiences and to see global connectedness or global issues through having those experiences, they need some kind of conceptual framework and guidance to do more critical analyses of what they might see in those travels and they need to do this in advance of this travel. Otherwise, as seen in Chapter 4, student teachers only focused on the cultural differences without an understanding of the meaning behind cultural differences and similarities, and of the existence of global dynamics and hybrid cultures. In addition, the teacher educator, due to her assumptions about student teachers’ limited prior experiences based on their perceived gap between their wider and deeper global experiences and the student teachers’ narrow and superficial experiences, did not expect preservice teachers to be global beings. Of course, it was true that most student interviewees grew up in homogeneous places, within similar family values under the conservative U.S. K-12 school cultures. However, their diverse travel-abroad experiences were quite an unexpected result, contrasting with their instructor’s assumptions that their students would have few world traveling experiences. For this reason, the global stories of preservice teachers remained unheard in the social studies methods class. The instructor’s limited understanding about the preservice teachers being only cultural beings rather than global beings was not the only issue to prevent student teachers from speaking about global topics. In the next section the tensions that student teachers and the teacher educator experienced in teaching and learning global topics/issues in the social studies methods class and/or student teaching places will be discussed.
Tensions and Global Discourses

Chapter 5 addressed the global perspectives that the participants of the preservice social studies methods class interpreted regarding course objectives, teaching strategies, class readings and discussions, and their Social Inquiry Project (SIP). In addressing these perspectives, I revealed that student teachers and teacher educators experienced an assortment of tensions and conflicts when they planned and implemented the incorporation of global perspectives into the classroom where they were student teaching and in the preservice teacher education class. This section explains four tensions more explicitly and then addresses the ways in which the tensions are interwoven with the neoliberal, radical, and transformative standpoints along with the professionalization tradition as defined by Zeichner (2003).

First of all, as seen in chapter 5, global topics/issues existed with a close relationship to multiple perspectives as one of the important class frameworks in the social studies methods class. Developing multiple perspectives was closely connected to other course objectives, such as creating a democratic classroom, conducting inquiry, developing critical thinking skills, and understanding the diverse backgrounds of students. However, these objectives were not necessarily achieved using a global perspective since this perspective was not an explicit framework for this class. As many participants pointed out, global perspectives were not the main focus of the course - global education exists not in the form of topics or issues, but in perspectives, even when using the term “global.” However, as the social studies methods class did not teach global education in an explicit way, student teachers and the teacher educator showed different variations of understanding what its meaning. While student teachers believed the class was not designed to teach global education because it was not the main topic/issue or
the explicit framework of the class, the instructor believed that global education was not the main purpose of the course because of the “set readings” and “set curriculum.”

In other words, as student teachers had to follow standardized curriculum for the grades they were doing their practicum in, teacher educators also taught their group of student teachers based on the same weekly schedules implemented across the cohorts. Of course, the process of creating this curriculum used by the teacher educators is quite different from the one used by the schools to create their curriculum because all teacher educators participated in changes in the existing weekly readings and schedules at weekly meetings. In spite of observing most of the weekly meetings for three years, however, the instructors’ syllabi, weekly schedules and assignments were not altered significantly even though they sometimes added different textbooks and different teaching materials. As seen in Table 4, since the weekly schedules were full of many topics and readings, teacher educators had to take out some topics from the schedule or reduce teaching time for some topics in order to deal explicitly with global issues in their class. For this reason, teacher educators chose “set curricula” and “set readings” as the most important obstacle in dealing with global topics explicitly.

In short, the structural tension between existing topics as ‘explicit content’ and global topics as ‘inexplicit perspectives and examples’ was the first reason preventing global topics from being taught as an explicit framework in the social studies class. In order for global topics/issues to be chosen as visible topics, teacher educators actually needed a great deal of extra time and energy in preparing teaching materials, including weekly readings. Convincing other instructors of the value of teaching global topics/issues was also an issue. For this reason, in defining global perspectives as part of the multiple perspectives “beyond the white, American perspective” and claiming “all [of the existing] weekly topics are understood from a global
perspective,” teacher educators followed the existing curriculum without significant change to the course structure.

Another tension between the two different conceptual frameworks, ‘manageable knowledge’ and ‘expanded knowledge,’ also played a role in the difficulty in implementing global perspectives in the social studies class. For example, I found significant competing evaluations of the SIP by instructors, who argued that global perspectives would be “too big to handle” for the student teachers and that SIP is “such a small project.” This conflict is revealed not only in the SIPs but also in the student reading reflections from the social studies methods class. Student teachers often brought up the same claim that they needed more applicable and practical concepts to support their work in the student teaching settings rather than abstract knowledge. In this sense, knowledge of global topics/issues might easily be designated as abstract knowledge by the student teachers. The student teachers’ common contention was that global issues/topics were too abstract or too big to teach to their young students, which was mentioned under “age inappropriateness” in the reading reflection section, SIPs, and interviews. The reason that both the instructor and student teachers focused so much on pedagogical knowledge rather than subject matter knowledge is because student teachers were placed as teacher candidates at the time they were taking the social studies methods course and one of the essential objectives of the class was ‘understanding school community and students’ as part of their professional knowledge.

However, understanding the school community and their students did not necessarily need a narrow and manageable framework. As mentioned in the SIP outline, the small scope of this project resulted in the limited understanding that student teachers had about school/community issues and caused them to consider resources only within the schools’
community. In many cases, the project might have lost the benefits of including larger community boundaries based on their connections with other societies, which also influenced students’ daily lives in many ways. With this narrow framework, the meaning of “cultural borders” was not as diversified in Inquiry #2, because their definition limited borders, making the area so narrow that student teachers did not recognize the existence of national borders in spite of their experiences with different foreign cultures. If this scope could be expanded, the student teachers would be able to not only observe diverse social justice issues and to listen to differing voices from a wider variety of community members, but they would also understand social borders more clearly - in particular, they would be able to view school borders with global perspectives.

In a sense that the social studies methods class concentrated more on the pedagogical knowledge than the subject matter knowledge and highlighted the performance-based teacher education based on ‘professional’ teaching strategies, the class is deeply associated with the university-based professionalization tradition (Zeichner, 2003). As seen in the literature review chapter, however, this tradition historically confronted the academic tradition’s condemnation that the university-based education course driven by the professionalization tradition exclusively focused on the technical and vocational aspects of teacher education (Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Zeichner, 2003). Although I disagree with the narrow definition of teacher capacity depending only on the teacher’s verbal ability and subject matter knowledge in the academic tradition, I agree that the focus on only pedagogical knowledge might prevent student teachers from asking for a bigger picture of what to teach. While concentrating on a “purely mechanical implementation activity” of the professionalization tradition loses sight of what is being accomplished for what groups and for whose benefit it is being done (Zeichner, 2003, p. 502),
the social studies methods class might miss an important teacher education goal: The expanding of students’ conceptual framework while satisfying the student’s pedagogical needs that leads practical knowledge.

The disconnection between the teacher education course and the clinical experiences was the third tension that most preservice teachers pointed out. As addressed in chapter five, the preservice social studies methods course was mainly influenced by the transformative approach and a radical approach, while the student teaching sites was influenced by the neoliberal stance. In fact, due to the intimate relationship between teacher education curriculum and K-12 school curriculum, globally innovating teacher education was known as one of the direct ways to connect students’ lives to the globalized world (Merryfield, 1997). Although the student teaching experience is a continuation of the preservice teacher’s education, however, the education course and the practicum school displayed quite different global discourses.

Due to the previous two tensions, it was hard to see a globally expanded framework or explicit global topics/issues in the social studies methods class. Nonetheless, reading reflections showed certain global perspectives regarding a way of shaking the myth of objective history, as a way of seeing similar inhumane conditions that U.S. society and other societies share, and as a way of seeing their student teaching class from multicultural perspectives. In addition, through SIP assignments, some student teachers showed their knowledge about the global world by addressing (1) How global culture greatly impacts the lives of individuals around the world, and at the same time how local culture actively accepted other cultures and created different versions of culture, (2) How competitive cultures based on different values, beliefs, and ideas come into conflict with each other in the global world, and (3) How economic injustice is reproduced by the asymmetrical power structure behind global trade. Even though the previous two tensions
caused the radical discourse and transformative discourse related to internationalizing teacher education not to be significantly implemented in the social studies methods class, the above cases showed that the class taught student teachers both radical and transformative viewpoints and did not include a neoliberal standpoint.

This being said, the result-oriented environment in the preservice teacher’s placement schools demonstrated that the student teachers were teaching in quite different political circumstances from the university-based education course. In a neoliberal approach, teacher education is considered a global commodity as higher education (universities) involves competition with other institutions in the global education market (Dolby & Rahman, 2008). The neoliberal approach argues that the high quality of teacher education is assured by rigorous standards and a result-oriented environment that requires teachers to prove their quality by standardized tests (Apple, 2005). This neoliberal environment has influenced not only teacher education but also K-12 schooling. In student teaching schools, the rigorous standards and result-oriented environments were also found in the form of standardized curriculum, pedagogy, and in high-stake testing. Student teacher’s teaching practice was structured by this standardized curriculum and the influence of the high stake testing every hour and every day while they were in school. In addition, the given curriculum did not include global topics/issues but U.S.-focused events or Western civilizations. By contrast, the social studies methods class did not follow this neoliberal approach or the academic tradition, but took a radical stance on the neoliberal circumstance and embodied a professionalization agenda.

This tension between the university education course and the student teaching sites made student teachers consider global topics/issues viewed from a radical and transformative standpoint “too political,” “too controversial,” or “too abstract.” Also, this tension resulted from
a predetermined definition of school and an unchanging identity as a preservice teacher. In other words, they defined the student teaching setting as a predetermined place that teacher candidates had no influence over to make any changes to and to which they couldn’t bring new ideas, including global perspectives different from those already in practice.

In connection with the disconnection between the teacher education course and the student teaching school, the last tension was found between the traditional paradigm and the transformative paradigm. In the practicum site, preservice teachers encountered close-minded school cultures that were antagonistic toward teachers who tried to implement different ways of teaching. This close-minded school culture demonstrates that their practicum sites were under the traditional site-bounded paradigm. In other words, as the traditional paradigm considers the teacher the only source of teaching and knowledge (Y. Cheng, 2001), the student teaching school is driven by a senior-teacher-led teaching culture. As the traditional paradigm adheres to discipline-based and textbook-based teaching (Y. Cheng, 2001; Waks, 2003), student teaching schools resist different ways of teaching than traditional teaching driven by separate disciplines and textbooks. Within this paradigm, the existing values such as white middle-class perspectives are perpetuated. However, as seen in the Inquiry #4 Project, student teachers were encouraged to take advantage of local and global resources for teaching content, such as community members and Internet resources. In that this project equipped preservice teachers with the ability to network with their class to unlimited resources (Y, Cheng, 2001), the social studies methods class followed a transformative paradigm. The tension coming from the two different paradigms became one of reasons preventing diverse global knowledge, skills, and action plans developed in the Inquiry #4 Project from being implemented in their practicum site.
In short, diverse tensions entangled with competing global discourses hindered student teachers from implementing global education in the student teaching setting. First, the tension between existing topics as ‘explicit content’ and global topics as ‘perspectives and examples’ revealed that due to the existence of “set readings” and “set curriculum,” global topics/issues could only be implemented in very limited ways in the social studies methods class without curriculum structural changes. Second, the tension between ‘manageable knowledge’ and ‘expanded knowledge’ showed that the preservice teacher education class was influenced by the university-based professionalization agenda, which made the social studies methods class depend on pedagogical knowledge and vocational skills. In this situation, global topics/issues were easily excluded as abstract/controversial knowledge and as age-inappropriate knowledge. Third, the disconnection between the social studies methods class and student teaching schools showed the tension between radical and transformative learning and a neoliberal environment. Result-oriented school circumstances caused by neoliberal discourse forced student teachers to just use the school’s repetitive standardized curriculum and a pedagogy driven by high-stakes testing. Lastly, the influence of the traditional paradigm over the transformative paradigm hindered new ways of teaching such as the Lesson Planning Project from being taught and, as a result, white middle-class perspectives were perpetuated.

In conclusion, global perspectives in a preservice teacher education program as “inexplicit content” in a “packed” class ran by set curriculum as well as “too abstract” and “too controversial” knowledge rarely challenged existing U.S.-focused curriculum. Rather, by repeating the existing standardized curriculum in the student teaching school, the U.S.-centeredness that they were taught in previous K-12 curriculum was most likely represented and perpetuated in their student teaching classroom. In other words, throughout the preservice
teacher education program, most of the teacher candidates have been equipped as a globally-ill-prepared teachers, who had chances to learn about the existence of “others” or to explore perspectives different from their own American perspective but who didn’t always do so.

Implications for Internationalizing Teacher Education

The previous two chapters focused on the various obstacles and tensions that hindered student teachers and the teacher educator from teaching global perspectives in their classroom. At the same time, I described a few exceptional cases in which global issues/topics were effectively implemented. Along with the obstacles and tensions that teacher candidates and teacher educators faced, these special cases might also reveal new kinds of teacher capacities to develop globally-well-prepared teachers. Based on the research results, this section briefly suggests four of these capacities.

Awareness of students’ global experiences as a global resource. The awareness of students’ global experiences might be a basic teacher capacity if she/he wants to create a more inclusive classroom. The more the world is increasingly interconnected, the more students have a chance to travel to and in other societies or encounter people different from their own family backgrounds. By having them actively share these global experiences in their classrooms, teachers could not only involve their students in a wider view of the world, but also utilize their various experiences to educate their students as globally responsive citizens. In addition, as the United States becomes more rapidly globalized, more immigrant/international students, who were born and/or grew up in other countries, will move into American classrooms. It is easy for teachers to ignore their cultural differences or to recognize the differences as difficulties that they need to resolve. As a result, immigrant/international students might hide or lose their cultural identities and assimilate into American mainstream culture. However, if a teacher wants to
include them in their classroom, they should be aware of their cultural backgrounds and create a safe classroom environment that encourages those students to share their ‘foreign’ experiences. In order to create a safe classroom, teachers might need to have not only an ability to see their own and their students’ cultural stereotypes, but they will also need an attitude that will allow them to see the cultural diversity as a favorable resource rather than as a difficult obstacle to overcome.

**Creativity to find hybrid spaces within standardized curriculum.** Since standardized curriculum in K-12 schools structure every moment in a teacher’s daily life, it might be extremely difficult to incorporate global contents in classroom lessons. As the teacher candidates mentioned, if they want to teach different content than they are given, they would need to reduce the existing curriculum by giving it less time. However, since preparing for standardized tests continues to consume valuable time in the classroom, it is also not easy to fit lessons pertaining to global education within the curriculum. In contrast to this idea, some student teachers showed interesting skills in creating possible spaces within existing class times, within “extra” class times, or after the state test was completed for global education lessons. To develop this teacher capacity of incorporating global education, it might be essential for teacher education schools to choose teacher candidates who demonstrate a flexible attitude towards altering standardized curriculums in order to find moments when global contents can be implement. Also, developing the ability to create hybrid spaces between different disciplines to teach global contents is very important. To do so, this capacity also requires teachers’ ability to integrate the existing curriculum for shared goals such as global perspective-taking.

**Negotiation skills with conservative participants within traditional paradigms.**

Under traditional paradigms that are led by senior teachers and driven by a discipline-
based/textbook-based teaching culture, teachers will need to develop negotiation skills. Student teachers or first-year teachers often face disagreement about teaching content or strategies with senior teachers, principals, or parents. In particular, if they want to teach global perspectives, which might be non-existent in the current curriculum content or textbooks, they will certainly experience pedagogical discord with more conservative members of the school community. In this situation, many young teachers easily give up what they really want to teach and repeat the existing curriculum that supports the established school culture. Therefore, in order to incorporate new ways of teaching such as global education, teacher education programs need to equip teachers with negotiation skills in order to overcome these conflicts. To do so, teachers need to develop not only an ability to hold discussions in politically sensitive ways, but must also have the capacity to see seemingly-predetermined circumstances as potentially flexible. More specifically, when teachers convince other teachers of the value of global education through, for example, one communication skills of “triplized skills”—an ability to see the connection between individual and/or local needs and global needs—that could demonstrate the relevancy of global perspectives for students.

**Globally broadened and deepened perspectives.** Above all, teachers need to develop a capacity to see social phenomenon from globally broadened and deepened perspectives. When I interviewed student teachers, it was extremely hard to find a student teacher who had both broadened and deepened global knowledge. Many of them identified cultural differences in the world with the entire knowledge about the globalized world and tried to enjoy the cultural diversity in their classroom. However, almost none of them possessed critical perspectives on the subject of cultural diversity. This reveals that they might be simply celebrating cross-cultural differences and enjoying other cultures as pleasurable global commodities, which is referred to
as “the danger of happy global multiculturalism” by Heilman (2006, p. 195). However, in order to make sure that they understand the cultural differences in an authentic and meaningful way, they need not only a transformative standpoint but also a radical one since a transformative stance could provide them with more broadened knowledge about the world and people and a radical stance would give them a deepened knowledge. Therefore, even though the two approaches have different worldviews, preservice teachers continuously need to learn both transformative knowledge and critical knowledge to develop globally broadened and deepened perspectives.

**The Implication for Further Research**

For future studies, I suggest research be implemented on the exceptional student teachers and ‘normal’ student teachers in terms of their curiosity about the globalized world. Among the student interviewees, most student teachers revealed their ignorance of global issues in spite of their having various global experiences. Therefore, a comparative study between them and student teachers more interested in the globalized world would reveal an important implication for internationalizing teacher education. Beyond their family backgrounds, K-12 schooling, and travel experiences, the influence of high-stakes testing could also be an important research question in explaining their overall ignorance about the global world and why almost none of the student teachers had any memory of global content in K-12 curriculum.

Also, I suggest a further study on the ways that student teachers represent their global perspectives in the student teaching setting. Due to the time limit of this study, I depended mainly on the preservice teacher interview data in order to address how they represented their global knowledge and skills they learned in their social studies methods class. Future research might need to observe the student teaching settings to see how participants respond to different
global discourses in their daily practicum lives. While this research only highlighted the influence of the neoliberal environment, a future study could reveal more vividly the interactions between preservice teachers and divergent global discourses. Also, regarding the disconnection between university education courses and practicum sites, this study did not focus on the role of the cooperating teacher. By observing the relationship between cooperating teachers and student teachers, a future study might be able to address the disconnection issue in more depth.

Last but not least, a deeper study on the changes in the social studies methods class is needed. In fact, in the 2010 fall semester right after I finished data collection for this study, the instructors included global education content as part of their weekly schedule. However, there was no research about the ways that the content change influenced the instructors and students’ perspectives on teaching global education. A study of the curriculum change will reveal important implications regarding how global content transitioned from inexplicit to explicit content within the teacher education program as well as how the “set curriculum” might be changed with cooperation among instructors.
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Appendix A

Pilot Study

In the fall semester of 2007, I conducted a pilot study as a research assistant, observing the class taught by Ms. Young (pseudonym) almost every Thursday afternoon and occasionally Thursday morning classes taught by Professor Nancy (pseudonym) and another cohort among the five cohorts’ classes. The opportunity to observe a senior undergraduate class (the social studies methods course) came through my research assistant job supported by the Center for East Asian & Pacific Studies (EAPS). One of my main responsibilities was to observe a pre-service class at a Midwestern university and take fieldnotes as part of the outreach programs of EAPS. I started planning my fieldwork in early September in 2007 including preparing interview questions and obtaining IRB approval. I started observing the social studies methods course on October 11th, which was the first class, and continued to observe the class until December 6th, which was my eighth observation. Also, I conducted interviews with students on December 10th and February 14th as a follow-up interview and interviewed the instructor on February 29th.

My student interviewee, Jimmy (pseudonym) was a 22 year-old Jewish student. He was raised in a white community. He was a senior undergraduate at that time and was teaching in an elementary school where predominant numbers of his students were Caucasian. He had an average height, with pale white skin and short brown hair, usually wearing his university t-shirt and blue jeans. He was confident and very talkative in class and interviews as well. On December 10th, Friday afternoon at 2pm and February 14th at 10am, I interviewed Jimmy with prepared questions. I asked him what his opinions were on main activities and concepts learned during the class.

Another interviewee, Ms. Miranda Chandler (pseudonym), was a white female instructor,
who has two children and appeared be in her late thirties. She has taught this course for four years. Prior to her teaching experience of this class, she supervised student teachers in the field. She also taught students in elementary school in New York, New Hampshire and Massachusetts for fourteen years. She had short blond hair and she seemed to like wearing sportswear. In the class, as far as I observed, she was always an active and passionate teacher. On Feb 29th 2008, Friday morning at 10 am, I met Miranda at my department conference room. Because of her busy schedule, we only spent an hour for an interview with prepared questions (See Appendix. 3). We talked about main goals of class activities as well as the possibilities and difficulties of implementing a new topic such as global perspectives.

While I was doing this fieldwork, I obtained seven sets of notes from class-observation and three transcripts from interviews. In addition to the observation and interview resources, I referred to textbooks including Takaki’s (1993) *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* and diverse teaching materials including the syllabus. Most of teaching materials was obtained in the instructors’ planning meeting, which I observed on almost every Friday morning in the fall semester of 2007 and class website. Also, I used literature I reviewed in the previous section as interpretative frames.

The purposes of this study were three: to examine the general nature of a preservice teacher education class; to discuss possibilities and/or limitations of implementing global perspectives in the class; and to suggest appropriate ways to incorporate global perspectives into preservice teacher education. To address these questions, I conducted participant-observations of a senior social studies class and in-depth interviews of instructor and students. The nature of the social studies methods course (*Teaching Elementary Social Studies*) was summarized as a ‘multiple perspectives-conscious,’ ‘community-engaged,’ ‘method-oriented,’ ‘inquiry-focused,’
‘daily life-connected,’ but ‘overcrowded’ class. Also, each characteristic plays a role in the connection (i.e. multiple perspectives-conscious, community-engaged, and inquiry-focused) to global education or disconnection (i.e. method-oriented, daily life-connected, and overcrowded) from global education as defined by scholars in the literature review. In particular, the disconnecting characteristics were discussed through the differences and similarities between the social studies methods course and global education. Through this comparison and contrast, I argued that the social studies methods course follows the tradition of multicultural education in that this class is aware of racially marginalized groups within the U.S. Furthermore, I argued that despite the differences between the social studies methods course and global education, both have almost the same interests except for the scale (i.e. local or global level). Therefore, I suggested that if teacher educators change the framework from white privilege to Western privilege, the critical perspectives of social studies education is not only maintained, but also expanded to global perspectives on the privilege.
Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol for Students

Introduction

- State the purpose of the case study and why I am here interviewing this person
- Repeat confidentiality provisions of IRB and consent letter
- Request permission to tape the interview and tell what will happen to the tape/data
- Ask if there are any questions
- Mention that this will take about one hour, and if at any point you want to leave, let me know when you want to stop

First Interview Questions

Family and Educational Background

1. Would you tell me about your family background such as where you are from, and the important values that your parents emphasized as you were growing up?

2. What were your educational experiences in K-12 schooling like? Would you briefly tell me your K-12 school background such as which schools you went to? Second, tell me about the overall impression on your K-12 schooling.

Previous experiences about global perspectives

3. When you think about globalization or globalized world, what images or stories come into your head? Where do you think these images or stories come from?

4. When you think about non-Western people or society, what images or stories come into your head? Where do you think these images or stories come from?

5. If you have specific experiences that made you become interested in global world, please share.
   i. (follow-up questions) If you have had immigrant or international friends, can you describe your relationship with them? What did you learn from them?
   ii. (follow-up questions) What was it like for you to learn about the issues of the global connectedness in your K-12 schooling? What did you learn from kindergarten, primary, middle, and high schools?
   iii. (follow-up questions) If you have traveled abroad and/or met foreign people before, please share those experiences. What did you learn from them?

Experiences in the U of I pre-service teacher education program

6. Let’s switch the topic to the U of I pre-service teacher education program. What made you choose this pre-service teacher education program? What is your concentration? Why do you choose the concentration?
7. What influenced you the most when you were thinking of becoming an elementary (middle) school teacher?

8. Besides the social studies methods class, what global issues or topics did you learn in the other classes in U of I (or other college classes)? What were significant things that you learned from these experiences?

Learning in the social studies methods class

9. Thinking about the social studies methods class over the course of both semesters, personally and professionally, what aspects do you think is the most valuable? Why?

10. What kinds of concepts or issues did you learn regarding global issues or topics in this social studies class in the fall 2009? What did you learn from them?
   i. (follow-up questions) What did you learn from social inquiry projects (community study, crossing borders, and child study)?
   ii. (follow-up questions) What was your focus/concern when you prepared your unit plan? What was the best lesson that you learn from the unit plan?
   iii. (follow-up questions) Among Takaki’s ‘Different Mirror’ or ‘Doing History’ or ‘Black Ants’ or other readings in this class, which one was the most meaningful to you? Why?

11. In the spring semester of 2010, what were some significant memories you have had in the classroom?
   i. What did you learn from the weekly topics of art and music, history museums, controversial issues, and media literacy?
   ii. For the book club discussion, which book did you read and what did you learn from that book and discussion?

12. Which global issues/topics among these weekly topics or book club discussions did you learn? Would you tell me how they were important to you?

13. In what ways did your instructor encourage you to think about global issues and to think about how to teach them in your student/actual teaching class?

Global issues and obstacles in future class

14. As you enter the teaching profession, what do you want to explore regarding global issues in the future?

15. What are some obstacles that you see/expect from your teaching experience as you apply global issues?

Thank you for your time talking with me today. Is there anything else you would like to add before I turn off the recorder?

Second Interview Questions

Interpretation on the social studies class

1. What do you think the significant concepts/big ideas of this course?
2. In what ways, if any, did the objective/work help you to connect with global issues?

3. After taking this course, in what ways have you changed (or not changed) your perspectives about teaching global connectedness?
   i. (follow-up question) How did you incorporate these changes into your actual student teaching classes?
   ii. (follow-up question) If not changed, what was the main reason? Did you have any other eye-opening experiences?

4. Compared to other topics in the course, how important are global issues?

5. What suggestions would you make for addressing the topic of global issues in this class?

Students and school background in current school

6. Regarding your student teaching, would you tell me your day from the time you wake up to the time you go to bed?

7. Would you tell me about your teaching background?
   i. Where have you been teaching?
   ii. Which grade/subjects have you been teaching?
   iii. How many times have you been teaching in a week?

8. Would you describe your students’ background such as ethnic groups and social economic status?
   i. (follow-up question) If you have children who are immigrants or are not proficient in English in your class, please tell me your relationship with them.
   ii. (follow-up question) If you have experienced any difficulties with these children, please share.

9. Please describe overall social or cultural background of your students’ parents and neighbors in your school community.
   i. (follow-up question) If you have any relationships with immigrant children’s parents, please tell me what you have learned from them.
   ii. (follow-up question) If you experienced any difficulties with these parents, please share.
   iii. As you get a new teaching position next year, which community do you prefer to teach?

10. If you see any cultural differences of students or parents from your community where you grew up, please share. How do you feel these differences in your current school?

Experiences in student teaching

11. What are the main concepts you’ve been working with your students? What kinds of teaching strategies are you using?

12. To what extent have you been able to deal with global issues in your student teaching class?
i. (follow-up question) In what ways did you encourage your students to think about global issues? If there were main activities, please share.

ii. (follow-up question) If you think it is difficult to teach global issues/topics in your current class, what obstacles do you see?

13. When you think about the students in your present or future classroom, what would be some indicators that they well learn about global perspectives?
   i. (follow-up question) What kinds of knowledge do you want them to have?
   ii. (follow-up question) What kinds of skills do you want them to develop?
   iii. (follow-up question) What kinds of citizenship would you hope they will fulfill after they become adults?

14. If you are in a position to choose your curriculum for your future classroom, what global issues/topics would you like to address more in depth in your future class? Why are they important for your students?
   i. (follow-up question) If you think global issues are less important than other issues in your future class, what issues do you want to address more?
   ii. In your future teaching, what obstacles do you see/expect in order to include global issues in your teaching experiences?
   iii. In your opinion, how can we overcome these obstacles?

15. To what extent, if any, do you think you have changed your perspectives on addressing these global issues during your student teaching?

16. How do you want to address global connectedness and non-Western cultures in your future?

17. What roles do you want your children to play in the U.S. society and global society? How do you want to open their mind?

Thank you for your time talking with me today. Is there anything else you would like to add before I turn off the recorder?

Interview Protocol for Instructor

Introduction

- State the purpose of the case study and why I am here interviewing this person
- Repeat confidentiality provisions of IRB and consent letter
- Request permission to tape the interview and tell what will happen to the tape/data
- Ask if there are any questions
- Mention that this will take about one hour, and if at any point you want to leave, let me know when you want to stop
First Interview Questions

Educational background

1. Would you tell me your educational background and experiences before taking this position here? 11 years
2. What were the significant lessons that you learned from your previous teaching experiences? Always learning, inequity curriculum,
3. What is your overall impression of teaching in the U of I?

Previous experiences about global perspectives

4. When you think about globalization or the globalized world, what images or stories come into your head? Where do you think these images or stories come from?
5. When you think about non-Western people or society, what images or stories come into your head? Where do you think these images or stories come from?
6. If you have any specific experiences that made you become interested in global world or foreign people, please share.
   i. (follow-up questions) If you have had immigrant or international students, can you describe your relationships with them? What did you learn from them?
   ii. (follow-up questions) If you have experienced any cultural differences/difficulties in these students, please share. How did you feel about them?
   iii. (follow-up questions) If you have traveled abroad and/or met people from other countries before, please share those experiences. What did you learn from them?

Teaching experiences in the social studies methods class

7. Thinking about the social studies methods class over the course of both semesters, personally and professionally, what aspects do you think is the most valuable? Why?
8. Which topics/concepts/activities in your social studies class addressed global perspectives in the fall 2009?
   i. (follow-up questions) In what ways, if any, do you think social inquiry projects (community study, crossing borders, and child study) connect to global topics?
   ii. (follow-up questions) In what ways, if any, do you think the unit plan assignment connect to global topics?
   iii. (follow-up questions) How do weekly readings such as Takaki’s ‘Different Mirror’ or ‘Doing History’ or ‘Black Ants’ or other readings, or weekly topics in this class connect to global topics?
   iv. (follow-up questions) What tensions or conflicts, if any, did you see among these topics/concepts/activities?
9. Which topics/concepts/activities in your social studies class addressed global perspectives in the spring 2010?
   i. (follow-up questions) Which global topics did you see in the weekly topics of art and music, history museums, controversial issues, and media literacy?
ii. (follow-up questions) Regarding the book club discussion, which global topics/issues did you see/expect from those book and discussion?

iii. (follow-up questions) What tensions or conflicts, if any, did you see among these topics/concepts/activities?

10. Compared to other topics in the course, how important are global issues?

11. In what ways did you encourage students to think about global issues or global perspectives?

12. What were your goals in teaching those global topics/concepts/activities?
   i. (follow-up questions) What specific knowledge, if any, did you want your students to develop? Why were these important to you?
   ii. (follow-up questions) What specific skills, if any, did you want your students to develop? Why were these important to you?
   iii. (follow-up questions) What specific attitudes, if any, did you want your students to develop? What kinds of citizenship would you hope they will fulfill? Why were these important to you?

13. What was the most important thing that you have learned from this class in terms of concepts or activities regarding teaching global issues?
   i. (follow-up questions) What kinds of possibilities or limitations did you see in what you’ve learned?

14. What was the most important thing that you have learned from your students regarding teaching global issues?
   i. (follow-up questions) What were their beliefs or attitudes toward global issues?
   ii. (follow-up questions) What, if any, possibilities or limitations did you see in the students’ beliefs, attitudes or skills?

15. In what ways did you encourage your students to teach global perspectives in their student/actual teaching? If you couldn’t, why not?

Second Interview Questions

Interpretation on the social studies class

1. After teaching this course, in what ways have you changed (or not changed) your perspectives about teaching global connectedness?
   i. (follow-up question) How did you incorporate these changes into your teaching classes?
   ii. (follow-up question) If not changed, what was the main reason?

2. What do you think the most significant concepts/big ideas of this course?

3. In what ways, if any, did the big concepts help you to connect with global issues?

4. What do you think the most significant objective/goal of this course?

5. In what ways, if any, did the objective/goal help you to connect with global issues?
6. To what degree, did your students achieve your objective? In what ways, if any, did these achievements enhance global perspectives or not?

Obstacles in teaching global issues in the social studies class

7. What sort of things made it difficult to teach global perspectives in the social studies class?
   i. (follow-up question) What kinds of obstacles within this course do you expect to encounter?

8. What kinds of general obstacles outside this course might make you reluctant to teach global perspectives?
   i. (follow-up question) Are there any curriculum or state teaching standards that, in any way, affect the way you teach global perspectives? If so, why?

9. What changes would you make in the next year? Why?
   i. (follow-up question) What global issues/topics would you like to address more in depth in your future class? Why are they important for your students?

Opinion about teaching global perspectives in teacher education

10. How do you define global perspectives in teacher education in general and social studies education in particular?
   i. (follow-up questions) Do you think there are diverse or competing definitions of global perspectives? If so, what kind of underlying tensions do you see within these definitions?
   ii. (follow-up questions) Among these diverse opinion and/or definitions about global perspectives, what elements are most important to you? Why?

11. To what extent, do you think it important to teach global connectedness in teacher education in general and social studies education in particular? Why or why not?
   i. (follow-up questions) What kinds of individual, local, national and global needs do you see in teaching global issues in this global era?
   ii. (follow-up questions) Why do you think your students need to learn these concepts or issues?

12. To what extent, do you think it important to teach non-Western culture in teacher education in general and social studies education in particular? Why or why not?
   i. (follow-up questions) What kinds of individual, local, national and global needs do you see in teaching non-Western culture in this global era?
   ii. (follow-up questions) Why do you think your students need to learn these different cultures?

13. In what ways, if any, do you want your preservice teachers to address global connectedness and non-Western societies in their future class?

14. What suggestions would you make for addressing the topic of global issues in this class?
Thank you for your time talking with me today. Is there anything else you would like to add before I turn off the recorder?