

2016

The Global Imperative for Teacher Education: Opportunities for Comparative and International Education

Elena Aydarova

Arizona State University, olena.aydarova@asu.edu

Sheila K. Marquardt

Minnesota State University, sheila.marquardt@mnstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/fire>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [International and Comparative Education Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Aydarova, E., & Marquardt, S. K. (2016). The Global Imperative for Teacher Education: Opportunities for Comparative and International Education. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 3(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.18275/fire201603011066>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education by an authorized editor of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

The Global Imperative for Teacher Education: Opportunities for Comparative and International Education

Abstract

In the context of globalization, teacher education has to respond to the global imperative by helping pre-service teachers develop global consciousness and awareness (Apple, 2011; Zhao, 2010). This paper addresses this imperative by first identifying the spaces for global competencies in teacher education standards at the national, regional, state, and institutional levels. Next, we analyze two universities' attempts to internationalize teacher education programs and demonstrate how the lack of specificity in teacher education standards emerge as gaps in the curriculum and in pre-service teacher learning. We argue that re-fashioned comparative and international education courses could address these gaps by developing students' conceptual understandings of global processes and their impact on education. The ultimate purpose of such courses will be to challenge pre-service teachers' ethnocentric assumptions about education and to foster a planetary relational view necessary for the development of a more just modernity on the global scale.

Keywords

Global Approach, Teacher Education, Comparative Education, International Education

THE GLOBAL IMPERATIVE FOR TEACHER EDUCATION: OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Elena Aydarova¹

Arizona State University, USA

Sheila K. Marquardt

Minnesota State University, USA

It is within this framework, thinking the world, not just the nation-state, that I say to all of us: let us imagine anew imperatives that structure all of us, as giver and taker, female and male, planetary human beings.

~Gayatri Spivak (2012)

Introduction

It has become customary for authors writing about internationalization of education to start their arguments with descriptions of the changing social conditions precipitated by the time-space compression of globalization (D. Harvey, 1989). No consensus has been established as to whether the changes are real or only rhetorical (Ritzer, 2007; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004); whether the processes of greater interconnectedness are new or whether they have been in existence for a while (Tilly, 2004). Amidst this uncertainty, definitions of globalization abound. Appadurai (1996) refers to globalization as imagined worlds and cultural flows mediated by ruptures in ethnoscapas, mediascapas, technoscapas, financescapas, and ideoscapas. De Sousa Santos (2006) extends these observations by describing globalization as

a multifaceted phenomenon with economic, social, political, cultural, religious and legal dimensions, all interlinked in a complex fashion. Strangely enough, globalization seems

¹ *Correspondence:* 302A Farmer Building, Forest Mall, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-5411; olena.aydarova@asu.edu

to combine universality and the elimination of national borders, on the one hand, with rising particularity, local diversity, ethnic identity and a return to communitarian values, on the other. In other words, globalization appears to be the other side of localization, and vice versa. (p. 393)

Despite the lack of consensus on the nature or definition of globalization, scholars tend to agree that significant interconnectedness of the world has created new challenges for education and for pre-service teacher education. The latter in particular has appeared significantly unprepared for these challenges. At a time when teachers are expected to ensure America's global competitiveness, address the country's poor performance on international tests, deal with the effects of migration in their classrooms, as well as develop students' global competencies and global citizenship (Zhao, 2010), teacher education remains one of the most parochial elements in U.S. higher education (Longview Foundation, 2008). A flurry of proposals to re-orient teacher education towards global imperatives (Zhao, 2010) or to internationalize its operations (Kissock & Richardson, 2010; Olmedo & Harbon, 2010; Quezada, 2010; Shaklee & Baily, 2012) emerged in recent years. These proposals have included increasing pre-service teachers' global awareness, developing teacher candidates' intercultural competencies, creating opportunities for clinical experiences in diverse settings, encouraging teacher candidates to learn an additional language, and transforming curricula. Focusing on course work in teacher education, Shaklee (2012) noted that, "we should continue to review course work in light of international perspectives, global systems, and global problems and foster problem-based learning that engages candidates in creative and analytical thinking" (p. 249). Despite multiple efforts to address these challenges, real and imagined obstacles (Mahon, 2010) prevent many programs from creating opportunities for teachers to learn to "think internationally" and "to see the world relationally" (Apple, 2011, p. 225).

In this article, we examine the calls to develop pre-service teachers' global competencies across different levels of educational policy-making and show how, despite extensive efforts, teacher education curriculum has not been consistently adapted to respond to these calls. Using two programs as an example, we show that despite overt commitment to global imperatives, limited content or few experiences prepare teachers to think "internationally" and "relationally" on a global scale. Similarly limited are the opportunities for future teachers and teacher educators to critically examine the foundations of many internationalization efforts, such as discourses of competition and U.S. domination over various Others. We argue that reconfigured coursework in comparative and international education (CIE) that examines various intersections of globalization and education will allow teacher education to respond to the challenges posed by globalization and will help pre-service teachers to develop a stance as responsible participants in a global dialogue.

Globality and Diversity in Teacher Education Standards

In this section, we focus on various standards for pre-service teacher education and trace how constructions of globality and diversity appear across the standards documents that shape teacher education curricula in two Midwestern institutions. The constructions of globality and diversity change from one text to another, yet they reveal strong intertextual links between different standards. Even though expectations for global content in teacher preparation may vary across different texts, standards for teacher education curricula consistently present globality and diversity as inalienable parts of professional teacher preparation. Yet the standards' lack of specificity as to how global content can be conceptualized opens up opportunities for the teacher

education community to address those expectations according to the priorities already identified by the field (see Apple, 2011; Roberts, 2007, Shaklee, 2012; Zhao, 2010).

Standards by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). We begin with an analysis of standards created by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The first theme that cuts across a variety of teacher education standards is the theme of globality. The press release for the standards issued in 2013 included the following statement about CAEP's intentions:

CAEP is raising the bar for educator preparation, ensuring that providers are producing highly effective teachers for every classroom and helping to ensure that all of America's P-12 students are prepared to compete in today's *global economy*. (emphasis added; Everett, 2013)

Of note in this justification is the goal of competition in the global economy. The language of global economy has become so commonplace that it becomes necessary to consider the silences in this statement to break through the commonsense of national agendas. The standards are not created to foster strong democracy through education or to expand opportunities for each child that attends U.S. schools. It is not setting out to improve education so that students in U.S. schools learn to live meaningful and fulfilling lives. Rather, the press release frames this document's significance in global economic terms. In a later section, we will return to this point and consider ways in which CIE can challenge the common sense of such framings.

The standards documents refer to "global economy" only once, using the same framing as that quoted above. The reference to globality appears in the text of one of the standards:

Standard #5: Application of Content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and *global issues*. (emphasis added; CAEP Accreditation Standards, 2013/2015, p. 4)

Unlike other key constructs used in the composition of the standards, "local and global issues" that appear in this section remain undefined and unexplained. Apart from its lack of specificity, this phrase is also important because of the conceptual focus it represents. Local and global are constructed as "issues" that need to be solved through "critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving." Similarly to the earlier point about justification for the standards through their role in helping P-12 students compete in the global economy, it is important to consider the silences in this text. It is not the local and global diversity, complexity, or interconnectedness that may require the application of knowledge for better understanding or more effective communication. The world at large is presented as a problem to be solved.

The second theme that plays an important role in teacher education standards is the theme of diversity. Preparing teacher candidates to engage with diverse Others emerges as a priority in the work of teacher education programs. Of note is the construct of diversity that CAEP standards put forward. In the beginning of the text, a glossary provides the following explanation of what "all P-12 students" stands for:

All P-12 students: Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender,

language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin. (CAEP Standards for Accreditation, 2013/2015, p. 3)

This definition captures the multiple aspects of diversity that seem to characterize American schools. Yet, this all-inclusive definition becomes slightly reshaped in other sections of the text. For example, in the section that explains the role of diversity and technology in teacher education standards, the following reconceptualization is provided: “From race and ethnicity to poverty, language, disabilities, giftedness, religion, sexual orientation, and gender, *America is diversity*” (emphasis in the original; CAEP Accreditation Standards, 2013/2015, p. 20). What aspect of diversity is the first one to become disposable in teacher education standards? It is the diversity connected to immigration – one of the key global processes in modern days – that subsequently becomes erased in this text. This erasure is so successful that this aspect of diversity does not appear in any of the other standards documents that shape teacher education curricula. It is to these documents we turn next.

InTASC, State, and Institutional Standards. CAEP standard # 5 focusing on “global issues” is connected to InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) standards. This phrase appears to be the most commonly used globally-oriented phrase in the text. In this document, under the same standard, “local and global issues” are expected to be tackled through “diverse social and cultural perspectives,” “disciplinary knowledge,” and connections between concepts (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013, pp. 27-29). The next most commonly used phrase is “global awareness” (p. 27). Together with “health literacy,” “civic literacy,” and “environmental literacy,” it is identified as one of the “interdisciplinary themes” that teachers should be able to explore in their classrooms. The following example illustrates this point:

The teacher understands how current interdisciplinary themes (e.g., civic literacy, health literacy, global awareness) connect to the core subjects and knows how to weave those themes into meaningful learning experiences. (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013, p. 24)

This standard assumes that teachers themselves already possess this “global awareness” and can now employ it as an “interdisciplinary theme.” Once again, similarly to “global issues” above, “global awareness” remains undefined and unspecified; what it might entail in a curriculum is not discussed. But there is more that teachers need to be able to do about it. For example, the list of teacher knowledge items includes the following statement: “the teacher knows where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding, and how to integrate them into the curriculum” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013, p. 27). What those resources might be remains a question. Overall, InTASC standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013) are peppered with a variety of global responsibilities that a teacher is expected to carry out, such as developing “global skills” in their students (p. 4), fostering “interactions with local and global peers” (p. 29), and support students’ “collaboration with local and global peers” (p. 46).

State and university standards, as near mirror images of each other, are less ambitious in incorporating global agendas into teacher education programs. As a part of “understanding and appreciating liberal arts,” teacher candidates are often expected to possess “an understanding of global and international perspectives” (Michigan Department of Education, 2005, p. 22). In addition to a perceptual engagement with globality, teachers are supposed to “demonstrate

knowledge of the various [learning] communities..., including the professional community and local, state, national, and international communities” (Michigan Department of Education, 2005, p. 27). The goal of increasing teachers’ awareness of multiple communities to which she might belong are laudable, but the question worth considering is whether or not she has been equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary to navigate various communities. The absence of other international or global goals in the standards suggests that this positions a teacher in the midst of multiple scales of governance and authority without equipping her with the conceptual and intellectual tools to navigate, or have a voice in those communities (Carano, 2013; Merryfield, 1997; Mottola Poole & Russell, 2015).

Overall, two patterns emerge from our analysis of the documents. First, even though phrases linked to the global agenda for teacher education occur throughout various standards documents with steady regularity, they appear undefined and unspecified. Definitions, explanations, or elaborations of what constitutes international perspectives or global issues are not provided, even though other aspects (such as diversity) are subjected to clarifications and explanations. Second, the relative emphasis placed on the global agenda along with the meanings attached to it fluctuates across different levels, receiving the most attention in the regional InTASC standards and declining at the state and university level. What remains to be seen is how this agenda becomes translated into the competencies developed by teacher education programs.

Program Curriculum. Teacher education curriculum is often heavily regimented and regulated, which creates obstacles for incorporating global or international elements (Schneider, 2003, 2007). To examine how these obstacles are navigated by different programs, we will focus on two Midwestern public universities: one is a teaching-oriented institution with a limited number of specializations provided; the other one is a research-intensive institution with large enrollments across a variety of majors. In the teaching institution, the courses that teacher candidates are required to take comprise 120 credits, leaving pre-service teachers with only one elective they can take that is supposed to satisfy the global competency requirement—a course on global health or another topic addressing an international issue. The courses within the teacher education program itself are heavily loaded with content, leaving little room for incorporating global and international perspectives. The only place where global or international infusion becomes possible is in the course on multicultural education.

The research-intensive institution has created a cohort program that prepares pre-service teachers for working in global contexts. Students take four courses required by the cohort program during their freshman and sophomore years. Of those courses, one explicitly focuses on the questions of immigration and the complexity of teaching immigrant students. Another course is dedicated to students’ service learning placement in a program that provides support services to immigrants. The remaining two courses incorporate some readings about immigrant students’ experiences in schools or briefly address questions of globalization. The upper-level courses that students take once they are admitted to the teacher preparation program itself are intended to incorporate “global and international perspectives” but rarely manage to. This happens because either instructors teaching them feel unprepared to introduce international perspectives or the expectations placed on the content of the courses do not allow for any additions.

To address the gaps in the curriculum and to provide students with opportunities to develop global competencies, study abroad trips are often offered as options within teacher education programs, but such opportunities are limited, typically quite short, and not always affordable (Institute of International Education, 2015). Currently, many universities support study abroad programs with the goal of having students “develop knowledge, skills, attitudes,

and experiences necessary either to compete successfully in the global marketplace or to work toward finding and implementing solutions to problems of global significance” (Lewin, 2009, p. xiv). As part of their mission statement, they refer to developing globally-minded graduates, but most often students travel to “familiar locations” (Che, Spearman, & Manizade, 2009, p. 104), where they typically do not have to wrestle with the cognitive dissonance of self/Other as they do in less familiar study abroad destinations. In general, students’ knowledge about other countries or appreciation of other cultures can be limited, creating an unrealistic challenge for study abroad trips to transform their perspectives of the Other. Instead those short trips tend to produce what Bodle (2013) theorized as a “bubble”: students’ inability “to travel outside of a set of invisible boundaries created by the constraints of language, political climate and a unique guest/host relationship.” Davies and Pike (2009) point out that there is a need to encourage an in-depth understanding of culture in teacher education programs, but that simply taking a study abroad trip does not mean that teachers will integrate this into their own teaching (Holden & Hicks, 2007), and that without mediated experiences, it can actually lead to confusion and the reification of misperceptions of the Other.

Regardless of their potential benefits or shortcomings, study abroad trips can be challenging to access for teacher education students. In the research intensive institution (described above) that has invested significantly in internationalization of its operations, the total number of students participating in study abroad trips from all of the College of Education was 79 in 2012 and 94 in 2013. These numbers represent only a fraction of the entire undergraduate student body and the over 1200 undergraduate students enrolled in the College’s teacher preparation programs. Similarly, in the teaching institution, about 25 students of 506, or about five percent of education majors, participated in a study abroad program, and about 20, or less than five percent, did their student teaching in international contexts. While these trends are encouraging because they show growing attention to internationalizing teacher education, they also reveal that only a small percentage of students become exposed to global themes through such initiatives.

Gaps in Addressing the Global Imperatives

Thus far we have demonstrated that there is a nationally-circulated call² for infusing teacher preparation with global perspectives, but there exists a gap between what the standards advocate and what the curriculum makes possible. In addition to the gap itself, what is included in these global perspectives and skills is quite vague. Analysis presented so far demonstrates that, despite the presence of international and global themes in standards for teacher preparation, the potential of those themes is only partially realized in teacher education curriculum. First, while instructors engage in earnest efforts to bring in international perspectives, the limited time available for additional content leaves room only for window-dressing approaches to the theme of globality, unless it is a specific course set up distinctly for this purpose (such as the course on working with immigrant students). Second, even though study abroad trips have the potential to compensate for a lack of spaces for global awareness in the curriculum, they are accessible only to a small fraction of students. Thus, teacher education students’ exposure to “international and global perspectives” continues to depend on instructors’ commitments and interests, making engagement with this standard rather opportunistic (McTighe Musil, 2006). Similarly, others

² It would be important to research which actors outside of teacher education promote global agendas and how they benefit from their spread. This is an issue that deserves serious consideration but is beyond the scope of this paper.

have found a stark lack of global education content in teacher education coursework (Allard & Santoro, 2006; Ferguson-Patrick, et al., 2012; Garmon, 2004; Haberman, 1991; Mills, 2008).

Therefore, we wonder if this might be an opportunity for the comparative and international education community to engage with these calls and their lack of specificity to start conversations about global and international perspectives that CIE courses could bring to teacher education curriculum. These courses could address CAEP and InTASC standards, particularly in relation to the knowledge, dispositions and performance required in order to have genuine global education (Hovland et al., 2009). In putting forward this proposal, we recognize that teacher education curriculum is quite full. Yet we believe that it is possible to locate spaces that can be dedicated to CIE content.

For example, the teaching institution described above already requires that students take a general education course that focuses on international themes, such as “World Religions” or “Global Sexualities in Pop Culture”—courses that are not directly engaging with the topics vital for future teachers. The research institution described above tailored two professionally-oriented courses to the topic of immigrant students, which leaves a possibility of allowing one of those courses to focus on globality more broadly conceived. There are other institutions that have also found a way to incorporate global content into teacher education curriculum. For example, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse identified the preparation of “globally responsive teacher” as their vision and integrated a course titled “Education in a Global Society” into teacher education curriculum. Together these examples illustrate that even though the task can be quite challenging, it is nevertheless feasible to incorporate a CIE course into teacher preparation.

Historical Perspectives on the Relationship between Teacher Education and CIE

Before we transition to considering specific ways in which the curricular gap of globality can be addressed with the help of CIE courses, we want to acknowledge the complex relationship between teacher education and comparative education. As early as 1975, Borrowman suggested that competency-based teacher education was too technically-driven to incorporate CIE courses into its curriculum. Stakeholders wanted teacher education programs to be accountable for their graduates’ performance in the classroom, and there was allegedly no way to prove that comparative education courses make better teachers. Noah’s (1975) response that similar questions have been asked of few other courses in teacher education curriculum reveals that comparative education has much to offer teacher candidates:

It seems to me, however, necessary to understand that modern comparative study is just as concerned with the cross-cultural aspects of education. If this is true, comparative education is especially important for the training of teachers to work in the multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-religious faith society of the contemporary United States. Somehow or other teachers have to acquire an understanding of the rich interdependencies of the schools (and the way they work) with the variety of cultures extant in the United States. Study in the field of comparative education, I submit, is one of the important ways those insights may be developed. (p. 368)

Two years prior to this argument, Ruscoe (1973) suggested that comparative education can accomplish four goals in teacher education curriculum. It can warn against “overzealous borrowing,” help with “testing educational innovations,” examine “generalizations about education,” and help teachers gain new perspectives on how teaching is done in the U.S. Ironically, the U.S. educational innovation of that time that Ruscoe described was accountability.

He argued that a study of comparative education could help teachers understand the inappropriateness of policies that single them out as solely responsible for students' achievement. We believe that these insights are as relevant today as they were then. CIE courses can play an important role in helping teachers understand "educational innovations," notice interdependencies of schools, and be better equipped to work with immigrant populations in multicultural schools.

It is also worth noting that these debates rotate around CIE's need to defend itself as a legitimate social science and, therefore, protect its academic position. Association with teacher education, however, requires a pragmatic reorientation necessary to serve the needs of teachers' professional preparation. For a discussion of the tensions between academic disciplines and teachers' professional preparation, see Labaree (2004). We agree with Kubow and Blosser (2014) that there is merit in considering what CIE as a field has to offer teacher education and how CIE can benefit from closer ties with teacher education. In the current political climate when both university-based teacher education and undergraduate-level comparative education courses are threatened with extinction, their potential survival rests on the ability to collaborate, innovate, and work together towards a shared goal—a more just and ethical world where teachers receive extensive professional preparation that equips them with tools necessary to be organic intellectuals (Gramsci, 1971).

CIE Courses in Teacher Education

What could CIE courses offer in order to address the calls for more global content expressed in the standards so that teacher candidates develop global awareness? How could those courses prepare teacher candidates to engage with the Other on a deep level that would afford opportunities for transformative cosmopolitan learning to happen? In this section of the paper, we explore our vision for the type of CIE conceptual framework that would not simply respond to these national calls but would also prepare teacher candidates to re-consider their position in the world in such a way that they would be able to contest and challenge the discourses of education for global competition that have become the new "common sense" (Kumashiro, 2009) of educational reforms. A parochial focus on the classroom, the district, or the state in teacher preparation precludes a teacher from playing this role in the context where a significant number of national policies are shaped by global discourses. We emphasize the need for CIE courses that could equip students with conceptual tools necessary to understand global transformations in education, see connections between those transformations and changes in economic structures, and critically examine the role that teachers can occupy in the context of global change—a position of responsiveness and responsibility. But we also find that the common framing of CIE courses in terms of national differences and similarities, or convergence/divergence debates to be insufficient for the task. This framing reifies the imaginary national boundaries and continues to present nations as containers in which different cultures reside and educational systems operate.

This methodological nationalism (Shahjahan & Kezar, 2013) does little to help teachers in the U.S. and around the world understand several important issues. They include the material and discursive re-structuring of global economy, the role of international assessments in promoting educational standardization, the power of global actors in promoting educational transformations, and the ethical responsibilities of those who come from more privileged backgrounds to act towards greater good for all around the world. We believe that among many other possible topics that can be included in reconfigured CIE courses, it is those in particular that deserve extensive treatment and therefore each is briefly addressed next.

The Re-structuring of Global Economy. Pre-service teachers need the skills to critically analyze political discourses and know where to draw the line when they are asked to take the responsibility for their future students' success in the global economy. CIE courses could help them develop these skills by creating spaces for pre-service teachers to examine the transformations in the global economic systems that occurred in the last three decades and analyze the position that schools came to occupy in the re-structured global capitalist world order (Kelly & Kenway, 2014). This analysis would help pre-service teachers better understand the problematic nature of placing the responsibility for nations' competitiveness in the global economy on teachers and the troubling approaches of using global competitiveness agendas to draw attention away from economic inequalities within nations.

To consider the re-structuring of global capitalism (Kelly & Kenway, 2014), it is helpful to examine globalization scholarship from a variety of disciplines. For example, Hirst and Thompson (2000) demonstrated how transnational corporations move production and services to sites with the cheapest labor and minimal regulations. This movement led some to observe that capital is highly mobile, but the labor force remains highly constrained by the national migration regulations and controls. The volatility of capital's movements has less to do with the education or professional preparation of the labor force but more with cost-cutting and profit-increasing opportunities that this movement affords. Since the NAFTA agreement came into effect in 1993, the U.S. economy has lost more than a million jobs because manufacturing was moved to Mexico (Scott, 2003). The move did not happen because American schools did not prepare their students well or Mexican workers were more qualified. Manufacturing was moved because labor cost less and regulations on environmental protection were less stringent in Mexico (Scott, 2003). But this move has left behind struggling communities where unemployment soared and poverty levels rose dramatically (Apple, Kenway, & Singh, 2005).

The interplay between economic factors of labor costs and the relocation of production reveals how in some cases globalization has become the smokescreen that obscures the changed relationships between the state, the private sector, and the society. As D. Harvey (2007) observed about the spread of neoliberalism that globalization facilitates, the state serves to protect the markets for the private sector, but not necessarily to protect the society from the harmful consequences of market expansion to new frontiers. As has been noted before, in the current global economy, profits are privatized but risks are socialized. The changed relationships between the state, the private sector, and the society often leave individuals both vulnerable and responsible for their own well-being, removing the social nets that used to provide support in prior configurations of these relationships (Stiglitz, 2012). Students are told to get more education to ensure financial security, but the global rush to get more education decreases the value of degrees, making more workers compete for less-paying jobs (Brown, Lauder, & Ashton, 2011).

It is in this context that future teachers have to situate their work; it is from this understanding of the global economic system and its impact on the communities they will serve that they need to build their teaching practice. This understanding may help future teachers recognize the impact of the changed economic and social structures on students' economic opportunities and their motivation for schooling (MacLeod, 2009). It will also help teachers engage with deconstructing policy texts or publications in professional journals that argue that the quality of education should be increased to overcome the problem with job outsourcing (for example, Levine, 2010).

Apart from debunking myths about the relationship between education and economic growth (see Ramirez, Luo, Schofer, & Meyer, 2006), CIE courses could engage teacher candidates in the analysis of how political leaders and educational reformers use globalization as a smokescreen for domestic problems in education. For example, during Michelle Rhee's interview with CNN (April, 2011), the anchor suggested that the U.S. should pay less attention to international tests, but more attention to the disparities between "the good districts and the not-so-good districts." Michelle Rhee avoided responding to the question about national inequality and instead focused on global competitiveness: "When our kids grow up they are not gonna be competing against kids in Philadelphia or in Memphis. They're gonna be competing against kids in India and China."

In the context where economic inequality in the U.S. continues to rise (Stiglitz, 2012) and poverty's detrimental effects on students' opportunities to learn increases (Berliner, 2006), this exchange illustrates how schools' responsibility for maintaining U.S. global competitiveness has become a smokescreen for the problems of the American educational system. Instead of engaging with these difficult questions, Rhee evoked the globalization discourse. Pre-service teachers need to learn how to engage with these evasions and how to distinguish between various deployments of globalization discourses. Integrating such analyses into teacher education curriculum with the help of CIE courses would help programs address InTASC standards for teachers' global awareness and CAEP standards for preparing teachers to engage in explorations of global issues.

International Assessments. Pre-service teachers could benefit from learning about international assessments, such as PISA, TIMSS, and PIRLS, that have begun to play an increasingly important role in national policy-making and local decision-making. The emergence of the Common Core Standards in the U.S. was justified through references to American students' below average performance on PISA. Members of the political elite are paying close attention to the U.S. not performing well in those assessments and use those results to advocate for sweeping reforms. Widely publicized results of students' poor performance on international assessments undermines the society's trust in public schools and decreases their support for increasing investments in educational systems (Morgan & Poppe, 2012). In an attempt to mitigate the crisis rhetoric that emerged when PISA results were released in 2013, Learning First Alliance, a partnership of leading education organizations, issued a statement explaining what PISA is and how the results on this assessment should be read with great caution. *The Washington Post* ran a crash course explanation on how to make sense of PISA and what potential problems there may be with the test (J. Harvey, 2015).

Just as the members of society gradually become informed about some of the intricacies and complexities of the international assessments, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)—the organization in charge of PISA—now offers individual schools the opportunity to participate in this assessment on their own. In the U.S., more schools than anywhere else in the world chose to participate in school-level assessments (Sellar & Lingard, 2013), even though school-level assessments are expensive and not likely to produce helpful results (Rutkowski, Rutkowski, & Plucker, 2014). The growing influence of international assessments on the U.S. educational system is becoming more apparent every day, yet pre-service teachers and K-12 educators rarely get to engage in a discussion, let alone deep-level analysis, of what these assessments are, how to make sense of them, how to trace their impact on their practice, and how to engage in debates about those assessments in professional settings. Acquiring these skills, however, is precisely what they need to be able to participate in dialogues

across professional communities—the type of skills identified as necessary in state and institutional standards.

CIE courses could help pre-service teachers explore the profound impacts of these assessments. From defining what knowledge is worth knowing (allegedly to ensure competitiveness and growth in the global economy) to creating parameters for human development and becoming (Sellar & Lingard, 2013), these tests are reaching wider and deeper into educational practices and settings. Such assessments promote a set of values and set the stage for spreading prescriptions for pedagogies, curricular reforms, and creation of testing cultures (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). In a sense, they re-define the purposes of schooling on the global stage and do so through the subtle mechanisms of government buy-in and public acquiescence (Grek, 2009). These assessments facilitate standardization of educational systems, policies, and subjects (Spring, 2015). Reflecting on their ubiquitous presence along with the pressures that they have created in diverse contexts around the world, Meyer and Benavot (2013) describe the presence of these assessment programs as “testing regimes.” Engaging pre-service teachers in gaining an understanding of assessment processes—both in their global spread and in their local manifestations—can equip them with conceptual and intellectual tools necessary to take on the challenges of the profession that they are about to enter. Given the knowledge and research base that has been created by CIE, only those courses could respond to these challenges through a careful unpacking of connections between the types of knowledge, curriculum, and skills that teachers are expected to teach in schools and the ways in which international assessments are pushing in and modifying these expectations.

Apart from examining the re-definition of what constitutes worthwhile knowledge that international assessments introduce, pre-service teachers could benefit from exploring how results on international assessments are used or ignored in directing reform efforts in different countries. One such area of exploration could be ways in which the neoliberal re-definition of education as a commodity-producing enterprise makes it necessary to apply cost-benefit analysis to the performance of educational systems (DeLissavoy, 2015). The major goal becomes increasing system efficiency by measuring outcomes and identifying areas where costs can be cut. Participation in international assessments allows political elites to use international test performance to advance their agendas of cost-cutting and re-structuring of education (Steiner-Khamsi, 2010). In the U.S., poor performance on international tests has become the justification for turning much of public education to private sector control (Burch, 2009). Recognizing connections between global processes and national-level educational change will help pre-service teachers to be better-informed policy actors and advocates for public education.

Global and Transnational Actors. In addition to examining how international assessments affect educational reforms, school curricula, and teaching practices, pre-service teachers need to understand the role of global actors in educational transformations around the world. Even though an individual teacher may feel that global actors are so far removed that they are unlikely to matter, the intricate web of policy networks that include global actors and contribute to national level decision-making encircle her even without her overt knowledge of their presence. One such global actor is the OECD, which Spring (2015) refers to as the “World Ministry of Education” (p. 64). This organization was originally set up to monitor economic processes and steer trade agreements; over the years it has grown in its ability to influence how education is done, not only in its member states, but also in the countries that are not official members. But OECD’s ambition of increasing levels of educational attainment across the globe is intended to eventually reach teachers in their classrooms. Arguments about who should be

recruited into teaching, what type of training is sufficient or necessary for a person to have prior to embarking on their teaching career, or what type of support systems are necessary to ensure their success are increasingly shaped by reports produced by such actors as OECD. In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education, OECD now organizes annual meetings, such as the International Summit on the Teaching Profession, where their policy prescriptions for the questions above are disseminated among the invited ministers of education and other key national level decision-makers.

The activities of OECD, the World Bank, and other international organizations increasingly position teachers at the center of global neoliberal governance (Robertson, 2013) and global surveillance. Those who enter the teaching profession should become aware of how their work is framed and managed at the global level; they should also realize that there are international groups that attempt to counteract these influences and protect the rights of teachers around the world, such as the global teachers' union Education International. CIE courses could create spaces for mapping out relationships among these various actors, learning what agendas these different actors pursue, and how their activities can affect professional activities of individual teachers. As pre-service teachers learn about different international organizations, they can also learn about resources that they can use "to build global awareness and understanding" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013, p. 27) in their future students, as InTASC standards suggest they should.

Looking at international organizations alone could be beneficial but insufficient. The global rise of private sector involvement in education, we believe, would also need to be addressed in CIE courses. From examining the role of Microsoft Corporation in leading the way for introducing ICT competencies in national curricula around the world (Bhanji, 2012) to Pearson's control of textbook production, teachers' professional development, and learning outcome measurements (Ball, 2012), pre-service teachers would benefit from understanding the ways in which corporate actors shape educational agendas to carve out guaranteed markets for themselves. Understanding the complexity of these relationships as they span the globe and set in motion national and state educational policies would equip future teachers with tools necessary for an informed position on growing privatization of public education in the U.S. and in various contexts around the world.

Self and Other in Global Contexts. When global actors' role in standardization of education and in governing the teaching profession is growing (Spring, 2015), future teachers need to understand how these changes bring them into closer proximity with educational professionals around the world. Grasping the intricacy of this interconnectedness should help teacher candidates understand both the need for greater solidarity with members of their profession across the globe and the need to combat the tendencies of framing U.S. education through the lens of American exceptionalism. Such issues as standardized testing and curricula, teacher shaming, or immigrant students' struggles in new contexts are not unique to the U.S. Exploring how these challenges manifest themselves in various locales around the world and how other educational professionals respond to these challenges can expand pre-service teachers' planetary vision and help them imagine alternative narratives to the ones they might be subjected to locally or nationally.

To accomplish this pursuit of imagining alternatives, CIE courses should help pre-service teachers develop an understanding of their own position in relation to diverse Others. As multiple studies have demonstrated, it is common for predominantly White teachers in the U.S. to draw boundaries that separate them from either diverse students in their classrooms (Howard,

2006) or educators from other contexts (Dunn, 2013). These examples illustrate a lack of relational thinking that stems from unexamined and unquestioned positions of dominance that many White teachers occupy (Howard, 2006).

One area that could help illuminate the contradictions of this position is the exploration of neocolonial projects in education. The very fragmentation of the field in which development agencies apply expertise produced in the Global North to solve educational problems in the Global South could help pre-service teachers examine ways in which the Other can be positioned as inherently inferior and incapable of producing their own solutions. Hidden in these constructions of technical problem-solution conceptualization (Ferguson, 1994) are the patterns of consumption and exploitation that benefit the Global North without addressing the structural inequalities that necessitated these conceptualizations in the first place. Said (1978) explains the subtlety of these relationships:

Always there lurks an assumption that although the Western consumer belongs to a numerical minority, he is entitled either to own or to expend (or both) the majority of the world resources. Why? Because he, unlike the Oriental, is a true human being...a white middle-class westerner believes in his human prerogative not only to manage the nonwhite world but also to own it, just because by definition 'it' is not quite as human as 'we' are. There is no purer example than this of dehumanized thought. (p. 108)

Engaging pre-service teachers in examining their assumptions about educational systems in other countries can be helpful for challenging American exceptionalism, preparing pre-service teachers for working with diverse (particularly immigrant) students, and building their knowledge base about the countries they might visit during their study abroad trips or international teaching placements. Learning about other cultures and other educational contexts in CIE courses should help students “make the familiar strange” and move away from assuming the inherent superiority of how teaching and schooling are done in the U.S. Exploring development projects and their “unintended” consequences could also illuminate ways in which educators in the Global North are complicit in reconstructing dependencies through short-term projects and drive-by problem-solving in the Global South. The analytical work of critiquing some of the projects can serve as a model for pre-service teachers to consider how they could engage their future students in developing “global skills” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013, p. 4) and fostering “interactions with local and global peers” (p. 29), as InTASC standards suggest they should, in ways that would not reproduce hierarchies and assumptions of one’s own superiority.

This could be especially helpful if pre-service teachers gained insight into understanding their own positions in the world and how those positions affect how they read the world. Is their position based on “a protracted, almost metaphysical obligation to rule subordinate, or less advanced peoples” (Said, 1993, p. 10)? Do they come to the encounters with Others in order to see them for their own self-gratification or self-elevation? Or are they prepared to enter dialogues with Others as humble learners pursuing an exchange with those they consider to be equal? The pursuit of imagining alternatives and disrupting narratives of inevitable economic globalization can come through attempts to re-imagine the planet:

Both the dominant and the subordinate must jointly rethink themselves as intended or interpellated by planetary alterity, albeit articulating the task of thinking and doing from different ‘cultural’ angles. What is new here is that the dominant is educated, persistently

to attempt, at last, to suspend appropriation in its own interest in order to learn to learn from ‘below,’ to learn to mean to say – not just deliberately non-hierarchically, as the U.S. formula goes – I need to learn from you what you practice; I need it even if you didn’t want to share a bit of my pie; but there’s something I want to give you, which will make our shared practice flourish. You don’t know, and I didn’t know, that civility requires your practice of responsibility as pre-originary right. (Spivak, 2012, p. 347)

Whether through discussions of pedagogy of Ubuntu, Confucian influences on educational approaches around the world, or the impact of Freirian philosophy on formal and informal educational practices, CIE courses can help pre-service teachers develop a relational view of the planet. This view would allow them to learn from what Others practice, so that together with students and educators from around the world they could make their “shared practice flourish.” These explorations can enhance how diversity is commonly constructed and examined in teacher education, moving away from identity categories towards the recognition of diverse ways of being, knowing, and becoming (Dillard, 2002). This planetary relational view can promote an ethic of collective responsibility as a right, which is necessary to strive towards a more just modernity (Spivak, 2012; Ray, 2003).

CIE courses need to create space for examining these relationships between self and Other, so that pre-service teachers are better equipped for engaging with multiple forms of diversity, be it through international teaching placements, professional development in other countries, or in work with diverse communities in the U.S. We believe that to have profound conversations, to raise important questions, and to pursue insightful inquiries in new contexts or unfamiliar communities, pre-service teachers need a conceptual foundation that helps them see their position in the world and helps them develop an understanding of complexities of relationships that entangle them in relation to diverse Others. CIE courses could provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to learn how they could enter into a dialogue with diverse Others responsibly and ethically, so that transformative learning can occur for all parties involved in the interaction, regardless of where it takes place.

Conclusion

In this paper, we analyzed how the global imperative for teacher education echoes across the standards documents for teacher education programs. We have also described gaps that emerge in teacher education curricula around international and global trends, despite some efforts to incorporate global themes into teacher preparation. We believe that comparative education courses are necessary to address those gaps, particularly if their contents are tailored to equip teachers with conceptual foundations necessary to better understand global processes and transnational transformations in schooling and teaching around the world. While we support the move to integrate global content into other courses in teacher education, we note that such attempts can lead to opportunistic voluntarism.

In order to meet the standards for teacher education that focus on global and international perspectives, we believe a reconceptualized CIE course would be of great benefit. It can equip future teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary to be well-informed policy actors by focusing on global processes, international assessments, global actors, and self/Other relationships and address the learning progressions of Learner Development, Assessment, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, Leadership and Collaboration of INTASC standards. This reconceptualized CIE course could either fulfill a general education requirement or become a part of a multicultural education sequence. This sequence could enhance pre-service teachers’

global consciousness and challenge the ethnocentric assumptions which inform their interaction with multiple and diverse Others. The ultimate goal of such teacher preparation would not be education for U.S. economic competitiveness, but rather education of planetary human beings who take on the ethical responsibility of justice and care on a global scale.

References

- Allard, A., & Santoro, N. (2006). Troubling identities: Teacher education students' constructions of class and ethnicity. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), 115-129.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2011). Global crises, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(2), 222-234. doi: 10.1177/00224871110385428
- Apple, M. W., Kenway, J., & Singh, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Bodle, A. (2013). *The production of "the bubble:" Space in a short term "global" study tour*. Unpublished manuscript. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global education, Inc.: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berliner, D. (2006). Our impoverished view of educational research. *The Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 949-995.
- Bhanji, Z. (2012). Transnational private authority in education policy in Jordan and South Africa: The case of Microsoft Corporation. *Comparative Education Review*, 56(2), 300-319.
- Borrowman, M. L. (1975). Comparative education in teacher education programs. *Comparative Education Review*, 19(3), 354-362.
- Brown, P., Lauder, H. U. G. H., & Ashton, D. (2011). *The global auction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burch, P. (2009). *Hidden markets: The new education privatization*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013/2015). CAEP accreditation standards. Washington, DC: CAEP.
- Carano, K.T. (2013). Global educators' personal attribution of a global perspective. *Journal of International Social Studies*, 3(1), 4-18.
- Che, S. M., Spearman, M., & Manizade, A. (2009). Constructive disequilibrium: Cognitive and emotional development through dissonant experiences in less familiar destinations. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad* (pp. 99-116). New York, NY: Routledge.
- CNN (Producer). (2011, April 14). *Michelle Rhee answers critics*. [Television broadcast]. Atlanta, GA: CNN.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013). *Model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers*. Washington, DC: Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.
- Davies, I., & Pike, G. (2009). Global citizenship education: Challenges and possibilities. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 61-77). New York, NY: Routledge.
- DeLissavoy, N. (2015). *Education and emancipation in the neoliberal era: Being, teaching, and power*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2006). Globalizations. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23(2-3), 393-399.

- Dillard, C. B. (2002). Walking ourselves back home: The education of teachers with/in the world. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(5), 383.
- Dunn, A. H. (2013). *Teachers without borders? The hidden consequences of international teachers in US schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Everett, Z. (2013, August 29). New accreditation standards adopted to ensure quality in educator preparation. Press Release. Washington, DC: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.
- Ferguson, J. (1994). *The anti-politics machine: "Development," depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ferguson-Patrick, K., Macqueen, S., & Reynolds, R. (December, 2012). *Global education in teacher education programs: Views from pre-service teachers*. Paper presented at Joint AARE/APERA International Conference, Sydney, Australia.
- Garmon, M. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(3), 201-213.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). On education. In Q. Hoarse & G. N. Smith (Eds.), *Selections from the prison notebooks by Antonio Gramsci* (pp. 24-43). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Grek, S. (2009). Governing by numbers: The PISA 'effect' in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(1), 23-37.
- Haberman, M. (1991). Can cultural awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teaching Education*, 4(1), 25-31.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the conditions of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, J. (February 3, 2015). Ten things you need to know about international assessments. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2015/02/03/ten-things-you-need-to-know-about-international-assessments/>
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Globalization in question: The international economy and the possibilities of governance*. Oxford: Polity Press/Blackwell.
- Holden, C., & Hicks, D. (2007). Making global connections: The knowledge, understanding and motivation of trainee teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(1), 13-23.
- Hovland, K., McTighe Musil, K., Skilton-Sylvester, E., & Jamison, A. (2009). It takes a curriculum: Bringing global mindedness home. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad* (pp. xiii-xxii). New York, NY: Routledge
- Howard, G. R. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Institute of International Education. (2015). *Fields of study of U.S. study abroad students, 2003/04-2013/14*. Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange. New York: IIE.
- Kelly, P., & Kenway, J. (2014). Growing up in the great recession: Revisiting the restructuring of gender, schooling, and work. In N. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 167-184). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kissock, C., & Richardson, P. (2010). Calling for action within the teaching profession: It is time to internationalize teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 89-101.

- Kubow, P.K. & Blosser, A.H. (2014). Trends and issues in the teaching of comparative education. In A.W. Wiseman & E. Anderson (Eds.), *Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2014* (pp. 15-22). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2009). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with Ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Learning First Alliance. (2013). *Learning First Alliance issues statement about programme for international student assessment (PISA) results*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Levine, A. (2010). Teacher education must respond to changes in America: Teacher education must adapt to the same changes in the economy, demographics, globalization, and more that are prompting change in K-12 schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(2), 19.
- Lewin, R. (2009). Introduction: The quest for global citizenship through study abroad. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad* (pp. xiii-xxii). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Longview Foundation. (2008). *Teacher preparation for the global age: The imperative for change*. Washington, DC: Asia Society.
- MacLeod, J. (2009). *Ain't no makin' it: Aspirations and attainment in a low-income neighborhood* (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mahon, J. (2010). Fact or fiction? Analyzing institutional barriers and individual responsibility to advance the internationalization of teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 7-18.
- McTighe Musil, C. (2006). *Assessing global learning: Matching good intentions with good practice*. Washington, DC: Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1997). A framework for teacher education in global perspectives. In M. M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow, & S. Pickert (Eds.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators* (pp. 1-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, H. D., & Benavot, A. (Eds.) (2013). *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance*. Providence, RI: Symposium Books.
- Michigan Department of Education. (2005). *Michigan standards for ensuring excellent educators*. Lansing, MI: Office of Professional Preparation Services, Michigan Department of Education.
- Mills, C. (2008). Making a difference: Moving beyond the superficial treatment of diversity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 261-275.
- Morgan, S. L., & Poppe, E. S. T. (2012). The consequences of international comparisons for public support of K-12 education evidence from a national survey experiment. *Educational Researcher*, 41(7), 262-268.
- Mottola Poole, C. and Russell, W. B. (2015). Educating for global perspectives: A study of teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Education*, 195(3), 41-52.
- Noah, H. (1975). Response to Merle L. Borrowman: 'Comparative education in teacher preparation'. *Comparative Education Review*, 19, 367-368.
- Olmedo, I., & Harbon, L. (2010). Broadening our sights: Internationalizing teacher education for a global arena. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 75-88.
- Quezada, R.L. (2010). Internationalization of teacher education: Creating global competent teachers and teacher educators for the twenty-first century. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 1-5. doi: 10.1080/10476210903466885
- Ramirez, F., Luo, X., Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. (2006). Student achievement and national economic growth. *American Journal of Education*, 113(1), 1-29. doi: 10.1086/506492

- Ray, S. (2003). Ethical encounters: Spivak, Alexander and Kincaid. *Cultural Studies*, 17, 42-55.
- Ritzer, G. (Ed.). (2007). *The Blackwell companion to globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Roberts, A. (2007). Global dimensions of schooling: Implications for internationalizing teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 9-26.
- Robertson. (2013). Teachers' work, denationalisation, and transformations in the field of symbolic control: A comparative account. In T. Seddon & J. Levin (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2013: Educators, professionalism and politics: Global transitions, national spaces and professional projects* (pp. 77-96). Oxon: Routledge.
- Ruscoe, G. (1973). Comparative education and teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, 12(1), 23-28.
- Rutkowski, D., Rutkowski, L., & Plucker, J. A. (2014). Should individual US schools participate in PISA? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(4), 68-73.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. London: Vintage Books.
- Schneider, A. I. (2003). *Internationalizing teacher education: What can be done? A research report on the undergraduate training of secondary school teachers*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- Schneider, A. I. (2007). *To leave no teacher behind: Building international competence into the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- Scott, R. E. (2003). *The high price of 'free' trade*. Briefing Paper. Retrieved from http://epi.3cdn.net/bd3621354eb363cc30_9um6be9q0.pdf
- Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). PISA and the expanding role of the OECD in global educational governance. In H.D. Meyer & A. Benavot (Eds.), *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance* (pp. 185-206). Providence, RI: Symposium Books.
- Shahjahan, R. A., & Kezar, A. J. (2013). Beyond the “national container”: Addressing methodological nationalism in higher education research. *Educational Researcher*, 42(1), 20-29.
- Shaklee, B. D. (2012). Developing opportunities to internationalize teacher education. In B. D. Shaklee & S. Baily (Eds.), *Internationalizing teacher education in the United States* (pp. 237-252). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Shaklee, B. D., & Baily, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Internationalizing teacher education in the United States*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Spivak, G. (2012). *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spring, J. (2015). *Globalization of education: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2010). The politics and economics of comparison. *Comparative Education Review*, 54(3), 323-342. doi: doi:10.1086/653047
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Ed.). (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Stiglitz, J. (2012). *The price of inequality*. New York, NY: Norton & Company.
- Tilly, C. (2004). Past, present, and future globalizations. In G. Steiner-Khamsi (Ed.), *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending* (pp. 13-28). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 422-431.

About the Authors

Elena Aydarova is a Postdoctoral Research Scholar at Arizona State University. Her research focuses on globally-circulated educational policies that target teachers, teaching, and teacher education. She has published in *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *European Education*, *Journal of International Studies in Education*, and *The Global Studies Journal*. Dr. Aydarova has taught at an elementary school in Ukraine and teacher education programs in the U.S., China, and the United Arab Emirates.

Sheila K. Marquardt is an associate professor of education at Minnesota State University Moorhead. Her work in K-12 ESL contexts has informed her work in study abroad in teacher education and social justice education in both U.S. and global contexts. Currently, she teaches Social Foundations of Education courses, leads study abroad programs and provides professional development regarding Global Education on her university campus.