65

Globalization and Teacher Education

Lynn Paine, Elena Aydarova and Iwan Syahril

Despite the ubiquitous and multifaceted manifestations of globalization in our lives, examinations of teacher education policies and practices in the context of globalization remain relatively uncommon (for exceptions, see Bruno-Jofre & Johnston 2014; Loomis, Rodriguez, & Tillman 2008; Paine, Blömeke, & Aydarova 2016). To address this gap, this chapter examines how the movement of people, ideas, and policy actors across national borders has positioned teacher education at the intersection of global influences and transnational forces.

One key dimension of globalization is the movement of people across borders. For teacher education, this means preparing teachers for increasing diversity in classrooms, given the rise of migration/immigration. But it is not only school pupils who are migrating. Teacher education also now serves a pool of (future) teachers who themselves are on the move, as teachers – before or after their teacher preparation – travel across national boundaries to work. Globalization also entails the movement of ideas across local contexts. Ideas of good teaching, and what this means for teacher education, circulate with greater range and speed as a consequence of the heightened connections of globalization. Finally, in this period of what some describe as a world of networked connectivity, we note the rise of new mechanisms for trading and standardizing teacher education policies. The expansion of international assessments, comparative research, and international consulting have supported the growth of new forums for the discussion and development of ideas related to teacher education/teacher development (such as the International Summit of the Teaching Profession), the reach of new teacher education networks (like Teach for All, the international network of Teach for America, and its counterpart organizations in other countries), and the influence

of global corporate actors (like McKinsey and Pearson) on local and national teacher education policies and programs.

This chapter begins by exploring what constitutes globalization and why it has become relevant to teacher education. We then explore the movements of people and ideas by considering examples of three prominent phenomena: (1) the implications of immigration and migration on the work of and challenges for teacher education, (2) globally circulating ideas about teaching and teacher education, and (3) the rise of tighter connections through new networks and new actors engaged in shaping teacher education globally. The chapter concludes with a critical consideration of the role of research and implications for new lines of inquiry in teacher education. We imagine the teacher education community as participants in a discourse that has shifted scales through international links and is characterized by both growing standardization and attempts to subvert it.

VIEWING GLOBALIZATION AS A CONTEXT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Commentators on globalization in popular culture often highlight the increased connections across the globe and movement of goods and services. We take the view that globalization's relevance for teacher education is not only the result of the physical movement of materials and people but the exchange or transporting of ideas and the growth of international, transnational, or even so-called global perspectives on teaching and teacher education. In this chapter we focus on discourses of teacher education – practice, research, and policy – shaped by globalization.

To gain insights into these discursive transformations, the flows of ideas and people are particularly important to understand, as are spaces and networks. Such flows have contributed to the emergence of global imaginaries, 'a constructed landscape of collective aspirations … mediated through the complex prism of modern media' (Appadurai, 1996, p. 31). In these new imaginaries, how we think about and talk about teacher education (and teaching) is not understood within local norms. Rather, in the global neoliberal imaginaries, distant actors and norms no longer rooted in a particular location help shape the arguments for what teacher education should look like and be (Paine et al., 2016). Seen discursively, globalization offers new warrants and justifications for the policies, practices, and study of teacher education. Seen materially, globalization creates new challenges for teacher education as it now must prepare teachers for teaching increasingly diverse student bodies to be participants in both their nation(s) and a highly interconnected world (Zhao, 2010).

The past decade has witnessed a marked rise in the international attention given to teaching and teacher education as a policy focus and a topic of comparative research. International organizations (e.g. UNESCO, the World Bank, etc.)

have developed indicators for teachers and teaching. The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) study and the IEA Teacher Education and Development Study in Mathematics (TEDS-M) studies have been pioneers in making it possible to talk about teacher learning comparatively. All this contributed to making teacher development a topic that makes sense – and can be discussed – beyond a single country's borders (Motivans, 2012). These policy reports, international data sets, and research studies frame teachers, teacher education, and teaching in particular ways (Robertson, 2012). They reinforce the 'common sense' of talking about teacher education as a common problem, with standardized metrics and shared solution sets. Against this backdrop, we explore the influence on teacher education of three phenomena associated with globalization: the movement of students and teachers, globally circulating ideas, and new transnational networks and actors.

The Movement of Students and Teachers: Challenges to Teacher Education

Movement of students and implications for teacher education. The last twenty years has witnessed a marked growth in international migration. The number of international immigrants rose from 154 million in 1990 to 175 million in 2000 to 232 million in 2013 (United Nations, 2013). The growing trend means that there is an increasing possibility for teachers around the globe, in particular in destination countries,[1] to have students of immigrant background. In the USA one in four schoolchildren is now an immigrant or US-born child of immigrants (Tamer, 2014). In Europe the recent influx of immigration has changed the school demographics as well. For instance, in Spain the immigrant student enrollment has increased ten times since the early 2000s, making up almost 10 percent of the student body (Gómez-Hurtado & Coronel, 2015). In Italy the immigrant student enrollment has multiplied threefold over the last decade (Contini & Herold, 2015). In 2015, with the sudden rise in refugees and immigrants to Europe, the phenomenon grew even starker.

While the immigration trend worldwide does not follow a uniform pattern,[2] migration has heightened the importance of preparing teachers to work with student diversity. Studies suggest that teachers in many nations feel they lack the preparation needed to teach the linguistic and cultural diversity they face in their classrooms. While in one Danish study (Horst & Holeman, 2007) 88 percent of 268 teachers sampled had immigrant students in their classes, only 25 percent had had any attention paid to multicultural education in teacher preparation. Bravo-Moreno (2009) claims that Spanish teacher education works on 'the assumption of a homogenous classroom' (p. 425). Work by Kalekin-Fishman, Pitkanen, and Verma (2002) points to both the need and difficulty for teacher preparation in Finland, France, Israel, Germany, Greece, and the UK to help prospective teachers learn to teach immigrant children.

The increase in immigration and the need for teacher preparation to deal with its effects on schools have even affected countries not before seen as destination countries nor known for cultural and linguistic diversity. For example, the rise in immigration in South Korea since 2000 has met with teachers 'having difficulty understanding cultural differences of the minority students, leading to a kind of cultural ignorance even as they earnestly attempt to help minority students achieve academic success' (Kim & Kim, 2012, p. 248).[3] But, interestingly, countries with a history of immigration, such as Israel and Canada, also report that teachers feel unprepared to work with diverse students and need more multicultural training (Gerin-Lajoie, 2012; Goodwin, 2002).

As migration increases, the discussion of this challenge for teacher education grows. The Organisation for the Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (OECD, 2010a, 2010b) has made explicit policy recommendations both for pre-service and in-service teacher education, suggesting courses that directly deal with diversity and 'teaching in a multicultural setting' to 'help teachers to become more aware of diverse student needs, to focus on potentials and opportunities rather than deficits, and to develop didactic skills to support second language learners' (p. 57). Researchers also increasingly talk about the importance of diversity as a theme for and in teacher education (see, for example, Kalekin-Fishman et al., 2002). Yet in contrast to policy reports, the academic community typically couches its critiques and recommendations in terms of social justice (Planas & Civil, 2009), antiracism, empathic consciousness (Schröttner, 2012), or global competence (Zhao 2010).

In this context, literature in many countries explores possibilities for increasing the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that allow teachers to support the learning of all students. Many studies focus on helping teachers – pre-service and in-service – develop knowledge of culture and language, as well as skills that position immigrant students as knowers. We note three examples of broadly discussed teacher education strategies for addressing diversity which have taken on international or global aspects: culturally responsive pedagogy, the use of narratives, and service learning, or cultural immersion.

The concept of culturally responsive pedagogy informs teacher education discussions internationally. Having first entered conversation in the context of the USA, it is now much more widely discussed, reflecting both the prominence of international migration as an issue and the flow of educational ideas internationally. In the USA, Goodwin (2002) highlights culturally responsive pedagogy as a relevant pedagogical strategy for teachers to use when teaching immigrant children because 'it guides teachers to begin where children are and to build on what they know and bring' (p. 167). Gómez-Hurtado and Coronel (2015) discuss the importance of culturally relevant pedagogy to address the increased diversity in Spanish schools. Gordon (2006) highlights the absence of culturally relevant pedagogy approaches in Japanese teachers' practices for immigrant communities in Tokyo and neighboring cities. Yet research in and outside the USA reminds

readers that awareness to cultural diversity does not necessarily guarantee teachers can translate this awareness into practice. Teachers sometimes have other conflicting worldviews, such as an assimilationist stance, that leads to teaching in tension with culturally relevant pedagogy (Eisikovits, 2008).

The importance of teacher narrative and teachers' own biographies is another theme in literature on cultural diversity. For example, Kim, Ates, and Grigsby (2015) propose that student teachers, practicing teachers, and teacher educators working with immigrant students use cultural narratives as a pedagogical tool to address issues of language, culture, identity, and diversity. They argue that narratives, as culturally constructed stories, can be used to compare and contrast interpretations of shared experiences. This can lead to the cultivation of empathy and cross-cultural understanding that can promote culturally responsive teaching.

A third strand of discussion of teacher education and immigration/migration looks to service learning and international experience as ways to deepen teachers' capacity to attend to diversity. Advocates recommend service learning in teacher education programs to cultivate empathy for and understanding of immigrant students and the roles of teachers in supporting their learning (Bollin, 2007; Tilley-Lubbs, 2011). Some speak to the potential of international service learning in pre-service teacher education (Mbugna, 2010). Advocates argue for the power of cross-cultural immersion in the preparation of new teachers and the enhanced understanding of experienced teachers (Merryfield & Kasai, 2004; Sleeter, 2008). Programs increasingly incorporate international study and teaching practice to help future teachers be prepared for a diverse classroom (Dunn, Dotson, Cross, Kesner, & Lundhal, 2014; Kabilan, 2013; Mahon & Cushner, 2002; Xu, Chen, & Huang, 2015).

International teacher migration and teacher education. Issues of teacher education for global competence and teacher education for diversity in the context of migration have gotten much attention. What has received less attention is how international migration affects the teaching force itself and particularly ways in which it interacts with initial teacher education and in-service professional development. Increasingly, teachers seek employment in schools beyond their national borders: South African teachers in UK schools (Manik, Maharaj, & Sookrajh, 2006), international teachers from India, the Philippines, and Eastern Europe in US schools (Brown & Stevick, 2014; Dunn, 2013), immigrants from the former USSR in Israeli schools (Michael, 2006), and teachers from English-speaking countries in UAE, Qatari, and Omani schools (Kirk, 2013). Noting the intensifying flows of international teacher mobility, *Education International* – or the global federation of teacher unions – issued a report that sought to address the vulnerable status of migrant teachers in receiving societies (Caravatti, Lederer, Lupico, & Van Meter, 2014). Teachers' motivations for mobility vary: challenging work conditions, low pay, armed conflicts, or the lack of high quality professional preparation in home countries (Ochs, 2007).

Teacher education in the context of these flows comes to occupy a contradictory position. On the one hand, the state or external donors that fund teacher preparation expect programs to guarantee a supply of teachers for national schools; on the other hand, pre-service teachers who desire employment opportunities beyond national borders challenge the program offerings as suitable or unsuitable for their future professional success. In some contexts this contradictory position is fraught with conflict as policy-makers attempt to hold teacher education programs accountable for graduates' employment in national schools, whereas pre-service teachers pursue training in these programs to accumulate cultural and linguistic capital to move abroad (Aydarova, 2016). In these cases, investments in the human capital that teacher education programs represent bear returns for other countries, subjecting small or weak states to further brain drain and teacher loss (Ochs, 2007).

To address the challenges of teacher loss in sending countries, to regulate the qualification recognition in receiving societies, and to protect the rights of migrant teachers, the British Commonwealth member states developed the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol in 2004 (Miller, Ochs, & Mulvaney, 2008). UNESCO has considered adopting the principles outlined in the protocol in contexts beyond the Commonwealth states for managing not only voluntary but also involuntary teacher migration (Penson & Yonemura, 2012).

Inter-state regulation, however, does not always address the needs of teachers in new cultural contexts. Apart from the challenge of getting their qualifications recognized in new contexts (Guo, 2013), international teachers often report a lack of preparation for dealing with the behavior problems and classroom management issues that they face in UK or US classrooms (Dunn, 2013; Ochs, 2008). Many teachers also report limited knowledge of school policies and educational practices in new contexts (Dunn, 2013); teachers of color who migrate to new contexts often feel unprepared for the racism and discrimination they face in receiving societies. While these teachers are brought in to meet the needs of receiving societies, their own needs of professional development are rarely met adequately and systematically. Not completely invisible, but certainly a predominantly silenced minority, these teachers are often left to fend for themselves in schools (Dunn, 2013). Recent research offers a fairly disturbing indictment of the limited ways teacher education and professional development take this changing context – of teachers moving across borders – into account.

The Movement of Ideas: Globally Circulated Visions and the Challenge to Recognize Local Contexts

The growing communication between national policy actors, international exchange, development assistance, and networks of scholarship have led to what appears to be increasingly shared rhetoric about a vision of what counts as good

teaching and hence what the desired outcome of teacher education should be. In particular, the idea of learner-centered pedagogy (hereafter, LCP) is a kind of 'traveling policy' (Thompson, 2013). There has been, according to one observer, an 'explosion' of documents and rhetoric calling for this kind of teaching (Ginsburg, 2009, p. 2), such that LCP has become 'a pedagogical buzzword in educational policy and practice' (Ahn, Cha, Ham, Ju, Kim, Ku, Lee, & Park, 2013, p. 2). Different terms are used in different contexts – from 'active learning' (Ginsburg, 2009) to 'child centered pedagogy' (Sriprakash, 2010) to, in China, *suzhi jioayu*, or what is often translated in English as 'education for quality' (Kipnis, 2006). But all share a commitment to transforming teacher-driven didactic approaches to teaching and putting students' active learning at the center.

The idea of LCP is not new, yet internationally the push for it as an idea of 'best practice' gained significant momentum from the late 1980s on, especially after the 1990 Jomtien World Conference on Education for All (EFA): Meeting Basic Learning Needs, jointly organized by the UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, and the World Bank. The document that came out of that meeting, *World Declaration on Education for All,* argued that 'active and participatory [instructional] approaches are particularly valuable in assuring learning acquisition and allowing learners to reach their fullest potential' (WCEFA, 1990, Article 4). Subsequent World Bank support gave further weight to this. Ten years later the Dakar Framework reiterated the importance of 'well trained teachers and active-learning techniques' (UNESCO, 2000, p. 17). Since then USAID's global Education Strategy has focused on a similar theory of change: 'Improving instruction is a complex task that entails . . . supporting improved teacher training . . . [toward] adoption of teaching methods that involve students in the learning process' (2005, p. 9). In other words, policy recommendations make LCP a central focus of teacher development. Research studies echo this theme. In a review of the *International Journal of Educational Development* from 1981–2010, Schweisfurth (2011) found 72 articles focused specifically on LCP, including studies from 34 different countries across four regions of the world. With the support of widely circulating research and endorsed by aid agencies, the press to reform teaching – and to rely on teacher education as a way to bring new ideas into schools – has been a hallmark of educational efforts globally.

We can point to many examples of how visions of good teaching – as a kind of traveling policy – now inform visions of good teacher education. One rich case comes from the idea of PAKEM in Indonesia. An acronym that has come to take on particular policy and pedagogical significance over two decades, PAKEM stands for teaching that supports active, creative, effective, and joyful learning. As a recent USAID document outlined:

A teacher's role is to facilitate an effective learning that:

- Encourages students to actively interact with the environment
- Develops critical and creative habits

- Takes place in a joyful/fun atmosphere
- Encourages students to do higher order thinking skills
- Uses materials in the nearby learning environment
- Encourages cooperation among students (USAID PRIORITAS, 2013)

Drawing its support from and referencing an eclectic mix of sources – from Confucius to Temple University (US) scholar Melvin Silverman – this reform notion has evolved over time through the confluence of aid agencies from the USA, Australia, New Zealand, and Intel Education, now also embraced by Indonesia's own Ministry of Education (Gora & Sunarto, 2010). Where the initial efforts were focused on classrooms, attention now falls on teacher education. Pre-service teacher educators are encouraged to rethink their content and pedagogy to support this vision of teaching.

The push to revise pre-service education in ways that support an ambitious new vision of teaching is present in Indonesia and many countries, and similar trends are visible in in-service education as well. Yet, as Schweisfurth's (2011) review of studies indicate, the wide circulation of ideas about good teaching and what this means for teacher development does not mean that LCP professional development effort has in fact transformed teaching. In reviewing the experience of PAKEM in Indonesia, one study found the policy's effort to introduce active learning had basically failed 'due to a combination of technical, political and cultural factors' and the borrowing of external approaches without sufficient regard for the 'cultural context' (Heyward, 2014).

Similarly, Vavrus and Bartlett's study of teacher learning efforts in Tanzania documents teachers' mixture of appreciation for some aspects of LCP and incorporation of LCP activities in their practice with rejection of LCP's epistemological assumptions and limited ability to enact it due to material and contextual constraints (such as the entrance examination) (Vavrus and Bartlett, 2013). Vavrus (2009) calls for a recognition that pedagogy must be seen as 'contingent'. Yet in the context of globalization's connections, frequent sharing, and global gaze, LCP is often treated as 'best practice'. One critic notes: 'The pedagogy . . . is often presented as if it were value-free and merely technical' (Tabulawa, 2003, p. 9), with principles 'whose application has tended to be oblivious to the context in which they are being applied' (Tabulawa, 2013, p. xiv).

Global Connections, New Networks and New Actors in Teacher Education

One outcome of the increasing connections of globalization is the rise of new networks and new mechanisms for disseminating ideas about teacher education (policies, programs, and practices). There are many such examples, but here we consider one: the International Summit on the Teaching Profession (ISTP), which has recently emerged as the gathering place for trading policies

that target teachers. Allegedly initiated by US Secretary of Education Arne Duncan as an opportunity to learn what other countries are doing in education, ISTP brings together the ministers of education, teacher union leaders, education experts, and outstanding teachers from the top-performing countries in the The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) assessment. The Summit is organized by the OECD, which administers PISA and TALIS assessments, Education International, the global federation of teachers' unions, and the government bodies responsible for education in the host countries. The sponsors of the Summit are 'a mix of philanthropic organizations and corporations, all with an interest in the governance of teachers' (Robertson, 2012, cited in Dale, 2014, p. 47). Among them are Pearson, the Ford Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, and Google.

In the years since its commencement the formula for the Summit arrangements has become routine. The OECD prepares background reports, which provide structure for the Summit's program and are then discussed by the participants. The background reports highlight key practices that top-performing countries engage in and provide suggestions for possible reform directions. After the Summit, the OECD publishes an extended version of this report with elaborated proposals from the background report. The Asia Society publishes final reports as well, highlighting both the key points that were brought up for the discussion and the commitments that each country made for the improvement of their education.

ISTP acts as a mechanism for knowledge dissemination; it streamlines and sharpens messages. OECD reports, serving as both background and culminating products, reinforce the message about teachers' key role in revamping the system and what works in the teaching profession. For example, the Asia Society (2011) report states that the Summit participants recognize that 'teachers are the single most important in-school ingredient when it comes to student achievement and that the quality of an education system rests on the quality of its teachers' (p. 4). Even though this position has been questioned elsewhere (Kumashiro, 2015), it emerges as internationally accepted 'common sense'. The OECD 'signature' policies of recruiting professionals with no teacher preparation or using evaluation to improve instruction are the consistent messages presented throughout these reports. At the end of the event, countries' delegations pledge what reform measures they are going to implement in their home countries. These pledges are then used to evaluate progress made during the next year's Summit. Such a process encourages and contributes to standardization of teacher policies among the participating countries. As delegates from other countries are invited to watch the events and news of the Summit spreads internationally, it sets an exemplar for the rest of the world to follow.

The focus on initial teacher preparation emerged during the first summit in 2011. That discussion was led by Finland, where currently all teachers are

required to have master's degrees from teacher preparation programs before they can be licensed to teach. The Finnish delegation described their model as a:

> research-based teacher preparation system . . . in which teachers are expected to understand and be involved in research . . . have strong content knowledge, a broad repertoire of pedagogical approaches, and training in diagnosing students with learning difficulties and in differentiating instruction . . . Strong clinical experience under the supervision of master teachers is also an important part of the training in schools associated with the universities. (Asia Society, 2011, p. 8)

At the conclusion of the summit, participants expressed commitment to 'raising the quality and rigor of teacher-training programs, linked to professional standards' (Asia Society, 2011, p. 27).

Despite these claims, both the background and ensuing OECD reports identified three principles for ensuring 'high quality initial teacher education': clear standards for what teachers have to know and be able to do in their subjects, school-based teacher preparation models over academic preparation, and 'more flexible structures of initial teacher education … opening up new routes into the teaching career'. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in the USA stood as an example of the first principle. The second principle of school-based teacher preparation was offered without an example that demonstrates its effectiveness. For the last principle (more flexible routes), however, the supporting evidence pointed to how teachers are prepared to participate in research in Finland, Japan, and China. Therein lies the contradiction: the principle articulated (and set in bold in the text) suggests that 'high quality initial teacher education' can be effective even if it is completely bypassed, whereas the examples and the explanations describe contexts where the required university-based teacher education is demanding, rigorous, and robust (Sahlberg, 2012). Ultimately, this example illustrates the disconnect between the agendas pursued by the OECD through its reports and the practices actually pursued by the top-performing countries towards its own measures of success. Selectively using international studies and data, OECD reports frame the conversations and steer a particular discussion about teacher education.

By 2015, the common sense generated by the summits' reports converged on the notion of 'raising the rigor of teacher preparation programs to equip prospective teachers with strong subject matter skills and extensive clinical experience' (Asia Society, 2015 p. 23). This framing of initial teacher education omits attention to pedagogical skills. Additionally, clinical experience is singled out as the solution to the problems that plague teacher education programs.

The summits' mechanism for generating common sense is also problematic as it excludes voices of teachers and teacher educators. Blogs and newspaper articles written by teachers and educators who attended are peppered with testimonies of watching others discuss their profession, with rare opportunities to participate in the discussion. Even the pictures from the summits present a relatively standard

format – a square table that includes all official delegations and seats in the back for the observers. Teachers' lack of opportunities to share their perspectives contradicts the messages by the delegations that teachers need to be actively involved in reform processes.[4]

The rise of such transnational networks and actors on the teacher education scene give currency to the power of a model to be borrowed across contexts. From our review, it appears that these new global networks and actors are changing both the stakeholders in teacher education and the terms of the conversation.

Globalization's Contradictory Voices: The need for Dialogue

While these circulating ideas and the growing importance of new actors in teacher education appear to move towards some convergence around ideas of what constitutes the goals of and best practices in teacher preparation, it is clear that there are contradictory tendencies in the voices about teacher education today. On the one hand, for example, the focus on the need to attend to cultural diversity or to help teachers develop a learner-centered pedagogy reflects an ambitious vision of teaching and hence raises the bar for teacher education in every country. At the same time, calls for more flexible entry into teaching, stronger clinical approaches that reduce the engagement with university-based teacher preparation, and fast-track approaches to teacher development all speak to a narrowed vision of teacher education (Crowley, 2016; Furlong, Barton, Miles, Whiting, & Whitty, 2000; Youens, McIntyre, & Stevenson, 2016; Zeichner, 2010). Both tendencies reflect the impact of global processes and international exchange.

Teacher education discussions today exist within global conversations. These conversations are characterized by multiple and sometimes conflicting voices. As international networks and growing awareness of globalization shape how teacher education is viewed, the voices of teacher educators are, as the ISTP experience suggests, too often marginalized. Teacher educators and researchers of teacher education need to be part of the 'global' conversation.

These shifts of globalization create a need for new lines of inquiry in teacher education research. Already an abundance of scholarly writing acknowledges the context of globalization, but the field needs more empirical analyses of how the movements of people and ideas and the shifts in scale have affected both what teacher education programs attempt to do and the impact of their work. For example, while there are normative claims about the importance of developing global competence in teachers and their students, more analysis of the effects of different approaches are needed. And to what extent is culturally relevant pedagogy a concept that has global resonance and shares the same meaning everywhere? How does the contingent and contextual nature of teaching – the subject

of teacher education – interact with widely circulating notions of best practice in teacher education? We have a small number of context-specific case studies, but analytic effort that ranges across individual cases could generate new insights into persistent challenges in teacher education reform. Finally, the recent increase in international teacher mobility and the rise of new networks and actors call for research that is not bound by national education systems. For example, what is the role, scope, and impact of networks and transnational actors on teacher learning? In the context of globalizing forces shaping how teacher education is viewed, it is more important than ever that teacher education researchers and teacher educators play an active role.

Research must be attentive to contradictory voices. In the wake of standardizing discourses in teacher education, we note an important cross-current that reflects the 'rising particularity' that is one outcome of globalization (de Sousa Santos, 2006). For example, in the same time that LCP has become the dominant refrain in teacher education discussions around the world, there has been emerging interest in local and indigenous pedagogies. Tabulawa, in his critique of the imposed 'borrowing' of LCP as a one-size-fits-all solution to improving teaching, argues for the importance of context; in his discussion of teaching reforms in Botswana, he explores epistemological traditions within African schooling that must be considered alongside any discussion of LCP. Similarly, a growing number of Chinese scholars critique the value of learner-centered teaching (Li, 2016) and advocate for a recovering of 'authentic' Confucian pedagogical traditions (Wu, 2011; Deng, 2011). In short, while there may appear to be standardization in some visions informing teacher education, there is also a push back and challenge to such a vision. Within the research community we need more knowledge of the range of these voices.

What it means to be a teacher today, in this period of heightened and intense connection, and what that means in terms of preparing teachers and supporting their learning must, of course, be understood from the experience of those most engaged in the work. Globalization allows for easier exchange of materials, participation in international conferences, and circulation of education journals. Yet for all the attention to international exchange of information and practices, there are not yet well-established mechanisms that allow authentic dialogue. For learning through dialogue that can take place across different contexts, we need sustained conversation. That this kind of conversation is not a familiar part of institutional, policy, or research life is clear. That it is necessary to offset what otherwise are simple generalizations, facile comparisons, and limited understanding is also clear.

Notes

1 10 top immigrant-destination countries in 2013 with 51 percent of world immigrants: the USA, Russian Federation, Germany, Saudi Arabia, United Arab of Emirates, United Kingdom, France, Canada, Australia, and Spain (http://esa.un.org/unmigration/documents/The_number_of_international_migrants.pdf).

2   For instance, the large number of immigrants going to Taiwan and Saudi Arabia are chiefly migrant workers, mostly low skilled. Their migration does not impact the destination country's school system as the receiving governments in these two countries have a strict policy on immigrants' permanent settlement and migrants' reunification with their families. In other cases there is the emergence of a particular pattern specific to a region, such as the Early Study Abroad phenomenon in East Asian countries such as China and South Korea (Song, 2011). Many families in these countries send their school-aged children as early as possible before college to schools in English-speaking countries to acquire English, with the thought that the ability to be fluent in English will enhance the students' academic success in the educational market (e.g. passing top college English entrance exams in home country).

3   In fact, the South Korean educational system has created a new teacher role – bilingual teacher – charged with providing both language support to non-native speakers and multicultural education to all students in a school. Special teacher education programs have been developed to train such teachers (Jin, 2016).

4   Social media and other virtual outlets offer evidence of and voices of protest. During the summit in Amsterdam, one of the participants tweeted: 'Same tune as #*ISTP2013* however more government control, more (mis)management in schools, and protesting students'.

REFERENCES

Ahn, S.-H., Cha, Y-K., Ham, S-H., Ju, M-K., Kim, S., Ku, H., Lee, S.-K., & Park, Y. S. (2013, April). *Principal instructional leadership and teaching for learner autonomy: A multilevel analysis of the South Korean TALIS 2008 data*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Asia Society. (2011). *Improving teacher quality around the world: The International Summit on the Teaching Profession*. Available from http://asiasociety.org/files/lwtw-teachersummitreport0611.pdf

Asia Society. (2013). *Teacher quality: The 2013 International Summit on the Teaching Profession.* Available from http://asiasociety.org/files/teachingsummit2013.pdf

Asia Society. (2015). *Implementing highly effective teacher policy and practice: The 2015 International Summit on the Teaching Profession*. Available from http://asiasociety.org/files/uploads/26files/2015teachingsummitsm.pdf

Aydarova, E. (2016). 'I Want a Beautiful Life': Divergent chronotopes in English language teacher education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1–31.

Bollin, G. G. (2007). Preparing teachers for Hispanic immigrant children: A service learning approach. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *6*(2), 177–189.

Bravo-Moreno, A. (2009). Transnational mobilities: Migrants and education. *Comparative Education*, *45*(3), 419–433.

Brown, K. D., & Stevick, D. (2014). The globalizing labor market in education: Teachers as cultural ambassadors or agents of institutional isomorphism. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *89*(1), 4–16.

Bruno-Jofré, R., & Johnston, J. S. (Eds.). (2014). *Teacher education in a transnational world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Caravatti, M. L., Lederer, S. M., Lupico, A., & Van Meter, N. (2014). *Getting teacher migration & mobility right*. Brussels: Education International. Available from http://download.ei-ie.org/docs/webdepot/teachermigrationstudy.pdf

Contini, R. M., & Herold, M. (2015). Intercultural education in Italy and in the United States: The results of a binational inquiry. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *7*(1), 203–218.

Crowley, C. B. (2016). Teach For/Future China and the politics of alternative teacher certification programs in China. In L. Lim & M. W. Apple (Eds.), *The strong state and curricular reform: Assessing the politics and possibilities of educational change in Asia* (pp. 131–147). New York: Routledge.

Dale, R. (2014). Globalization, higher education and teacher education. In R. Bruno-Jofré & J. S. Johnston (Eds.), *Teacher education in a transnational world* (pp. 33–53). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2006). Globalizations. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *23*, 393–399

Deng, Z. (2011). Confucianism, modernization and Chinese pedagogy: An introduction. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *43*(5), 561–568.

Dunn, A. H. (2013). *Teachers without borders? The hidden consequences of international teachers in US schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dunn, A. H., Dotson, E. K., Cross, S. B., Kesner, J., & Lundahl, B. (2014). Reconsidering the local after a transformative global experience: A comparison of two study abroad programs for preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, *36*(4), p. 283–304.

Eisikovits, R. A. (2008). Coping with high-achieving transnationalist immigrant students: The experience of Israeli teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(2), 277–289.

Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher education in transition: Re-forming professionalism?* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. (2012). Racial and ethnic diversity in schools: The case of English Canada. *Prospects*, *42*(2), 205–220.

Ginsburg, M. (2009). Active-learning pedagogies as a reform initiative: Synthesis of case studies. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research and US Agency for International Development.

Gómez-Hurtado, I., & Coronel, J. M. (2015). Nothing to do with me! Teachers' perceptions on cultural diversity in Spanish secondary schools. *Teachers and Teaching*, *21*(4), 400–420.

Goodwin, A. L. (2002). Teacher preparation and the education of immigrant children. *Education and Urban Society*, *34*(2), 156–172.

Gora, W., & Sunarto. (2010). *PAKEMATIK: Strategi pembelajaran inovatif berbasis TIK* [PAKEMATIK: An innovative learning strategy basing on TIK]. Accessed on Feb 17, 2016, from https://books.google.com/books?id=D5MYVbhT81UC&pg=PA27&lpg=PA27&dq=pakematik&source=bl&ots=AwASn4sJfu&sig=AsV5opHo8oB8FQOjkLmW5AvtqGo&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjIubHRzoDLAhXDm4MKHe69DR8Q6AEIHTAA#v=onepage&q=pakematik&f=false

Gordon, J. A. (2006). Assigned to the margins: Teachers for minority and immigrant communities in Japan. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*(7), 766–776.

Guo, S. (2013). The changing face of work and learning in the context of immigration: The Canadian experience. *Journal of Education and Work*, *26*(2), 162–186.

Heyward, S. (2014). Reforming teaching practice in Indonesia: A case study of the implementation of active learning in North Maluku primary schools. Doctoral dissertation, University of Tasmania.

Horst, C., & Holmen, A. (2007). Bringing multicultural education into the mainstream: Developing schools for minority and majority students. In L. Adams & A. Kirova (Eds.), *Global migration and education: Schools, children, and families* (pp. 17–33). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Jin, E. (2016). Trajectory of teacher education in South Korea: A review of policy and research. Presentation to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Kabilan, M. (2013). A phenomenological study of an international teaching practicum: Preservice teachers' experiences of professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *36*, 198–209.

Kalekin-Fishman, D., Pitkanen, P., & Verma, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Education and immigration: Settlement policies and current challenges*. London: Routledge.

Kim, S., Ates, B., & Grigsby, Y. (2015). Cultural narratives in TESOL classrooms: A collaborative reflective team analysis. *Reflective Practice*, *16*(3), 297–215.

Kim, S. K., & Kim, L. H. (2012). The need for multicultural education in South Korea. In D. A. Urias (Ed.), *The immigration & education nexus* (pp. 243–253). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kipnis, A. B. (2006). *Suzhi*: A keyword approach. *China Quarterly*, *186*, 295–313.

Kirk, D. J. (2013). Comparative education and the Arabian Gulf. In A. W. Wiseman & E. Anderson (Eds.), *Annual review of comparative and international education 2013* (pp. 175–189). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kumashiro, K. (2015). *Review of proposed 2015 federal teacher preparation regulations*.Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.

Li, X. (2016) Mis-placed learner-centred pedagogy: A Chinese perspective. Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Conference on East–West Reciprocal Learning in Education: *Research on Reciprocal Learning in Teacher Education and School Education in a Global View*. Chongqing, China.

Loomis, S., Rodriguez, J., & Tillman, R. (2008). Developing into similarity: Global teacher education in the twenty-first century. *European Journal of Teacher Education 31*(3), 233–245.

Mahon, J., & Cushner, K. (2002). The overseas student teaching experience: Creating optimal culture learning. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *4*(3), 3–8.

Manik, S., Maharaj, B., & Sookrajh, R. (2006). Globalisation and transnational teachers: South African teacher migration to the UK. *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 22(1–2), 15–33.

Mbugua, T. (2010). Fostering culturally relevant/Responsive pedagogy and global awareness through the integration of international service-learning in courses. *Journal of Pedagogy/Pedagogický casopis*, *1*(2), 87–98.

Merryfield, M. M., & Kasai, M. (2004). How are teachers responding to globalization? *Social Education*, *68*(5), 354–359.

Michael, O. (2006). Multiculturalism in schools: The professional absorption of immigrant teachers from the former USSR into the education system in Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*(2), 164–178.

Miller, J. (2009). Teaching refugee learners with interrupted education in science: Vocabulary, literacy and pedagogy. *International Journal of Science Education*, *31*(4), 571–592.

Miller, P. W., Ochs, K., & Mulvaney, G. (2008). International teacher migration and the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol: Assessing its impact and the implementation process in the United Kingdom. *European Education*, *40*(3), 89–101.

Morgan, J. (2012, August 16). Non-teaching bodies will be players, Pearson boss says. *Times Higher Education*. Available from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/non-teaching-bodies-will-be-players-pearson-boss-says/420876.article

Motivans, A. (2012). Rationale and meeting objectives. Presentation to the Indicators for Teachers and Teaching Expert Group Meeting, October, Institute for Statistics, UNESCO, Paris.

Mourshed, M., Chijioke, C., & Barber, M. (2010). *How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better*. London: McKinsey & Co.

Ochs, K. (2007). Implementation of the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol: Considering the education systems and context. *Perspectives in Education*, 25(2), 15–24.

OECD. (2010a). Closing the gap for immigrant students: Policies, practice, and performance. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2010b). *Educating teachers for diversity: Meeting the challenge*. Paris: OECD.

Paine, L., Blömeke, S., & Aydarova, O. (2016). Teachers and teaching in the context of globalization. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching (5th ed.)* (pp. 717–786). Washington, DC: AERA.

Penson, J., & Yonemura, A. (2012). *Next steps in managing teacher migration: Papers of the Sixth Commonwealth Research Symposium on Teacher Mobility, Recruitment and Migration*. London: UNESCO & Commonwealth Secretariat.

Planas, N., & Civil, M. (2009). Working with mathematics teachers and immigrant students: An empowerment perspective. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, *12*(6), 391–409.

Robertson, S. (2012). Placing teachers in global governance agendas. *Comparative Education Review*, *56*(4), 584–607.

Sahlberg, P. (2012). The most wanted: Teachers and teacher education in Finland. In L. Darling-Hammond & A. Lieberman (Eds.), *Teacher education around the world* (pp. 1–21). Routledge.

Sánchez, P., & Machado-Casas, M. (2009). At the intersection of transnationalism, Latina/o immigrants, and education. *The High School Journal*, *92*(4), 3–15.

Schröttner, B. T. (2012). The need for global consciousness. In D. A. Urias (Ed.), *The immigration & education nexus* (pp. 21–36). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: From solution to problem? *International Journal of Educational Development*, *31*(5), 425– 432.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.)* (pp. 559–582). New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, and Association of Teacher Education.

Song, J. (2011). Globalization, children's study abroad, and transnationalism as an emerging context for language learning: A new task for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(4), 749–758.

Sriprakash, A. (2010). Child-centred education and the promise of democratic learning: Pedagogic messages in rural Indian primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *30*(3), 297–304.

Tabulawa, R. (2003). International aid agencies, learner-centered pedagogy and political democratization: A critique. *Comparative Education*, *39*(1), 7–26.

Tabulawa, R. (2013). *Teaching and learning in context: Why pedagogical reforms fail in sub-Saharan Africa.* Dakar: CODESRIA. http://newebsite.codesria.org/spip.php?article1797&lang=en

Tamer, M. (2014). The education of immigrant children. Retrieved from https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/14/12/education-immigrant-children

Thompson, P. (2013). Learner-centered education and 'cultural translation'. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *33*(1), 48–58.

Tilley-Lubbs, G. A. (2011). Preparing teachers for teaching immigrant students through service-learning in immigrant communities. *World Journal of Education*, *1*(2), 104–114.

UNESCO. (2000). Dakar Framework for Action. Education for all: Meeting our collective commitments. World Education Forum. Paris.

United Nations, D. o. E. a. S. A., Population Division. (2013). *International migration report 2013*. Retrieved from: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/migration/migrationreport2013/Full_Document_final.pdf - zoom=100

USAID PRIORITAS. (2013). Reference materials for TTIs (Teacher Training Institutes, Teacher Education) 1: Good practices in school based management in the primary and junior secondary school. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00KNBH.pdf

Vavrus, F. (2009). The cultural politics of constructivist pedagogies: Teacher education reform in the United Republic of Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *29*(3), 303–311.

Vavrus, F., & Bartlett, L. (Eds.). (2013). *Teaching in tension: International pedagogies, national policies, and teachers' practices in Tanzania*. Boston: Sense Publishers.

WCEFA. (1990). *World Declaration on Education for All and Framework for Action to meet basic learning needs*. New York: WCEFA Inter-Agency Commission.

Wu, Z. (2011), Interpretation, autonomy, and transformation: Chinese pedagogic discourse in a cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *43*(5), 569–590

Xu, S., Chen, S., & Huang, J.(2015). Pedagogies of working with diversity: West–East reciprocal learning in preservice teacher education. *International Teacher Education: Promising Pedagogies (Part B). Advances in Research on Teaching*, *22B*, 137–160. Emerald Publishing Group.

Youens, B. McIntyre, J., & Stevenson, H. (2016). Silenced voices: The disappearance of the university and the student teacher in teacher education policy discourse in England. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the US. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(8), 1544–1552.

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