


Please cite the Published Version

Koh, Aaron, Pashby, Karen , Tarc, Paul and Yemini, Miri (2022) Editorial: Internationalisation in teacher education: discourses, policies, practices. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*. pp. 1-14. ISSN 1354-0602

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2022.2119381>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis (Routledge)

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/630378/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* on 31st August 2022, available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13540602.2022.2119381>. It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

EDITORIAL

Internationalisation of Teacher Education – Discourses, Policies, Practices

Aaron Koh^a, Karen Pashby^b, Paul Tarč, and Miri Yemini^d

^aFaculty of Education, The Chinese University of Hong Kong; ^bSchool of Childhood, Youth and Education Studies, Manchester Metropolitan University; ^c Faculty of Education, Western University; ^d School of Education, Tel Aviv University

The COVID-19 pandemic as context

The *timing* of this special issue is worth highlighting and warrants some discussion at the beginning of this editorial. The call for papers and the entire process of getting the collection of articles curated for this special issue occurred at a historical moment when a contagious and mysterious pathogen began to wreak havoc in the world at the end of December 2019.

The COVID-19 pandemic is the worst global health crisis of the 21st century. It has taken more than 5 million lives in the last two years according to the World Health Organization (2022) and has caused disruptions of various intensities and scales such as: paralysis of the global economy and international travel; social life curtailed with periodic lockdowns; job losses as the economy goes into a global recession; schools closures and/or the move to online, *inter alia*. However, on a brighter note, the temporal dimension of the pandemic has shown that with the passing of time – as it is with historical plagues of the past - there are signs of the pandemic receding. Speedy international efforts to “flatten the curve” with diagnostics and vaccine development and dissemination have seen positive results.

Some optimism began to show in early 2022 when we were about to finish the work on this special issue. International borders began to open for travel in the middle of 2022. However, any suggestion of a return to the popularity of pre-COVID study abroad programmes was premature given ongoing mutations and new waves of the virus; ‘abroad’ experiences had become an integrative aspect and interpretation of internationalisation of teacher education in some teacher education programs (e.g. Australia’s New Columbia Plan programme). Many universities continue to employ a wait-and-see attitude to study abroad; albeit most countries have accepted the ‘new normal’ to live together with the virus, whilst taking some necessary (or politically expedient) precautions.

The ‘timing’ of this special issue which coincides with the COVID-19 pandemic therefore begs the question: why devote a special issue on *Internationalisation of Teacher Education* (ITE) when other priorities of education demand(ed) more urgent attention? Indeed, not surprisingly, a dominant thrust in educational discourses tilted to anything and everything about the COVID-19 pandemic and the implications on and for education. More pertinent to our special issue, there is the paradox of how to ‘internationalise’ teacher education when physical mobility and travel came to a stand-still. This is not to say, however, that ITE only involves travelling overseas to experience, for example, the teaching practicum component in a different culture and context. There are, of course, many ways to internationalise teacher education that do not

involve mobility and travel, as the papers featured in this special issue amply show. But given the reality check that COVID-pandemic presented to the world and education, it is timely to ask ‘what is the “international” in the internationalisation of teacher education?’ And, ‘how (else) can teacher education “internationalise” more productively/ethically?’ Our editorial will consider these questions.

Despite all the chaos ushered by the COVID-19 pandemic, we view the “pandemic (as) a season of nevertheless” where life goes on and “the idea of the future beckons nevertheless” (Adelman, 2021, p.462). We extend this understanding to ITE. At this point we offer a cursory definition of internationalisation of teacher education and will return to give an expanded explanation later. Borrowing from Allan Luke (2004, p.1429) we ground ITE in the consideration of “teaching as cosmopolitan work and profession in critical and economic relation to flows, contexts and consequences of cultural and economic globalisation”; of course, there is much, much more to what it entails and how the term is variously defined in a body of existing literature. We examine the specifics and ‘histories’ of ITE through a scan of three previously published special issues on ITE in the next section. We unpack the term further in the penultimate section of our editorial using the set of six papers assembled in this special issue as a way to adumbrate a deeper discussion of what constitutes the ‘international’ in ITE.

We argue that the present and future beckon on-going conversations and research into the nexus between theory and practice (and vision and reality) in the internationalisation of teacher education. International/global education is arguably needed now more than before, as we have witnessed how during this COVID-pandemic even a pathogen (and wearing a mask) had sparked incidents of racism and violence against Asian looking people and exposed health risks along race and class lines. We cannot forget the video that went viral showing the murder of George Floyd by a policeman in 2020 in Minneapolis that fueled world-wide Black-Lives-Matter protests. The escalating Israeli–Palestinian conflict in 2021 and the 2022 on-going war in Ukraine are stark reminders that ‘modern tribalism’ and conflicts that arise from race, class, nationality, empire and religion are volatile fault-lines that can erupt anytime and anywhere.

This reality check situates and tempers propositions and aspirations of the *pedagogical ideals* of international/global education, such as the following generative articulations: “living together-in-difference” (Ang, 2001), “doing diversity differently” in multicultural education (Watkins & Noble, 2021), “cosmopolitan learning” (Rizvi, 2009), “intercultural conviviality” (Noble, 2013), ethical internationalisation (Andreotti et al., 2016). Thus, it is as if ITE is under challenge in its broader mission of preparing teachers with the capacities and commitments to teach and cultivate cosmopolitan virtues, interculturalism, tolerance of difference and diversity in schools and classrooms. We saw how the COVID-19 pandemic has re-opened fresh wounds

and heightened many of the obstinate social issues that have divided groups along race, color, nationality, religion and class lines.

Nevertheless, we argue that it is in this very post-pandemic moment of multiple crises that ongoing work to realise these pedagogical ideals of ITE is much needed. One approach, as taken in this Special Issue, is to study and learn from different teacher education programmes that are making strides in this area. We must not lose sight that the important work of accomplishing the broader mission of internationalisation of *K-12 education* begins with training teachers as the emergent frontline professionals leading the younger generations into shared futures. Our aim in this special issue is to think through, engage and take stock on the topic through a set of six papers curated as reflective of looming global crises (Unesco, 2021) and the desire for education, in this case ITE, to productively respond.

Before we proceed to highlight the essential themes of the collection and their implications for understanding and potentially steering ITE, we turn to canvass three prior special issues on the same topic to understand the characteristics, themes and developments of ITE. This brief review will put into perspective how, as an emergent field of research, ITE has evolved in recent times.

Prior special issues on internationalisation of teacher education

That there are three existing special issues on ITE is an indication that scholars are catching up with this area of research, seemingly left behind and overshadowed by the broader research focus of internationalisation of *higher education* (IHE). These three special issues, in addition to ours, suggest that ITE is gaining ground in terms of research and practice in teacher education programmes across the world. Furthermore, as a relatively new sub-field, on-going exploration and conversation as to how to internationalise teacher education is much needed. These special issues affirm that there is no single way of internationalising teacher education primarily because education systems are context specific, and teacher education in different countries organise their teacher training and priorities in relation to the dynamics of local cultures and national context. The three special issues that featured the theme of internationalisation of teacher education are: (1) *Internationalizing schools and colleges of education-educating teachers for global awareness* (Quezada & Cordeiro, 2007); (2) *Internationalization of teacher education: creating global competent teachers for the twenty-first century* (Quezada, 2010); and (3) *The internationalization of teacher education* (Sieber & Mantel, 2012).

As a sub-field in teacher education, ITE did not emerge from a vacuum. The phenomenon and accompanying research take a cue from international/global education broadly (Tarc,

forthcoming) and, in particular, IHE. Across the last hundred years, periodic calls have been made for education to foster ‘international understanding’ and world-mindedness’ for an independent world (Good, 2020; Meras, 1932); these calls have accelerated from the early 1990s and into the 21st century, largely under processes of neoliberalisation (Tarc, 2009). In particular a top-down policy trend of internationalisation as a ‘strategic mission’ of universities has become a significant trend (Knight, 2004). Jane Knight (2004), among other scholars, began to study these processes and shape academic discourses on IHE, which she defines as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p.11). These modifiers of internationalisation—“international”, “intercultural” and “global”— in Knight’s definition have also become ubiquitous in ITE discourse.

As a vibrant field, research on IHE continues to flourish. Philip Altbach and Jane Knight (2007), for example, expanded research in IHE, examining registers such as the global use of English, internationalisation of the *curriculum*, quality assurance and control, and regional and national policies (such as the Bologna Process). Waters and Brooks (2021) further extend the field of IHE by focusing on the politics, economics and ethics in higher education with international student mobilities as the centerfold of discussion. De Wit, Minaeva and Wang’s (2022) more recently edited collection of essays focus on student recruitment and mobility in non-

Anglophone countries.

A growing and dynamic trajectory in critical IHE is also building from the work of Sharon Stein (2017) and others, catalysed by the ethical internationalisation in higher education project (e.g., Andreotti et al., 2016). With a focus on higher education, the Critical Internationalization Studies Network, offers a strong and growing network of shared knowledge and multi-sectoral collaboration of those interested in “reimagining dominant patterns of relationship, representation, and resource distribution in the internationalisation of education” (CISN, n.d.). The network mobilises critical perspectives voicing concerns about how uneven global power relations can be reproduced in mainstream approaches to internationalisation, “particularly in Western/ised institution” (CISN, n.d.). Indeed, IHE is a flourishing and fertile field of research. But what of internationalisation in *teacher education*?

The internationalisation of teacher education seems to be an educational domain coming latest and most slowly into the IE movement (Quezada, 2010; Zhao, 2010). There are reasons for this slower take up. One reason is that teacher education is widely perceived as “a more skills-driven profession” than say “research-driven faculties of higher education” because of its strong ties with the teaching fraternity (Nazeer-Ikeda, 2020, p.1). Another reason is that many teacher education programmes have an explicit focus on meeting the needs of local educational

jurisdictions and employ teacher educators with local knowledge and experience in their own jurisdictions. Luke (2004) says it well when he states that “the teacher qua professional is prepared and entitled to profess the local, the regional, and the national” (p.1437). Furthermore, many initial teacher education are more concerned with “methods” – the know-how of how to teach a curriculum/subject area especially now that teachers’ work is increasingly being defined by regimes of national testing and accountabilities (Lingard, Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2016). This instrumental focus means that ITE is either neglected or given scant attention.

However, scholars have begun to argue that an overly nationalistic discourse in teacher training is too parochial and unsustainable. The premise of this argument is couched in an instrumental logic about how globalisation has altered the knowledge economy and ushered in the Fourth Industrial Movement; as such, new skills are needed in such an economy including teachers (Nazeer-Ikeda, 2020). We disagree with this argument because it falls into the trap of “fetishisation of skills” (Wheelahan, Moodie & Doughney, 2022. p.475) evident in many education policy discourse such as the 21st century competency skills framework and policy and others. Instead, we concur with Luke’s (2004) analysis that a new kind of teacher is needed in such an economy - what he calls a “cosmopolitan teacher”; a teacher who is able “to shunt between the local and the global, to explicate and engage with the broad flows of knowledge and information, technologies and populations, artefacts and practices...a teacher whose very

stock and trade is to deal with educationally ‘others’, with the kinds of transnational and local diversity that are now a matter of course (Chua, 2004)” (pp.1438-1439). Indeed, a growing literature is addressing the making of a “cosmopolitan teacher” in various ways in ITE as evidenced in three thematic special issues we discuss next.

Characteristics, themes and developments of internationalisation of teacher education

Before presenting the highlights of the three special issues, we attend to some caveats first. It is not our intention to summarise all the articles featured in each special issue, doing so would be making the editorial introduction and the abstract of each article redundant. We also do not go into the country specific case study and its contextual details, although we do not dismiss the significance of context in the discussion and analysis of ITE (see Pashby & Engel, 2020). Instead, our purpose is to distill in broad strokes a few characteristics, themes and developments of ITE before we highlight contributions of our special issue to the growing literature.

In our reading, these three special issues on ITE coalesced around a few prominent themes. First, collectively, they contoured the characteristics of *teacherly habitus* – a term we coin to allude to the cultivation of desired attributes of teacher candidates/pre-service teachers for the 21st century, the cosmopolitan teacher that Luke (2004) suggests. Borrowing from Bourdieu’s

idea of habitus, we develop the concept of *teacherly habitus* to suggest that ITE as a ‘field’ structures and cultivates “a way of being, a habitual state...a *predisposition, tendency, propensity* or *inclination*” (p.214, original emphasis) of certain *teacherly* attributes, dispositions and skills; teachers who are not only skilled in teaching their subject areas but are also to become inclusive and interculturally aware teachers.

The editorial in the *Teacher Education Quarterly special issue*, for example, pointed out that “inclusive educators honor the diverse cultural, linguistic, physical, mental, and cognitive complexities of their students (Quezada & Cordeiro, 2007, p.5). In the *Teaching Education* special issue, the editorial further defines *teacherly habitus* as teachers “hav(ing) international experiences, demonstrate(ing) foreign language competence, think(ing) globally, and (being) able to incorporate a global dimension into their teaching (Heyl & McCathy, 2003 cited in Quezada, 2010, p.1)”. But, the editors also argued that such *teacherly habitus* must be demonstrated by TE faculty members as they model exemplary teaching for teacher candidates.

The attention to specific registers of ITE is another salient theme in the three special issues. One key register is ‘internationalising the curriculum,’ reflecting the IHE literature, which can be seen as leading in this direction (Leask, 2020, 2015). Not unlike its companion term “internationalisation at home,” the curricular emphasis of internationalising the curriculum

pays attention to the “purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments” (Beelen & Jones, 2015). The imperative here is “to prepare all students to live and work in a complex, globalised world, as human, social, and economic beings” (Leask, 2020, p.1942).

Having an ‘abroad’ experience is another key ITE register. The three special issues highlighted stints of overseas teaching as case studies to show how Study Abroad in the form of international practicum arrangements can benefit and empower teacher candidates as they learn how to teach in a culture and context different from their own. This approach of doing ITE also varies in scales depending on funding support from government bodies and donor organisations. Our special issue also curated two papers (one in Australia and the other in the U.S.) that take up this mobility register of ITE. However, the three special issues also presented cautionary tales of Study Abroad documenting institutional, programmatic and funding issues related to the delivery of such a costly approach to ITE.

One heuristic point that we gleaned from the three special issues is the important consideration of context and the global-local dynamics in ITE. In the *Prospects* (2012) special issue, for example, “international actors and discourses” (Sieber & Mantel, 2012, p.9) are identified as significant players in the development of teacher education. These players include OECD,

UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank, the IEA and UNDP. Education policy scholars have written extensively about the commanding influence of supranational organisations such as those mentioned in global education policies, reform and governance (e.g., Lingard & Sellar, 2016; Rivzi & Lingard, 2010; Mundy & Verger, 2015). ITE is not exempt. Yet, local education systems and their socio-political and economic context are not as directly susceptible to the influence of “the global”. The editorial argued that policy transfer or following imposing external influence from supranational organisations can create tensions and be counterproductive (Sieber & Mantel, 2012). Case studies from ITE in South Africa, Serbia, Belarus, Afghanistan, Quebec in the special issue made this point abundantly clear. The themes and registers of these past special issues represent a bridge to our special issue contributions as illustrated in the next section.

Our special issue contributions

We now briefly introduce the six papers that comprise this special issue. In “Internationalisation, teacher education and institutional identities: a comparative analysis”, Annette Bamberger and Miri Yemini explore organisational identities in relation to internationalisation at two distinct teacher education colleges in Israel. Their study analyses the two colleges’ websites and their online course catalogues to explore their institutional identity in relation to internationalization, and, in turn, how internationalisation is shaping each specific institutions’ identities. Given how

entrenched Israeli society is in internal conflicts that also play out in particular ways in ITE, this study provides insights into how the content from each institution reflects broader power struggles among various actors. Drawing on a typology from Pratt and Foreman (2000), Bamberger and Yemini find two distinctive internationalisation strategies evident in the college's management of their organisational identities: aggregation and compartmentalisation. One college explicitly addressed internationalisation as connected to local multiculturalism, combining or aggregating different identities into a synergy with international partners and aiming for national public good to extend outwards. The authors find this strategic identity offers possibilities for anti-oppressive approaches in ITE. The other college exemplified a compartmentalisation of organisational identity. It was more nationally and regionally focused, while articulating internationalisation indirectly through connections to the Jewish Diaspora and cosmetically through English-language courses. In both cases, the college's specific conceptualisation of the nation mediated its expression of internationalisation, where a more outward looking approach indicated a thicker notion of ITE and a more inward looking thin multiculturalism prioritised internationalisation as inward mobility.

In another example of how local issues of diversity shape and mediate ITE approaches, Laura Engel and Stephanie Gonzalez explore a District of Columbia state-sponsored and teacher-led global mobility programme opening opportunities for "underrepresented" students. In their

article, “Toward inclusive internationalisation of schools: educators’ perspectives on leading students in global experiences”, interviews with classroom teachers and educational staff involved in the programme provide insights into the possibilities and challenges of *explicitly inclusive* internationalisation strategies. In this case, there was an attempt to rectify the lack of access to international mobility on the part of marginalised communities. Engel and Gonzalez also explore the impact of involvement in the programme on teacher professional identity. They found participants indicated a sense of empowerment to develop stronger professional commitments to internationalisation and appreciated the way global travel provided a significant opportunity to develop stronger relationships with students. Overall, the teachers and staff involved express how the programme supported them to develop new ways to see themselves as global education advocates.

Engel and Gonzalez’s study raises some important implications for teacher education in regards to challenging deficit-minded perspectives and supporting more student-centered and/or experientially-oriented pedagogical approaches which these teachers were able to develop through these mobility experiences. Participants also noted a gap in their preparation for supporting students in navigating their own national identity development, especially aspects of “racial and racialised identity development through global travel” (13). The authors thus posit the importance of supporting teachers to develop critical reflexivity around their own

racial and national identities. Here, again, as with Bamberger and Yemini's study, their study demonstrates intersection of engaging with deep differences in the local context. The ways these complexities are taken-up in specific internationalisation efforts (in this case to increase access to international mobility opportunities for more students) and the ability or lack thereof among teachers to navigate the possibilities and tensions in encounters with different types of contexts abroad raise the complexities faced by teachers and suggest a potential lack of resourcing in teacher education.

While Engel and Gonzalez's study highlighted many key benefits of access to mobility on teachers' development of their sense of global citizenship as advocacy, in an example from Finland, Youngmin Mo, Margie Appel, Jin Won Kim, and Moosung Lee investigated the assumption that international study experiences support efficacy in teaching in multicultural classrooms. They note the strong role of ITE as policy seeking to promote teachers' culturally responsive teaching practices, yet they aim to address the lack of research identifying the positive, long-term impacts of studying abroad in teacher education. In "Pre-service teachers' international study experiences or in-service teachers' professional learning communities: what comes into play in Finnish teachers' self-efficacy in multicultural classrooms?", they take a deep look at the quantitative TALIS survey and initially find a positive correlation between Finnish teachers' previous international study experience and their self-efficacy in teaching in

multicultural classrooms. However, when looking at additional important variables, this correlation is not maintained. Instead, teachers' engagement in professional learning communities (PLCs) appears to be the sole significant factor. Their study raises some important implications for ITE, and the authors suggest that study-abroad must be deliberately designed as a transformative learning experience and specifically to focus on teachers' development of critical reflexivity around their assumptions about "others" (619). They see this intentional design as crucial to pre-service teachers being more open to culturally responsive strategies and point to the great importance of professional learning communities to supporting such practice and maintaining long term professional efficacy.

In another example of research exploring the impact of international mobility in ITE, Ly Thi Tran, Truc Thi Thanh Le, and Fiona Henderson offer a case from Australia in "Rite of passage into the teaching profession? Australian pre-service teachers' professional learning in the Indo-Pacific through the New Colombo Plan". They examined self-reports of pre-service teachers' (PST) professional learning during mobility programs to the Indo-Pacific region as part of an explicit policy to encourage global competency. They found PSTs expressed benefits from their mobility experience in terms of building essential professional skills and supporting their ability to teach in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. The authors highlight evidence of empathy and social justice awareness and aspirations to work with refugee

communities. Their findings also raise different ways Australian PSTs encounter and respond to the local cultures of host schools and how they experience these various encounters in terms of challenging neocolonial perspectives. The study indicates a strong positive correlation between the experiences in 'foreign' cultures and the development of PSTs' global competencies. Their findings, including how Australian PSTs' report being 'idolised' by the local students, raise further questions to be explored around the ways such encounters enable a challenge to Australian PSTs' preconceptions of their host communities and how these programmes and their participants seek to challenge and yet are themselves embedded in complex colonial systems.

Building from the deep look at PSTs' experiences with internationalisation, the final two articles in this special issue explore ITE from the perspective of instructors. In "Curricular conundrums: Internationalising teaching and teacher education in Wisconsin", Matthew Thomas reviews the experiences of two White, American born, English-speaking male pre-service Physics teachers who were students in his undergraduate global education class. Drawing on data from the participants from interviews, in-class notes and observations, artefacts, and follow-up correspondence alongside data from the instructor's own self-study, the author takes time to reflect on each students' experience in his course. While some overlaps were evidenced, the two participants diverged in their application and translation of the course

content. One focused on teaching about different countries through real-life examples as a way to gain confidence in his curriculum design and lesson planning. The other was more reticent to take up global knowledge content and rather focused on diverse pedagogical approaches. Both were skeptical about their ability to apply global education in physics but managed to find ways. This article highlights the importance of opportunities for instructors and curriculum designers to deeply reflect on their approaches to enact global education. So often one year leads onto the next with minimal opportunities, and this type of reflexive study signals a need to build reflexive professional networks across ITE instructors. Thomas surfaces his own critical reflections around what should be prioritised in his global education course and how such choices impact current and future efforts of the PSTs in regards to global education.

He highlights three key lessons. First, in regards to the framing of his unit, Thomas sees benefits in different entry points provided as evident in the two students profiled, but also wonders if a more focused approach would encourage more investment on the part of students. He also reflects on the assessment in the unit and the extent to which the assignment's complexity promoted the PSTs to engage creatively in global education approaches or was overly complicated, a tension reflected in wider concerns about promoting global learning in subjects like Physics. This leads Thomas to consider how to balance his own enthusiasm for global education with an appropriate amount of content within the scope of this one course. He

concludes by prompting more critically reflexive research into the day to day teaching and learning occurring in ITE pedagogies.

As if answering that call, in the final paper, Paul Tarc and James Budrow take a critically reflexive approach to their ITE programme's attempt to support socio-cultural difference in education both/either at home or abroad. In "Seeking the cosmopolitan teacher: internationalising curricula in a Canadian preservice teacher education program", they provide a retrospective reflection on curricular development and iterations of teaching the ITE courses in their Canadian university. They share their collaborative understandings of generative ITE curricular content that explicitly seeks to foster cosmopolitan learning through critical methods of study and awareness raising. Locating their curriculum in a context where top-down internationalisation policy can be out of synch with the realities of teachers navigating 'super-diversity' in classrooms, they reflect on the importance of having framed their work through Rizvi's (2009) notion of Cosmopolitan Learning (CL). CL is based in a set of epistemic virtues—namely, historicity, criticality, relationality, reflexivity—through which students can situate themselves in relation to others and to world-wide conditions. They share specific aspects of the curriculum design and suggest instructors of ITE can explore ways of internationalizing content and pedagogy toward building generative understandings on possibilities and limits of enacting critical ITE, with CL as one promising orientation.

Surfacing the ‘international’ in ITE

In engaging the six contributions of this special issue, we also had the opportunity to read each case as defining the ‘international’ in ITE (see Tarc, 2009, 2019). In other words, each article, across its unique contexts and topical/thematic foci, makes a claim on how the ‘international’ represents an alteration or intervention into a more (nation)state-centered or ‘traditional’ teacher education. Further, from a ‘performative’ angle, we might further consider what is *desired* in the name of the ‘international’ (or the ‘global’) as it enters into the domain of teacher education. In this section, we begin by briefly excavating the ‘international’ of ITE in each of the six contributions.

Bamberger and Yemini’s paper is mostly analytic, in the sense of illustrating two distinct manifestations of internationalisation and, in turn, implying that it is important to differentiate/untangle which form of institutional internationalisation (in relation to the national and nationalism) is in play. Nevertheless, in relation to the pedagogical ideals of global/international education, we can infer that the approach of one institution is more promising than the other. In this sense, the *international* of ITE wants a thicker multicultural education toward the global public good, rather than a more inward approach that privileges mobility over curriculum.

In Engel and Gonzalez's paper, mobility is the register that activates a set of enriched understanding and practices in global education. But here the desire for the 'international' is to be more inclusive in the operationalisation of international experience/trips. Challenges are funding, scaling up and supporting this promising approach which places demands on families as well as teachers to step outside of their comfort zones. This approach is promising way of making more inclusive global travel and expanding teachers' notions of educating students and of (engaging) the wider community.

In Mo et al.'s paper, the already-existing TALIS data allows for a verification if past international experience correlates with teachers' sense of efficacy in multicultural classroom settings. In this study, the *international* is centered on the desire for teachers' culturally-responsive pedagogy to support student diversity in Finnish schools. Given their null result, the authors suggest that the *qualities* of the abroad experience matter and advocate that study abroad be structured by the goal of transformative learning and that teachers participate in a professional learning community. In this sense the *international* demands more than mobility.

In Tran et al.'s paper, mobility is the key register as Australian PSTs are to be enriched from their international experience. The *international*, so to speak, wants students to expand their understanding of difference and develop empathy and commitments to teach in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Given the authors' invocation of a 'decolonial' lens, the

international further is to disrupt neocolonial currents of students' experiences of the Other.

The authors are seeking to cultivate globally competent PSTs with a 'decolonial'/social justice orientation that "enriches their empathy and in some cases, sparks their desire to work with disadvantaged and refugee children." Although promising results reported, the *challenge* for the international, is how 'empathy' and 'disadvantage' can be (made) exterior to coloniality.

In Thomas's study, the *international* is invoked as "developing globally responsive teachers toward developing a more globally aware and engaged citizenry." More specifically the teacher-educator-author wants to develop globally competent science PSTs through his teacher education course. For one PST, the *international* comes to signify the integration of other countries into the physics content; for the other PST, responding with diverse pedagogical approaches becomes his way of *internationalising*. For the teacher educator, his retrospective reflection centers on his own praxis—*how* to support globally-responsive PSTs in ways that do not undermine their own autonomy as reflective emerging teachers who must navigate institutional constraints.

Finally, in Tarc and Budrow's paper, the *international* wants to cosmopolitanize or de-parochialise teacher education curricula. The authors tether this ideal to the development of critical reflexivity as oriented by a CL frame. This more critical and robust intention for

pedagogy is challenged by multiple practical realities of institutional learning, as well as the difficulty of inquiry/research, given how pedagogical enactments, teacher praxes, student engagement, are difficult to access and represent.

Thus the ‘international’ of ITE as constituted in these six contributions signal a set of pedagogical and cosmopolitan desires of international/global education, articulated with particular terms and proxies. In some sense, these ‘desires’ take us back to the notion of a habitus of ITE, albeit a habitus also implies a sufficient duration for PSTs to be enculturated; for this reason, studies on ITE could benefit from a longitudinal dimension that stretches into the PSTs early years of teaching in schools as well as to follow teacher educators’ longitudinal reflections and shifting institutional contexts. The studies also surface the obstacles or tensions for internationalization to realize the more idealist visions. If a neoliberal imaginary is a dominant force shaping internationalization as instrumental/pragmatic (Tarc, 2009; Rizvi, 2009), then the presence and manifestations of the idealist (humanist and critical) visions, found in the six contributions reported here, are significant. And while there is no doubt a gap between the idealist visions and on-the-ground practices, the promise of a critical, education-focused internationalisation remains.

Conclusion

In this special issue we have examined internationalisation processes in teacher education in multiple contexts dealing with questions of organisational structures, of identity, of inequality, of teaching and learning and of the value of ITE despite challenges and tensions. While the preoccupation with the internationalisation process has not diminished in its intensity in recent decades, the future of the field must be considered critically. One vital task, which has motivated our special issue, is to illuminate actual (and possible) forms of ITE, to consider limits and possibilities, in the hopes that greater understandings will inform how internationalisation can be enacted and steered in the domain of teacher education.

Of course, this task is no easy one, since ITE remains a complex phenomenon that can be examined from many angles. It is also constantly evolving and changing both in light of the world's coping with the COVID pandemic and as a result of economic, political and social processes shaping schooling across diverse contexts globally and locally. ITE has similar features to internationalisation in higher education in general, but it also has unique characteristics due to the localness of the teaching profession, and the tighter control of nation-states over the curriculum and training methods. Further, *teacher* education is *inter-generationally* implicated in, by way of teachers' responsibility for children's and youth's learning and becoming, the upcoming generations' participation in the world.

Finally, we anticipate three important directions of development for ITE futures. The first is on internationalisation that does not involve physical mobility. Internationalisation 'at home' was much talked about even before the COVID pandemic. With the increasing pressure of environmental movements against air travel, alongside technological developments in teaching and learning, we are likely to continue to explore the most appropriate ways to implement this process in institutions. For example, research could explore the use of communications technologies as the vehicle to connect TE in different countries so as to reduce carbon food print. While digital footprints are not neutral, new media technologies and platforms can be used to connect teacher educators and to collaborate on ITE curricular and pedagogy as Tarc and Budrow suggest.

Second, the process of internationalisation in teacher education should be examined in light of nationalist and inward convergence trends of political systems in many countries that impact education (examples of these processes include right-wing government elections in Eastern European countries, Brexit and more). We suggest further research could explore cosmopolitanising the 'international' in ITE, given how the national (and sometimes nationalism) mediates the international (as Bamberger and Yemini show). While national and local educational jurisdictions will maintain a level of control over education, how can teacher education foster critically reflexive cosmopolitan values, commitments and ethics and build

transnational human solidarities?

A third direction of prospective development, is the impact of ITE on PSP and the students they (will) teach. It seems that many of the training tracks are localised, in the sense that the training is carried out in the schools by the school staffs. It will be interesting to see how processes of ITE may take place within k-12 schools and intersect with preservice ITE. We suggest that longitudinal studies be conducted in the form of tracking graduates of preservice ITE programs as they enter schools and carry the international/global education torch in their early years as k-12 teachers. Such longitudinal studies could inquire into and consider how in-service PD for teachers might augment preservice ITE, as Engel and Gonzalez illustrate, with greater access to mobility opportunities as a key element. Finally, we hope our special issue will be a source of inspiration that will spur more vibrant research and conversations on ITE even as many global uncertainties lie ahead of us *nevertheless*.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

Notes on contributors

Aaron Koh is Associate Professor at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Faculty of

Education. His research interests are sociology of elite schooling, global studies in education and international and comparative education. He is the co-founding book series editor of Cultural Studies and Transdisciplinarity in Education (Springer).

Karen Pashby is Professor of Global Citizenship Education at Education Studies at Manchester Metropolitan University where she co-leads the Education and Global Futures Research Group in the Education and Social Research Institute. Her research explores the productive tensions offered when centring decolonial critiques in global learning. Recent funded research with teachers has engaged intersections among critical global citizenship education, environmental and sustainability education, and anti-racist and anti-oppressive pedagogies..

Paul Tarc is Associate Professor at Western University's Faculty of Education in London, Ontario. His research centers on limits and possibilities of progressive and critical pedagogies in global times. He coordinates global/international education programs in teacher and graduate education.

Miri Yemini is Associate Professor in Education at Tel Aviv University. Her research addresses processes of internationalisation, global middle class, global citizenship education and involvement of external actors in education. Recent edited book (with Christopher Lubienski

and Claire Maxwell) published by Bristol University Press explored how external actors engage with education systems around the world.

ORCID

Aaron Koh ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9883-3227>

Karen Pashby ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9967-8262>

Paul Tarc ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8526-343X>

Miri Yemini ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5633-6473>

References

Adelman, R. A. (2021). Enduring COVID-19, nevertheless. *Cultural Studies*, 35:2-3, 462-474.

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.

Andreotti, V., Stein, S., Pashby, K., & Nicolson, M. (2016). Social cartographies as performative devices in research on higher education. *Higher education research & development*, 35(1), 84-99.

Ang, I. (2001). *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West*. London: Routledge.

Beelen, J., Jones, E. (2015). Redefining Internationalization at Home. In: Curaj, A., Matei, L.,

Pricopie, R., Salmi, J., Scott, P. (Eds) *The European Higher Education Area*. Springer, Cham.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. (trans: Nice R). Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Chua, B. H. (2004). The cost of citizenship: Diaspora, ethnicity and class. Paper presented at the Workshop on Identities, Nations and Cosmopolitan Practice, Asia Research Institute, Singapore.

Critical Internationalization Studies Network (CISN). N.d. [webpage].

<https://criticalinternationalization.net/>

De Wit, H., Minaeva, E., & Wang, L. (Eds.)(2022). *International Student Recruitment and Mobility in Non-Anglophone Countries*. London: Routledge.

Good, K. D. (2020). *Bring the world to the child: Technologies of global citizenship in American education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationals. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Leask B. (2020) Internationalization of the Curriculum, Teaching and Learning. In: Teixeira P.N., Shin J.C. (Eds.) *The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education Systems and Institutions* (pp.1940-1949). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8905-9_244

Lingard, B., & Sellar, S. (2016). The changing organization and global significance of the OECD's education work. In K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard and A. Verger (Eds.), *The Handbook of Global Education Policy* (pp.357-373). Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Lingard, B., Wayne, M., & Rezai-Rashti, G. (2016). Introduction - Testing regimes, accountabilities and education policy: commensurate global and national developments. In B. Lingard, M. Wayne and G. Rezai-Rashti (Eds.), *National Testing and Accountabilities in Education Policy*. London: Routledge.

Luke, A. (2004). Teaching after the market: From commodity to cosmopolitan. *Teachers College Record*, 106(7), 1422-1443.

Meras, E. A. (1932). World-mindedness. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 3(5), 246-252.

Mundy, K., & Verger, A. (2015). The World Bank as an education policy governor. In A. Kaasch and K. Martens (Eds.), *Actors and Agency in Global Social Governance* (pp.1-23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nazeer-Ikeda, R. Z. (2020). *Internationalization of Teacher Education and the National State*. London: Routledge.

Noble, G. (2013). Cosmopolitan habits: The capacities and habitats of intercultural conviviality. *Body & Society*, 19(2&3), 162-185.

Pashby, K. & Engel, L. (2020). Global Citizenship and Teacher Education in the U.S. and Canada. In C.C. Wolhuter and D. Schugurensky (Eds.) *Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education Theoretical and Practical Issues*, (pp. 233-249). New York: Routledge.

Pratt, M. G., & Foreman, P. O. (2000). Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 18–42.

Quezada, R. L., & Cordeiro, P. A. (Eds.)(2007). Special Issue: Internationalizing Schools and

Colleges of Education – Educating Teachers for Global Awareness. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(1).

Quezada, R. L. (Ed.)(2010). Special Issue: Internationalization of Teacher Education: Creating Global Competent Teacher and Teacher Educators for the Twenty-first Century. *Teaching Education*, 21(1).

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 30(3), 253-268.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge

Sieber, P., & Mantel, C. (Eds.)(2012). Special Issue: The Internationalization of Teacher Education. *Prospects*, 42(5).

Stein, S. (2017). Internationalization for an uncertain future: Tensions, paradoxes, and possibilities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 41(1), 3-32

Tarc, P. (forthcoming). Encyclopedia entry – K-12 Global / International Education (Volume:

Diversity, democracy, and social justice in education). In R. Tierney, F. Rizvi, K. Ercikan, & G. Smith. *International Encyclopaedia of Education* (4th Edition).

Tarc, P. (2019). Internationalization of education as an emerging field of study? A conceptualization of international education for cross-domain analyses. *Policy Futures in Education*, 17(6), 732-744.

Tarc, P. (2009). *Global Dreams, Enduring Tensions: International Baccalaureate in a Changing World*. New York: Peter Lang.

UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Waters, J., & Brooks, R. (2021). *Student Migrants and Contemporary Educational Mobilities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watkins, M., & Noble, G. (2021). *Doing Diversity Differently in a Culturally Complex World: Critical Perspectives on Multicultural Education*. London: Bloombury.

Wheelahan, L., Moodie, G., & Doughney, J. (2022). Challenging the skills fetish. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 43(3), 475-494.

World Health Organization (2022). WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) dashboard.
<https://covid19.who.int>

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