INTERNATIONALIZATION AND TEACHER EDUCATION: WHAT DISPOSITIONS DO TEACHERS NEED FOR GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT?

Erin Mikulec

Illinois State University / Fulbright Scholar at University of Helsinki, Finland

Abstract

As more and more universities begin the process of internationalizing their campuses, teacher education programs must also prepare pre-service teachers for global engagement. Establishing a strong foundation for global engagement is crucial in teacher training as it impacts not only pre-service teachers, but also the students with whom they will work. Teacher education programs can promote internationalization and prepare teachers for global engagement through study abroad programs as well as by incorporating models and frameworks for global education into the curriculum. Although there are a number of these models and frameworks available, all of which share many of the same indicators of global-mindedness, there is something missing: the dispositions that teachers need in order to participate in global engagement in a meaningful way. Drawing on research from critical theory, psychology and student development theory, this paper describes five dispositions that are essential for preparing teachers for global engagement. These dispositions include curiosity, tolerance for ambiguity, reflexivity, flexibility and persistence. These dispositions are not independent of one another and are required in different degrees, depending on the global context being investigated.

KEYWORDS: internationalization, teacher education, global engagement, pre-service teachers.

Introduction

More and more universities around the world are beginning the process of internationalizing their campuses (Coryell, Durodoye, Wright, Pate, Nguyen, 2012; Dzvimbo & Moloi, 2013; Fathi-Vajargah & Khoshnoodifar, 2013; Lugostova, Krashova, & Torhova, 2012; Tsuruta, 2013; Urbanovic & Wilkins, 2013). This means that teacher education must also find ways of integrating the principles of global engagement into teacher preparation (Dooly & Villanueva, 2006; Lahdenperä, 1996; Papastephanou, Christou, & Gregoriou, 2013; Quezada, 2010; Shaklee & Baily, 2012; Tudball, 2012; Wang, Lin, Spalding, Odell, & Klecka, 2011). In discussing the complexity of the internationalization of teacher education, Sieber and Mantel (2012) identify various similarities and differences in teacher education between nations. In terms of similarities, they find that there is universal agreement that all teachers should be flexible and creative in their approach, have a profound knowledge and understanding of content, students and pedagogy and are reflective practitioners. On the other hand, the authors point out, there are a number of significant differences between countries when it comes to teacher education; such as perceptions of the profession, levels of governmental systems that exert control over the work that teachers do and how they are trained. For instance, as Ostinelli (2009) points out, there is a "polarization" in the sense that while there many aspects of teaching indicative of a profession, there is also a fair amount of bureaucracy and work that must be carried out as mandated at some level, which can reduce teaching from a profession to a functionary vocation. Further complicating the move to integrate global engagement into teaching and teacher education is the reality of accountability and standards.

Internationalization and Teacher Education

The internationalization of teaching has the potential to impact not only the global community, but the local community in which teachers work as well. By incorporating global perspectives into teacher education, institutions not only impact new teachers, but by extension, the students and communities which they will serve. West (2009) echoes this and says that teacher educators must not only help pre-service teachers to shape their own global mindedness, but also prepare them to transfer this to their students. And, as Olmedo and Hardon (2010) discuss, internationalization means reconstructing education from the perspective of global citizenship.

Fanghanel and Cousin (2012) argue that global citizenship can be defined in one of two ways, the first being "an attempt at Westernising the world, applying Western values and concepts to non-Western contexts"; while the second represents a "multiculturalist approach underpinned by a respect for cultural difference and 'indigenous' scripts and by a promotion of local cultures and local knowledges" (p. 40). Meanwhile, Burnouf (2004) summarizes a myriad of research concerned with global education and narrows the field down to awareness of multiple perspectives, cross-cultural competence, human choices

and environmental issues, as well as knowledge of global dynamics. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between global education and multicultural education, so as not to run the risk of treating global issues from a strictly Western point of view or with a superficial perspective (Lucas, 2010).

Research has sought to distinguish between global education and multicultural education. While the latter typically focuses on the impact of diversity within the immediate educational environment, such as schools and communities, the former is more concerned with issues that transcend political borders, challenge the status quo and invite critical examination of the interconnectedness and impact of a global society. Through this critical examination, teachers not only increase their own awareness of a global society, but become more sensitive to those "issues that can affect children, families and communities, and having those perspectives inform the way they teach" (Olmedo & Hebron, 2010, p.77). This requires that both teachers and teacher educators have a clear understanding of their own positionality when it comes to global issues, given the ideological nature of such discussions and examinations, especially given its potential impact on schools and students (O'Connor & Zeichner, 2011).

However, there is a caveat to the internationalization of teacher education. According to Grimmet (2009), internationalization has become the foundation for ensuring economic development and global competitiveness. This presents a danger of viewing internationalization as a commodity that is valued solely because it leads to, or provides certain groups with economic advantages. This has the potential to treat global issues from an economic gains perspective rather than as a critical examination of the ways in which the world is connected. Rönnström (2012) discusses this tendency in teacher education reform, which he criticizes as being "almost exclusively oriented toward principles of economic growth, effectiveness, and competitiveness at the expense of other important aims of education in the global era, such as the development of reflective and communicative capacities and education for cosmopolitan citizenship" (p. 194). O'Connor and Zeichner (2011) share this belief in their assertion that internationalization and global education are about "politics of recognition" and that in order for learners to truly engage with these concepts, they must value the "impact of cultural and racial systems of domination on the socioeconomic marginalization of certain peoples" (p. 523).

Preparing Teachers for Global Engagement

How, then, are programs to tackle these issues in teacher education and preparation? One way for teacher education programs to do this is through study abroad experiences for pre-service teachers. Cushner (2007) identified several key aspects of the impact of international study abroad experiences on pre-service teachers, including learning about the self and others, development of empathy, increased self-confidence and efficacy, and a positive impact on global-mindedness. West (2013) illustrates the various ways in which this can be done as well as the benefits for both students, teachers and the institutions involved. However, the experiences themselves must be rich and provide meaningful opportunities for professional development and personal reflection. Alasuutari and Jokikokko (2010) emphasize the importance of emotionally powerful experiences in the education of teachers and cite short-term study abroad programs or international internships to help accomplish this. Furthermore, these experiences, both formal and informal, are part of a long-term process that provides teachers with opportunities to reflect on their growth and development. DeVillar and Jiang (2012) described the impact of student teaching abroad in China, Belize, Costa Rica and Mexico on 10 participants who then returned to the United States to begin their careers. The authors contend that the experience impacted the participants by developing their creativity and flexibility as well as having a deeper understanding of the needs of diverse students, leading to greater culturally-responsive teaching.

However these experiences rely on teachers being at a certain point in their preparation in order to take advantage of such opportunities. It is simply not realistic that all pre-service teachers are able to complete a study abroad program during their preparation, given the often rigid sets of requirements in such programs that do not allow for a lot of flexibility, such as spending a semester overseas, without increasing the length of study. Furthermore, although pre-service teachers typically have a range of options in terms of study abroad, it is important that this not be the extent of internationalization in teacher education, which can be unidirectional and may or may not have a lasting impact on a teachers' development of global mindedness. These results and impact of experience rely on the length of time spent abroad, the types of activities in which pre-service teachers are involved, the extent to which the participants engage and interact with the local people and culture, and even the location in which they choose to complete a study abroad program. For instance, the impact of an experience such as the ones

described in DeVillar and Jiang (2012), whose participants studied abroad in China, Belize and Mexico, might be significantly different that those who complete their experience in Western Europe. Study abroad experiences can also potentially be detrimental in the development of global-mindedness or may even serve to reinforce stereotypes or simply provide shallow or artificial experiences where participants lack a genuine understanding of the historical influences on a particular context (Blanco Ramírez, 2013), which researchers have established as a key component to meaningful global engagement (O'Connor & Zeichner, 2011; Olmedo & Hebron, 2010).

Another way for teacher education programs to prepare teachers for global engagement is through the use of models and frameworks of internationalization and values. Merryfield, Tin-Yau, Po, and Kasai (2008) identified five aspects of global-mindedness, which include a knowledge of global interconnectedness, inquiry into global issues, skills on perspective consciousness, habits of mind, such as open-mindedness and recognition of bias, stereotypes and exotica, and finally cross-cultural experiences and intercultural competence. The Global Competence Matrix (Boix Mansilla & Jackson, 2011) outlines four key competencies needed for global engagement. According to the authors, globally-minded learners investigate the world beyond their immediate environment, recognize perspectives other than their own, communicate effectively with diverse audiences and take action to improve conditions. Finally, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2013) has developed the *Global Learning Value Rubric*, which serves as an assessment tool for measuring the degree to which a learner has developed or possesses certain qualities identified as needed for global engagement, such as global self-awareness, perspective taking, appreciation of cultural diversity, personal and social responsibility, understanding global systems, and knowledge application. Still others have sought to develop assessment tools to determine global citizenship and mindedness (Hett, 1993; Morais & Ogden, 2011) as well as to try to make sense of the terms and definitions associated with the various models and frameworks available (Hicks, 2003).

While frameworks and models can provide teachers with a guide for developing instructional strategies and activities with a global focus, teachers must also be mindful that taking action does in fact lead to an understanding of complex global systems and issues in a way that does not promote a deficit model. In other words, while comparisons are important for understanding issues in a global context, teachers must shape instruction in a way that does not lead students to a sense that life is "better" in one part of the world versus another or that traditional Western models of educational, political or ideological systems and philosophies are the key to development (Papastephanou, Christou, & Gregoriou, 2013). Implementing frameworks and developing these skills and competencies also relies on the teacher having a highly developed global awareness and curiosity that leads her or him to investigate and research ways in which global issues can be incorporated into teaching. This is especially important when the work aims to examine critical global issues so that students understand the gravity and importance of such questions and how they relate to their own lives as global citizens.

Given the number of skills and competencies that have been outlined by the various models and frameworks, teacher educators cannot assume that pre-service teachers already possess the awareness, attitudes and dispositions required in order participate in global engagement, which often involves confronting difficult issues. Furthermore, this confrontation requires that learners reflect on their own role and level of participation and impact on various global issues.   What is missing from these models and frameworks is a discussion of the dispositions needed for carrying out this work. Preparing teachers for global engagement requires a unique set of dispositions that differ from those traditionally discussed in teacher education. With so many definitions and expectations to prepare learners for global engagement, teacher educators must also consider the dispositions needed to begin to engage with these concepts and ideas. As teacher education has traditionally been very homogenous, there is a need to challenge pre-service teachers to look beyond their immediate environment to a larger global arena. Therefore, while there are a number of similarities in approaches to and definitions of global-mindedness and global education, there is no discussion of the dispositions learners need in order to engage with them.

Dispositions in Teacher Education

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2002) defines dispositions as the *"professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development"*. Jung and Rhodes (2008) describe dispositions as dimensions

of personality, patterns of behavior and cultivatable human qualities. Dispositions are at the core of teacher education and typically serve to represent what pre-service teachers ought to strive for in their preparation and professional development.

Researchers have attempted to identify the essential dispositions of good teachers that lead to effective instruction. Misco and Shiveley (2010) present a taxonomy of dispositions in teacher education and identify three primary categories. The first of these, Open-Mindedness, includes tolerance, embracing diversity, sympathy and curiosity. The second category, Wholeheartedness, includes persistence, compromise and fortitude, while the third, Responsibility, focuses on commitment to justice, working for a common good, honesty, and respect for the rights and dignity of others. (p. 123). Moreover, as Welch, Pitts, Tenini, Kuenlen and Wood (2010) point out, dispositions are linked to one's personal values, which include the beliefs and attitudes that an individual uses in order to make sense of the world. Because of this, dispositions in teacher education can be problematic as the profession demands a common set that identifies quality and effective teachers and pedagogy. However, dispositions are also highly individualized according to one's own personal approach to them and can both encourage and hinder learning within different educational contexts (Shanks, Dobson, & Gray, 2012). Stewart and Merryman (2011), using dispositions based on social sciences such as open-mindedness, cultural competence, respect and responsiveness, found that they "served as a filter for viewing past experiences and reemerged to influence decision-making" (p. 114). Although the authors contend that these findings indicate the potential of such dispositions to "embrace a global view" (p. 115), they may also reify existing limitations in perspectives or give a false sense of understanding and competence.

Therefore, teachers need support in the development of professional dispositions. Mills and Ballantyne (2010) proposed a hierarchy of the development of dispositions which begins with the foundation of self-awareness and self-reflectiveness, which the authors define as knowing one's attitudes and beliefs while still maintaining a critical perspective on them. The second tier in their hierarchy is Openness, which involved being receptive to diversity. Finally, the top tier of the hierarchy is a Commitment to Social Justice, which is understood to be a commitment to equity and equality for all people in society. This final tier is critical as teacher educators begin to examine the role of dispositions in preparing teachers for global engagement. Global engagement requires that all learners, pre-service teachers and their future students alike, recognize how their own location, experiences and positionality influence the way they interpret the world. It also requires that they consider how those same things influence the world and how others benefit, or don't, as a result (O'Connor & Zeichner, 2011).

However, this process can appear to be deceptively simple and may cause teachers to view global engagement as merely a matter of carrying out the task of teaching while integrating a global perspective, which may or may not lend itself to meaningful understanding or learning (Rönnström, 2012). Just as teacher education has long relied on dispositions to shape the way in which teachers are prepared, this same attention must also be given to the dispositions required for the internationalization of teacher education and preparing teachers for global engagement. The question then becomes, what dispositions are needed for global engagement in teacher education?

Dispositions for Global Engagement

According to Karges-Bone and Griffin (2009), dispositions must be "fair and focused" (p. 31). The following dispositions draw on research from critical theory, psychology, and student development. In this way, the dispositions represent the broad spectrum of perspectives and traits required for meaningful global engagement. For the purposes of the following discussion, the term "learner" is used to describe both teachers and students, as each have a stake, directly and indirectly, in global engagement pedagogy.

Curiosity

Curiosity is an essential disposition for preparing teachers for global engagement. Berlyne (1960) identified basic components of curiosity: unfamiliarity, novelty, complexity, ambiguity and conflict. These aspects of curiosity are suitable for global engagement as all of these traits are present in examining issues in an international context. Curiosity is what prompts learners to begin to ask questions and is simply the desire to know more; to not accept something at face value. Furthermore, curiosity often begins with questions which lead to more questions and not necessarily answers. According to Freire (1998), curiosity moves us to "question, know, act, ask again and recognize" (p. 81).

Engel (2013) stresses the importance of questioning in encouraging and fostering curiosity in learners and recommends activities in which learners must first identify what they want to know and then search for answers. Engel admits that this is easier said than done, particularly in an age of standardization where teachers may feel pressured to adhere to a prescriptive curriculum. Lewis (2012) cites Freire (1997, 1998) who contends that curiosity can take one of two paths: on the one, it continues and flourishes through pedagogy, while on the second, it is "anesthetized" as a result of traditional banking methods of education. Furthermore, curiosity is an essential first step in preparing learners for global engagement because it requires that they have questions, which may fly in the face of their established identity and perspectives. For instance, as Bright and Mahdi (2012) explain, one concern for learners in the United States in particular, who may "see the rest of the world revolving around its center", is the recognition that this is simply not the case and it may be "difficult for some Americans to suspend disbelief that their view of the world and its complex aspects is the best and dominant perspective" (p. 88). Therefore, learners need a certain level of curiosity that takes them beyond this realization and leads to a desire to know why this is, how this came to be and how the learner can expand her or his own understanding of the world.

At the same time, curiosity, which relies on questions leading to more questions, can facilitate learners' deep understanding and engagement with complex global issues. It is important to develop this particular aspect of curiosity to ensure that the questions that learners ask do not lead to superficial understandings or disengagement from fear of the unknown. For example, as Bright and Mahdi (2012) discuss, "when languages, religions, traditions, and governmental systems are different across cultural groups, the danger of limited information, stereotyping, and partial knowledge can create fear and long-term cultural conflict" (p. 890.

Tolerance for ambiguity

Another critical disposition for global engagement is a tolerance for ambiguity, defined by Furnham and Ribchester (1995) as the "way an individual (or group) perceives and processes information about ambiguous situations or stimuli when confronted by an array of unfamiliar, complex or incongruent clues" (p. 179). This requires a learner to be comfortable, to some degree, with simply not knowing right away. This disposition is also important when learners must begin to consider the Other in global engagement; examining the lives and contexts of groups and individuals around the world. For some, the unknown can be discouraging and even frightening. However, a tolerance for ambiguity is also important when it comes to a willingness to engage with new ideas and concepts that are not immediately clear or understood and is essential for learners to engage in a transformative global experience and understanding (Bright & Mahdi, 2012).

Investigating, examining and reflecting on global issues presents learners with situations where there may or may not be one single correct answer and where all relevant information may not be available. Chang, Chen, Huang and Yuan (2012) found that "exploring the unknown" resulted in greater confidence, self-efficacy and understanding of the world, in 10 participants who had completed international service in 7 different countries. They also noted significant gaps in their expectations and the realities of each international context. Although the participants in this study experienced this transformation in a foreign setting, by practicing meaningful global engagement, learners can begin to understand similarly without a service abroad experience. Nonetheless, a certain level of tolerance of ambiguity was required of the participants in this study. The same ambiguity tolerance is essential for global engagement, in that learners are essentially investigating the unknown as well.

Reflexivity

Although personal and professional reflection is something that is central to teacher education, reflexivity is crucial for global engagement. While reflection aims to guide in understanding the impact of an event or experience on one's own self, reflexivity challenges one to understand the nature of cause and effect in a more cyclical way. Rather than an event simply impacting the agent, the agent must also consider how their actions impact the context in which they are acting. In terms of global engagement, this entails not only acknowledging the impact of new knowledge or a new experience on oneself, but also how one fits into a global context through their actions and positionality (Hamdan, 2009). Reflexivity is a needed disposition as global engagement challenges learners to consider issues that transcend nation

states and borders, such as climate change and an ever-growing equity gap among people around the world.

According to Bolton (2010), being reflexive means that learners "become aware of the limits of knowledge, of how behavior plays into organisational practices and why such practices might marginalize groups or exclude individuals" (p. 14). Furthermore, McNulty, Davies and Maddoux (2010) assert that students who have regular opportunities to engage with conflicting viewpoints and perspectives often demonstrate greater flexibility in problem-solving and are more open to alternative solutions. In order to develop the flexibility, learners must engage in constant reflexivity, which allows them to shift their perspective and facilitates the development of alternative solutions and points of view. By incorporating these opportunities through global engagement pedagogy, learners can develop this flexibility, which can persist into adulthood.

Flexibility

Flexibility requires that learners adjust their conceptual map as new information presents itself. This disposition allows learners receive and process new information and acknowledge that it may not fit with their preconceived notions of how the world should be. As McNulty, Davies and Maddoux (2010) point out, it is impossible to predict the issues and situations in which learners will find themselves in the future, especially in an age of globalization, which makes flexibility critical. Furthermore, flexibility allows for greater autonomy in learning since learners understand that there can be multiple solutions and approaches to different problems or issues. Learners who demonstrate flexibility and use it to teach themselves both collaboratively and independently are better equipped to continue learning into adulthood, as they are capable of learning from others as well as by themselves (Engel, 2013).

Flexibility also allows learners to readjust their approach to a task or concept if they find that their initial attempt does not lead to the information or answer they are seeking. McNulty, Davies and Maddoux (2010) state that mental flexibility enables learners to adjust their perspective as they receive new information, develop problem-solving skills and encourages openness and acceptance of others, all key points identified in models ad frameworks for global engagement. According to Kashdan and Rottenberg (2010), when learners are open and receptive, they actively seek out new information and are more willing to "to make room for the positive and negative feelings that often arise when confronting novel, complex, uncertain and unpredictable stimuli such that they can engage rather than avoid" (p. 873).

Finally, Misco and Shively (2010) state that, "as students become more cognitively flexible and agile, custom, dogma, and parochial understandings can be disrupted within the complexity that globalization engenders" (p. 125). However, this disruption can also come with the discomfort of recognizing the impact that one's dominant culture has had on another group, sometimes in a negative way. It is in these times that learners require still another disposition.

Persistence

Persistence is a concept that comes from student development theory and asserts that students will persevere when a task or concept becomes difficult. In other words, learners continue to engage and do not give in when tasks or ideas become a challenge. Astin's (1984) theory of involvement emphasizes the importance of interaction with both faculty and other students in developing persistence in post-secondary academic settings. In other words, the more students interact with others, academically and socially, the more likely they are to persist. Their connected learning experiences enable them to learn and make friends at the same time, thereby bridging the divide between academic work and social conduct that frequently characterizes student life (Tinto, 1998).

Persistence is also linked to motivation; if learners are intrinsically motivated, they are more likely to persist in difficult tasks or concepts. This is also connected to expectancy and certainty, as outlined by Dickhäuser, Reinhard, and Englert (2011), who found that learners that expected to do well, and with high levels of certainty, would persist in their efforts while learners who low expectancy and high levels of certainty, did not, as they did not foresee their success. Therefore, persistence is an appropriate disposition for global engagement, as it requires interaction with a diverse populations, concepts and ideas.

Global engagement requires that learners critically examine their own ideas, beliefs, understanding and positionality. As Hamdan (2009) illustrates, "insider-outsider can cause discomfort, especially when

revealing negative aspects of one's own cultural group" (p. 377). This can, at times, become challenging, unpleasant or uncomfortable as learners, therefore making persistence vital. Global engagement also demands interaction. It requires that learners interact with new concepts and ideas, unpleasant realities, and the discovery of incongruences between how they imagine the world to be and how it is in reality for different contexts. And, as has discussed earlier, also requires interaction with the Other, defined as one who is perceived by the group to not belong and to be inferior in some way, which can at first be a daunting and uncomfortable endeavor.

Global engagement can serve as a reinforcing agent of persistence as students can extend their learning through involvement in extra-curricular or service activities. For pre-service teachers, this can connect to student organizations on campus where they can find connections to issues related to global engagement which would provide both academic and social interaction with fellow students and faculty advisors. In the K-12 environment for which teachers are prepared, this is more difficult but certainly not impossible. In these settings, teachers can help students develop activities related to global learning through awareness campaigns, or collections and donation drives. These projects and activities still provide the academic and social interactions with both teacher and fellow students that promotes involvement and therefore persistence, which may then be transferred to future educational and work contexts.

Conclusion

Dispositions play an important role in the internationalization of teacher education and preparing teachers, and their future students, for global engagement. One other important aspect to remember is that, like the dispositions traditionally associated with teacher education, these dispositions for global engagement are required in different degrees as a situation or context calls for them. For instance, learners may find that a particular context requires more tolerance for ambiguity, particularly if there are a number of unknowns, or learners may need to draw upon persistence if a situation presents an unpleasant reality.

These dispositions are also inter-connected. Learners may find that persistence is needed when tolerance for ambiguity is low; flexibility needed when curiosity leads to more questions and reflexivity and persistence needed when reality becomes unpleasant, challenging or uncomfortable. For instance, Hulme, Green, and Ladd (2013) found that curious students appreciated opportunities that allowed them to explore and confront standard ways of thinking and were also comfortable with the unknown. While Shanks, Robson and Gray (2012) state that by "changing an individual's expectations of their learning and encouraging them to be more expansive may produce longer term benefits acting as a solid foundation for engagement with a lifelong learning model of professional development" (p. 196). Cesh, Davis, & Khilji (2013) found that plasticity of the mind, transcendence, mindfulness, curiosity and humility were all traits of global-mindedness in study of 24 global leaders from public and private sector organizations and international agencies. And, finally, as Bolton (2010) asserts, "reflection and reflexivity for development involve willingness to stay with *uncertainty*, unpredictability, doubt, questioning" (p. 7).

Nonetheless, both teachers and teacher educators must be mindful in their approach to teaching for global engagement. Teacher educators also have a responsibility to model the same dispositions they expect in order to support development in their pre-service teachers (Karges-Bone & Griffin, 2009). Such teaching practices must not only challenge learners to assess and define their own perspectives, but to also engage in rich and critical reflection and discussion. Furthermore, this must be done in s way that assigns equal value to diverse perspectives and practices around the world and does not promote simply a comparative assessment that can lead to deficit model of thinking, but rather a deeper understanding of how the world is connected.

Internationalization in teacher education not only provides an opportunity to develop one's global self-awareness but also allows for a greater understanding of issues in the world that can lead to a commitment to taking action. According to West (2012), a truly transformative international experience includes factors such as being a cultural outsider and opportunities for reflection on ones' own personal and cultural identity and understanding. This is can seem an overwhelming task, especially for pre-service or novice teachers who are only beginning to plan for instruction and incorporate the required standards, much less to also include global perspectives. Nonetheless, these dispositions are important if we expect teachers to continue their commitment to global engagement once they complete their preparation and begin their careers.

References

1. Alasuutari, H., & Jokikokko, K. (2010). Intercultural learning as a precondition for more inclusive society and schools. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration, 5*(3), 27-37.
2. Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2013). *Global Learning Value Rubric.* Available at: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/globallearning.cfm
3. Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education.
4. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, July, 297-308.
5. Berlyne, D.E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity.* New York: Mc-Graw-Hill.
6. Blanco Ramírez, G. (2013). Learning abroad or just going abroad? International education in opposite sides of the border. *The Qualitative Report, 18*(62), 1-11.
7. Boix Mansilla, V. & Jackson, A. (2011). Educating for global competence: Preparing our youth to engage the world. Available at: http://asiasociety.org/files/book-globalcompetence.pdf
8. Bolton, G. (2010). *Reflective practice: Writing and professional development* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
9. Bright, L.K. & Mahdi, G.S. (2012). U.S./Arab reflections on our tolerance for ambiguity. *Adult Learning, 23*(2), 86-89.
10. Burnouf, L. (2004). Global awareness and perspectives in global education. *Canadian Social Studies, 38*(3).
11. Cesh, M.; Davis, E.B.; & Khilji, S.E. (2013). Developing a global mindset: Learning of global leaders. *European Journal of Training and Development, 37*(5), 489-499.
12. Chang, W.; Chen, L.C.; Huang, Y.; & Yuan, Y. (2012). Exploring the unknown: International service and individual transformation. *Adult Education Quarterly, 62*(3), 230-251.
13. Coryell, J., Durodoye, B. A., Wright, R., Pate, P., & Nguyen, S. (2012). Case Studies of Internationalization in Adult and Higher Education: Inside the Processes of Four Universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *16*(1), 75-98.
14. Cushner, K. (2007). The role of experience in the making of internationally-minded teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 34*(1), 27-39.
15. Dickhäuser, O.; Reinhard, M-A; & Englert, C. (2011). "Of course I will…": The combined effect of certainty and level of expectancies on persistence and performance. *Social Psychology of Education, 14*(4), 519-528.
16. Dooly, M. & Villanueva, M. (2006). Internationalisation as a key dimension to teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 29*(2), 223-240.
17. Dzvimbo, K., & Moloi, K. (2013). Globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, *33*(3).
18. Engel, S. (2013, February). The case for curiosity. *Educational Leadership,* 37-40.
19. Englert, C. (2011). Children's need to know: Curiosity in schools. *Harvard Education Review, 81*(4), 625-645.
20. Fathi-Vajargah, K. & Khoshnoodifar, M. (2013). Toward a distance education based strategy for internationalization of the curriculum in higher education in Iran. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 12*(1), 147-160.
21. Fanghanel, J. & Cousin, G. (2012). 'Worldly' pedagogy: a way of conceptualising teaching towards global citizenship. *Teaching in Higher Education, 17*(1), 39-50.
22. Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
23. Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart.* London: Continuum.
24. Furnham, A. & Ribchester, T. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the concept, its measurement and applications. *Current Psychology, 14*(3), 179-199.
25. Grimmet, P.P. (2009). International teacher education: Liberal cosmopolitanism revisited or postmodern trans-nationalism. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 36*(4), 7-25.
26. Hamdan, A.K. (2009). Reflexivity of discomfort in insider-outsider educational research. *McGill Journal of Education, 44*(3), 377-404.
27. Hett, E.J. (1993). *The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego
28. Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: A reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review, 55*(3), 265-275.
29. Hulme, E.; Green, D.T.; & Ladd, K.S. (2013). Fostering student engagement by cultivating curiosity. *New Directions for Student Services, 143,* 53-64.
30. Jung, E & Rhodes, D. M. (2008). Revisiting disposition assessment in teacher education: broadening the focus. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(6), 647-660.
31. Karges-Bone, L. & Griffin, M. (2009). Do they have the right dispositions? Teacher education in the new Conceptual Age. *SRATE Journal, 18*(2), 27-33.
32. Kashdan, T.B. & Rottenberg, J. (2010). Psychological flexibility as a fundamental aspect of health. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*, 865-878.
33. Lahdenperä, P. (1996). An analysis of internationalisation and intercultural outlook in Swedish teacher education. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies, 7*(2), 24-34.
34. Lewis, T. (2012). Teaching with pensive images: Rethinking curiosity in Paolo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 46*(1), 27-45.
35. Lucas, A. G. (2010). Distinguishing between multicultural and global education: The challenge of conceptualizing and addressing the two fields. *The Clearing House, 86*(3), 211-216.
36. Lugostova, A.; Krashova, T,; & Torhova, A. (2012). Internationalizing teacher education: The case for Belarus. *Prospect, 42,* 71-90.
37. Merryfield, M.M.; Tin-Yau, J.L.; Po, S.C.; Kasai, M. (2008). Worldmindedness: Taking off the blinders. *Journal of Curriculum & Instruction, 2*(1), 6-20.
38. Mills, C. & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 447-454.
39. Misco, T. & Shiveley, J. (2010). Seeing the forest through the trees: Some renewed thinking on dispositions specific to social studies education. *The Social Studies, 101*, 121-126.
40. Morais, D. B. & Ogden, A. C. (2011). Initial development of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(5), 445-466.
41. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). www. ncate.org.
42. O'Connor, K., & Zeichner, K. (2011). Preparing US teachers for critical global education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3-4), 521-536.
43. Olmedo, I., & Harbon, L. (2010). Broadening our sights: Internationalizing teacher education for a global arena. *Teaching Education, 21*(1), 75-88.
44. Ostinelli, G. (2009). Teacher education in Italy, Germany, England, Sweden and Finland. *European Journal of Education, 44*(2), 291-308.
45. Papastephanou, M., Christou, M., & Gregoriou, Z. (2013). Globalisation, the challenge of educational synchronisation and teacher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *11*(1), 61-84

46. 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.
47. Rönnström, N. (2012). From globalist to cosmopolitan learning: On the reflexive modernization of teacher education. *Ethics and Global Politics, 5*(4), 193-216.
48. Shaklee, B.D. & Baily, S. (2012). A framework for internationalizing teacher preparation. In Shaklee, B.D. & Baily, S. (Eds.), *Internationalizing Teacher Education in the United States* (93-111). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
49. Shanks, R.; Robson, D. & Gray, D. (2012). New teachers' individual learning dispositions: A Scottish case study. *International Journal of Training and Development, 16*(3), 183-199.
50. Sieber, P., & Mantel, C. (2012). The internationalization of teacher education: An introduction. *Prospects, 42*(1), 5-17.
51. Stewart, C. & Merryman, N. (2011). Linking dispositions to a global environment. *National Social Science Journal, 36*(2), 107-116.
52. Tinto, V. (1998). Colleges as communities: Taking research on student persistence seriously. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(2), 167-177.
53. Tudball, L. (2012). Global perspectives in teacher education: Through an Australian lens. In Shaklee, B.D. & Baily, S. (Eds.), *Internationalizing Teacher Education in the United States* (93-111). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
54. Tsuruta, Y. (2013). The knowledge society and the internationalization of Japanese higher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 33*(2), 140-155.
55. Urbanovic, J., & Wilkins, S. (2013). Internationalisation as a strategy to improve the quality of higher education in small states: Stakeholder perspectives in Lithuania. *Higher Education Policy, 26*(3), 373-396.
56. Wang, J., Lin, E., Spalding, E., Odell, S., & Klecka, C. (2011). Understanding Teacher Education in an Era of Globalization. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(2), 115-120.
57. Welch, F.C.; Pitts, R. E.; Tenini, K.J.; Kuen;en, M.G.; & Wood, S. G. (2010). Significant issues on defining and assessing teacher dispositions. *The Teacher Educator, 45*(3), 179-201.
58. West, C. (2013). Global classrooms, global teachers: Building cross-cultural competence through experiences abroad. *NAFSA: Association of International Educators*. Available at: http://www.nafsa.org/.
59. West, C. (2012). Toward globally competent pedagogy. *NAFSA: Association of International Educators*. Available at: http://www.nafsa.org/.
60. West, C. (2009). Internationalization of teacher education: Three case studies. *NAFSA: Association of International Educators.* Available at: http://www.nafsa.org/

INTERNACIONALIZACIJA IR MOKYTOJŲ RENGIMAS: KOKIO PASIRUOŠIMO REIKIA ŠIUOLAIKINIAMS MOKYTOJAMS SIEKIANT EFEKTYVIAI DIRBTI GLOBALIZUOTAME PASAULYJE

Erin Mikulec

S a n t r a u k a

Straipsnyje analizuojamos mokytojų profesinio rengimo programos. Teigiama, kad šiuolaikinis mokytojų rengimas turėtų atliepti globalaus pasaulio iššūkius. Viena vertus, mokytojai patys turi būti paruošti dirbti skirtingose kultūrinėse aplinkose, kita vertus, būsimi mokytojai turės paruošti mokinius sėkmingai gyventi ir veikti globalizuotame pasaulyje. Todėl svarbu peržiūrėti ir tobulinti mokytojų rengimo programas siekiant orientuoti jas į kompetencijas, reikalingas internacionalizacijos kontekste. Pasaulinėje mokytojų profesinio rengimo praktikoje egzistuoja įvairūs modeliai, kaip paruošti mokytojus sėkmingam darbui globalizacijos sąlygomis. Tačiau dažniausiai šių modelių pagrindas – būsimų mokytojų mainų programos ir galimybė studijuoti užsienio šalyse. Straipsnyje, kritinės teorijos, psichologijos, besimokančiųjų kompetencijų ugdymo(si) teorijų įžvalgų analizės pagrindu, sukuriamas būtinų šiuolaikiniam mokytojui kompetencijų modelis. Šis modelis apima smalsumą ir aktyvaus mokymosi gebėjimus, tolerancijos ir kitoniškumo pripažinimo gebėjimus, gebėjimą reflektuoti savo veiklą ir mokytis iš savo patirties, lankstumą ir atkaklumą siekiat tikslų. Teigiama, kad minėtos kompetencijos nepriklauso vienos nuo kitų, jų poreikis priklauso nuo situacijos ir konteksto.