

## Globalization, Global Mindsets and Teacher Education<sup>1</sup>

**A. Lin Goodwin**  
**The University of Hong Kong**

(Final Draft to *Action in Teacher Education*)

### Abstract

Globalization is undoubtedly affecting every aspect of our lives. The reach and the reality of globalization means that what happens “there” to “them” now affects what happens “here” to “us.” The destinies of billions of people around the planet have become inextricably tied, connected by multiple networks, whether virtual, commercial, political, trans-familial, socio-cultural, or educational. This is the globalized space in which today’s teachers operate, it is the space they must navigate, they have no choice to do otherwise than to look, know, think, understand and teach beyond the boundaries of the(ir) local. But what exactly does that mean in practice? In response, I begin first with a brief discussion about globalization—what it means, and how it is—or perhaps not—affecting teaching and teacher education. I then discuss the mindsets teachers (and therefore teacher education/educators) need to cultivate along four dimensions in the context of globalization: the curricular, professional, moral, and personal. I then close with two immediate actions we should take as/to be a global teacher education community.

Key words: globalization, teacher education, global mindset, curriculum

---

<sup>1</sup> Goodwin, A. L. (2019). Globalization, Global Mindsets and Teacher Education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 42(1), 6-18. DOI: 10.1080/01626620.2019.1700848

## **Globalization, or the Dwindling Space Between There and Here, Them and Us**

It is August 24, 2019, and the Amazon—“the lungs of our planet”—is on fire; “blazes of a scale not seen in nearly a decade” are creating “an ecological disaster” that is “escalat[ing] into a global political crisis” (Londoño, Andreoni, & Casado, 2019, para. 1). A trade war between the world’s two largest economies could, according to International Monetary Fund simulations, “[lead] to a 0.4% fall in long-term world GDP” (Chong & Li, 2019, p. 2). In an “unprecedented intervention by the Geneva-based United Nations body” the U.N. Human Rights office “adds to international calls for Hong Kong to set up an independent investigation into the anti-government protests” that have been going on in the Special Administrative Region (Lau, 2019, para 2). “PISA scores...[which]... leverage education policy across 80 participating countries that account for more than 80% of the world economy” (Ledger, Thier, Bailey & Pitts, 2019, p. 2), now will also measure global competency, as defined by OECD, “a potent and growing authority in education policy decisions” (p. 3), influencing over 80 jurisdictions around the world.

This is the reach and the reality of globalization—what happens “there” to “them” now affects what happens “here” to “us.” The destinies of billions of people around the planet have become inextricably tied, connected by multiple networks, whether virtual, commercial, political, trans-familial, socio-cultural, or educational. Decisions and actions made in/by one country disturb the balance in many others. Communication is porous and so commentaries across borders have become common. The space that might have separated us in even the recent past, has dwindled and is further narrowing. A devastating example of that was the global economic downturn that began in 2008, when “the financial crisis, which originated in the United States” became a global virus that “affected most world financial markets almost

simultaneously, then turned into an economic crisis in many countries” (Huwart, & Verdier, 2013, p. 128). The theoretical six degrees of separation, that strangers are linked by six or so social connections, are likely to be fewer (four? three?) in today’s hyper-connected world. This is the globalized space in which today’s teachers operate, it is the space they must navigate, they have no choice to do otherwise than to look, know, think, understand and teach beyond the boundaries of the(ir) local. Globalization is undoubtedly affecting every aspect of our lives, “changes and events in one part of the world are often acutely felt by the rest of the world” (Weber, 2007, p. 280). In light of the “global convergence around educational policies, practices, and values” (Jackson, 2016, p. 1), any conversation about globalization must focus on teachers, teaching and teacher education.

I begin first with a brief discussion about globalization—what it means, and how it is—or perhaps not—affecting teaching and teacher education. I then discuss the mindsets teachers (and therefore teacher education/educators) need to cultivate along four dimensions in the context of globalization, and close with two immediate actions we should take as/to be a global teacher education community.

### **Globalization in Teacher Education**

Although there has been considerable rhetoric about the need for global education, little attention has been paid to how teachers are actually teaching about the world, its peoples, and global issues.

(Merryfield, 1998, p. 345)

As teacher educators, we continue to ignore global change...ignoring the reality that we live in a globally interdependent world, are part of the global (not local) professions of

teaching and teacher education and are preparing educators to educate young people who will live past the year 2100.

(Kissock & Richardson, 2010, p. 91).

In an increasingly diverse and globally connected world, we need teachers who possess global competencies...but this work has not been as widely undertaken in teacher education as in higher education more generally.

(Kopish, 2016, p. 78)

### **Defining Globalization**

Writing for the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of *Action in Teacher Education* calls for a glance at history. Arguably, the history represented by the three quotes above is recent, only the past 20 years, but that era has significance in relation to the topic at hand. First, it was a time of unprecedented global mobility. For example, the close of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw a 57% increase in the foreign-born population in the U.S. Today, “there is greater human mobility than ever before...refugees and displacement are likely to become a defining issue of the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (Betts, 2015, para. 10, 7). Second, it was a period that witnessed events that had a major world impact, such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in the U.S., the Arab Spring in North Africa and the Middle East region, and the global financial crisis mentioned earlier. Third, advances in technology and the invention of social media platforms, such as the launch of the iPhone and Facebook, re-defined community and connection by facilitating cheap, instant, and readily available communication on an international scale. Fourth, air travel shifted from being a luxury that few could afford, to a mode of transportation that was openly accessible and now moves millions of passengers a day, crisscrossing the globe. This phenomenon of shared

significant experiences, and the “meeting and mixing of people, ideas, and resources, across local, national, and regional borders... has been largely perceived to have increased in intensity and scale during the late 20th and early 21st centuries” (Jackson, 2016, p. 16).

All these factors (among many others) have brought people, geographies and multiple discourses into close relief, the “intensified global interconnectivity” (Pauwel, 2019, p. 257) and inter-dependence that are so commonly invoked when any conversation turns to globalization. Undoubtedly, globalization is variously defined because the term has been used “in an inclusive sense, encompassing...[many]... ‘big concepts’” (Standish, 2014, p. 170). But in this discussion, globalization refers to the intersection of and connections across countries, the blending and blurring of borders, the mutuality of their trajectories resulting from the intertwining of economies and cultures, and the trade in ideas (and ideologies), practices, technologies, and people. Globalization is, therefore, not one thing or place, and cannot be associated with any single event; rather it is a concept that “refer(s) to both the process and consequences of shrinking distances between places on this planet” (Zhao, 2010, p. 422). These shrinking distances support an “ever increasing worldwide flow of ideas, practices and material objects boosted by organizations and transnational institutions and resulting in increasing interdependency between people and nations” (Pauwel, 2019, p. 257). Globalization calls into question “traditional boundaries between nations, cultures, languages as well as our notion of education, as a whole, and the education of teachers specifically” (Brown, Lycke, Crumpler, Handsfield, & Lucey, 2014, p. 261). The question is, how much have notions of the education of teachers been challenged by globalization?

### **The Impact of Globalization on Teacher Education?**

The three quotes at the start of this section would suggest not much, that over the last 20 years, teacher education scholars have seen little impact of that challenge and so have repeatedly called for teacher education to be responsive to globalization. In fact, a review of the literature seems to indicate that, “education programs are often among the least internationalized on U.S. campuses” (Kopish, 2016, p. 78; cf. Kissock & Richardson, 2010; O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011), and preservice teachers exhibit low levels of global knowledge and feel unprepared to teach global issues or content (Cushner & Mahon, 2002; McGaha & Linder, 2014; Merryfield & Kasai, 2004; Zeichner, 2010). An examination of almost 4000 articles on teacher education published by reputable U.S. journals between 2005 and 2015, revealed almost no mention of immigrants, immigration, or immigrant education, and minimal attention to broad issues of diversity (cf. Goodwin, 201). This despite the massive global movement of peoples across the world in the last decade, and “the new collective majority of minority children” in U.S. public schools (Maxwell, 2014, para. 3), where one in four children under age 18 is an immigrant or a child of immigrants (Sugarman, 2019).

This lack of attention to migration and immigration is repeated internationally where “a drastic increase in the number of immigrants and the nature of migration in the last 20 or 30 years caught many nations by surprise and left teachers poorly prepared for the changed composition of their classes” (Paine, Blòmke, & Aydarova, 2016, p. 743). The latest TALIS results (Teaching and Learning International Study) indicate the same lack of preparedness for diversity expressed by teachers across 48 countries (OECD, 2019). This is highly problematic since “Globalization is shaping not only what is to be learned, but also who is to be learning” (O’Connor & Zeichner, 2011, p. 528). However, it is important to analyze carefully the content

(what) that global forces seem to be privileging, as well as which students (who) are positioned at the center—or periphery—of schooling.

Globalization has resulted in the importation and subsequent deep rooting of neoliberal ideals and discourses that emphasize free market economies, profit margins, global competitiveness, and the development of human capital to power the capitalist machinery. This has fueled the Global Education Reform Movement or GERM, which is “often promoted through the interests of international development agencies and private enterprises through their interventions in national education reforms and policy formulation” (Sahlberg, 2012, para. 3), and forwards five principles or policies aimed at “standardization of education...focus on core subjects...low risk ways to reach learning goals...corporate management models...test based accountability” (para. 5-9). Education has become “a vehicle that assists the growing market economy,” (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2001, p. 139), both a battleground for political sparring and a commodity for sale or financial speculation by entrepreneurs and venture capitalists.

Ranking and sorting have become commonplace as countries and institutions compete to climb up league tables; they increasingly drive crucial decisions about education spending or teacher education policy according to scores on the plethora of international assessments, especially PISA, “the global yardstick for measuring success in education” (Schleicher, 2017, p. 123, cited in Ledger et al., 2019), or ranking regimes including Times Higher Education or QS World University Rankings. If one looks at teacher education through the lens of rankings or prevailing discourses around 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, work readiness, and economic competitiveness, one can begin to recognize that globalization has actually had an a deep impact on teacher education programs and practices, that notions of the education of teachers have indeed been challenged in certain ways. This is apparent, for instance, in the reforms of teacher education

underway throughout the world, which emphasize measurement and accountability, explicit standards and competencies, and “scientific” research-based practices (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017; Kosnik, Beck & Goodwin, 2016; Livingston & Flores, 2017).

The same is evident in the U.S. as teacher education/educators experience increasing standardization of teacher preparation curriculum, high stakes teacher certification testing, a reliance on data-driven and evidence-based outcomes, and mandatory accreditation (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017; Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015). Teacher education institutions are now regularly and publicly ranked, and are subject to a policy environment that is heightening control over university-based programs, tightening the accountability screws in terms of teacher/education evaluation, and diminishing the value of teacher preparation. It is no surprise then that teacher education institutions have been overly preoccupied with “aggressive and persistent efforts to regulate and control teacher education from the outside” (Zeichner, 2007, p. 37) at the same time that they are fielding “blistering media commentaries” about their inadequacies (Cochran-Smith, 2006, p. xxxii). Their energies have not been focused on “how teachers are actually teaching about the world, its peoples, and global issues” (Merryfield, 1998, p. 345), or “preparing educators to educate young people who will live past the year 2100” (Kissock & Richardson, 2010, p. 91), or global competencies for “an increasingly diverse and globally connected world” (Kopish, 2016, p. 78). Instead, their attention has been captured by “mounting dissatisfaction with teachers’ preparedness and effectiveness and growing criticism about the utility of teacher education” (Kosnik & Goodwin, 2013, p. 335), in the face of an increasingly competitive world, fueled by neoliberal policies that favor and promote marketization.



In reaction to this “mounting dissatisfaction,” and criticism, teacher educators have yielded to “increasing pressure to concentrate on the aspects of teacher preparation directly linked to student test scores” (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015, p. 10). This had led to the standardizing and narrowing of teacher preparation curriculum in terms of “what students need to learn, how their learning is assessed, how teachers are held accountable for student performance, and how teachers need to be prepared” in the U.S. (Wang, Lin, Spalding, Odell & Klecka, 2011, p. 116), and also elsewhere in the world (Allen, Singh, & Leonie, 2018; Livingston & Flores, 2015). This has been further exacerbated by the increasing marketization and commodification of teacher preparation such that university-based teacher education has, in the U.S. especially, but not solely, been forced to compete with a proliferating range of entrepreneurial alternate providers, the majority of which promise faster and cheaper routes to teacher certification (Arbaugh, Ball, Grossman, Heller, & Monk, 2015; Carter-Andrews, Richmond, & Stroupe, 2017). This has further constrained and shaped teacher education curricula in the direction of instrumentality, efficiency and technicalization, leaving little room for the kinds of knowledge or experiences necessary for educating globally competent teachers.

### **The Impact of Globalization on Curriculum**

Some have argued that the global emphasis on economic productivity and a skilled work force, using data from international assessments, such as PISA that has established itself as “an influential force for education reform” (Schleicher, 2018, p. 20), has led to the homogenization of instructional goals and curriculum across the world. Top performers on global assessments are now akin to rock stars, with lower performing countries making regular pilgrimages to PISA celebrities to learn their secret to top scores. These study tours seem to overlook the extensive, long-term, systemic—and collaborative—work that must be undertaken by any country serious

about educational reform, universal schooling and inclusive improvement (cf. Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). The search instead is for simple solutions, cheap fixes, and speedy results.

An alternative argument is that while there has been global homogenization, “international networking...tends to be asymmetrical. Power relations and global flows result in certain ideas being circulated, certain sources of knowledge being validated, and certain framing of issues being authorized” (Paine et al., 2016, p. 753). We see a lean towards the “West,” as English speaking scholars, primarily from the Global North and Australia, dominate international educational discourse, as well as the studies and sources that legitimize this discourse. Globalization and the directional flow of ideas—and their authoritative stature—is also a function of wealth such that “educational, developments in underdeveloped countries have been influenced by events, policies, and ideologies emanating from more powerful, industrialized countries” (Weber, 2007, p. 280). Given this new form of imperialism and the regulating effect of “policy borrowing” (Lingard, 2010; White, 2016), education in the context of globalization has become more synchronous around a narrower set of priorities (economic development), skills (21<sup>st</sup> century competencies and technology), subjects (literacy and numeracy), and goals (moving up the OECD league tables and international competitiveness).

The emphasis on tests and on competition, and the implicit public shaming that accompanies globally available PISA results, has an impact on learners and the kind of educational opportunities they are afforded. As our classrooms become more and more heterogeneous, a direct result of the global migration and displacement of peoples described earlier, the curriculum we provide needs to be equally diverse, versus more homogenized and standardized. Instead, for students who are poor, second language learners, newcomers, and

minoritized, in resource poor schools “isolated by race, class and language through minority-majority enrollment” (Orfield & Lee, cited in Jiménez-Castellanos & Garcia, 2017, p. 437), the curriculum fails to meet their needs but instead emphasizes discrete facts, proficiency in the dominant language, and “drilling and killing” in an effort to raise test scores (Carter & Darling-Hammond, 2016; Graham, 2013; Tyson, 2011) as a marker of “quality.” This level of segregation is not just a U.S. phenomenon, “[d]e facto segregation of migrant children in urban schools...exists in all European countries that have experienced relevant immigration in the second half of the 20th century” (Heckmann, 2008, p. 18), while immigrant-majority enrollment has been documented across OECD member countries (OECD, 2015), along with immigrant students’ low academic progress, compared to their non-immigrant peers (APA, 2012; OECD, 2016; Sugarman, 2017). History confirms that the best education has always been reserved for the privileged. One effect of globalization on learning and teaching has been the further rationing of rich and meaningful curriculum, and a widening of the achievement gap between those in the dominant (but minority) majority, and those in the marginalized (but majority) minority. “Global competition raises the dangers of adopting educational practices that may lift up test scores but undermine the very forms of learning that are most needed in a globalized world” (Flinders, 2009, p. 5)

### **Developing Global Mindsets: Four Dimensions for Teachers and Teacher Education**

Clearly, the impact of globalization on teaching, education and the life chances of all students is significant, and oftentimes detrimental. In what ways should/can teachers interrupt—and resist—possible negative impacts of globalization on classrooms and learners, but instead use this phenomenon as a conceptual lens for ontological rethinking and pedagogical reframing? I suggest that it is essential for teachers to develop (and for teacher education to cultivate) a

global mindset. This, I argue, is a small but significant first step that can enable teachers to become conscious of and transcend “the unabated mercilessness of global capitalism... [and]...neoliberal free market economies” (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2001, p. 137), and reclaim their critical role in nurturing young people and future world citizens who are thoughtful, discerning, empathetic and empowered. This global mindset can be theorized along four dimensions: the curricular, professional, moral, and personal. The four dimensions are not hierarchical, nor does one supersede another. Rather, they are all overlapping and complementary, at the same time that each has distinct features and a core purpose.

**The Curricular Dimension.** The idea of culturally relevant or responsive teaching is not an unfamiliar notion in the field of teacher education (Au & Jordan, 1981; Gay, 1993; Irvine, 1991; King, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Neither is the idea of multicultural curriculum (Banks, Carlos, Garcia, Gay, & Ochoa, 1976; Bennett, 1990; Grant & Sleeter, 1989; Nieto, 1992). For the past almost 50 years, since the publication of AACTE’s “No One Model American” (1973), teacher education has been striving to prepare teachers to work equitably and effectively with diverse students by using a wide range of instructional approaches, adopting a capacity mindset that honors students’ lived experiences and unique ways of knowing, and integrating culturally meaningful content into the curriculum. However, a global mindset within a curricular dimension means thinking about content, histories and perspectives beyond local and national boundaries, beyond the students in the room, and beyond place-based or geographically bounded socio-political issues. It

means viewing education from the perspective of a global citizenry, thus not only broadening the knowledge base of teachers but also sensitizing them to different perspectives on issues that can affect children, families and communities, and having

those perspectives inform the way they teach.

(Olmedo, & Harbon, 2010, p. 77)

In this conversation, a global mindset from a curricular dimension is distinct from efforts to internationalize the curriculum. “Internationalization can help develop international and intercultural knowledge, skills, and values in students—through...a curriculum that includes comparative, international, and intercultural elements” (Knight, 2012, p. 3). It is a process that focuses on developing cross-cultural understanding and familiarity such that students come to know the world and others in the world; internationalization enables students to learn *about* the world. Globalization, on the other hand, is associated with a “competitiveness and commercialism agenda” and “the worldwide flow of ideas, resources, people, economy, values, culture, knowledge, goods, services, and technology” (Knight, 2012, p. 4); globalization requires students to learn *through* the world. Thus, the curricular dimension means that teachers must not only be deeply knowledgeable about the intersection of the local with the global, but must be able to guide students in analyzing issues from multiple vantage points that globally interact and reverberate across time and space. Thus, studying a contemporary phenomenon such as the protests in Hong Kong, for example, requires examining intertwined histories of several countries and regimes, contemporary geopolitics and power dynamics, the global reach of the events and their impact on world conversations, perceptions and actions, economic impact and inequities, within group and between group conflicts, cultural+national+(post)colonized identities, language politics, and more. A global mindset drives teachers to pose different questions, and to expand notions of learning beyond content integration.

The curricular dimension within a global mindset directs teacher educators to first of all, ensure that skills of curriculum making become an integral component of preservice teacher

preparation. Curriculum making empowers new teachers to lead the curriculum, and therefore learning, versus being mere curriculum implementers who are led by curriculum mandated by policy makers. But curriculum making in/for a globalized universe is not simply the development of discrete lesson plans for tomorrow's class or units of study around specific content, but must be guided and undergirded by larger questions that are philosophical (what knowledge is of most worth?); political (who has the power to decide worthwhile knowledge?); cultural (what values, beliefs and ways of knowing are privileged?); existential (how do we come to know ourselves?); and more. And all these questions—of power, knowledge, meaning, identity—need to be investigated using a global lens that acknowledges, understands and forefronts the interconnectedness of people, places, practices and politics across nations.

**The Professional Dimension.** Positioned as a tool for capitalist development, education has become both the solution to progress, and the cause for any lack of it. Teachers, as those who are tasked with delivering education, are similarly positioned as instrumental to national development and economic growth; “when learning fails to materialize, teachers are often pointed to as the problem” (Evans & Yuan, 2018, p. 2). Consequently, they have been subject to increasing scrutiny, expectation and regulation over the past two decades to ensure quality and implementation compliance through “the rise of performance cultures...expressed through increased accountability, and the continued imposition of teacher standards” (Sachs, 2015, p. 414). The professional status of teachers continues to be in question (Goodwin, 2012), with teaching seen as low status work, and those who select teaching seen as less capable. Teachers around the world experience very disparate (and at times, desperate) working conditions, depending on the GDP of their home state, are paid less, and enjoy less support, professional development and autonomy than most professions requiring similar levels of education or

training (Evans & Yuan, 2018). It is also no accident that the womanization of the teaching profession and the fact that teachers work with young people who hold no political sway, is associated with lower wages, benefits and vocational control.

Globalization and the resultant flow of goods, people, knowledges, etc. means that teachers around the world are intimately connected, as well as mobile across physical and virtual spaces. In the professional dimension, teachers with a global mindset recognize that they are members of a global community of about 72 million (Roser, 2019). They have the leverage and the numbers to advocate for themselves, to resist the teacher bashing and blaming that is prevalent across the world, to demand better working conditions, to share ideas and resources, to uplift their profession. Recent international surveys of teachers reveal that the opportunity to have an impact on the lives of young people and to make a social contribution, are still the primary motivators for those who choose to teach (OECD, 2019). However, the oppressive high stakes testing and accountability environment in which too many teachers operate, as well as the need to simply survive on low wages, has diverted them from their core purpose and placed them in the position of reacting and complying, versus acting and leading. The professional dimension of a global mindset among teachers emphasizes the collective agency and communal power of teachers everywhere, to deeply affect the nature of their work and the learners with whom they work.

The professional dimension in teacher preparation means that teacher educators must redefine and expand what “professional” means when re-conceptualized from a globalization stance. Notions of collective agency may conjure up images of mass strikes, political bargaining and union sponsored activity. While these images are not untrue, they are not the focus or purpose of the professional dimension of a global mindset. Rather, this dimension suggests that

teacher educators more deliberately engage preservice teachers in reflecting upon, analyzing and clearly defining what it means to be a professional, not just in their local community, state or nation—the U.S., but in today’s global community where the status of teaching as a profession continues to be tenuous and undermined, where teachers often feel helpless to resist policies that are harmful to children, and where teachers themselves are battered by criticism, mistrust, and inadequate support at the same time that they are held up as the solution to the world’s ills.

**The Moral Dimension.** The moral dimension of a global mindset calls upon teachers and teacher educators to re-center their work on humanity and on social action. The purpose of teacher education is not to ensure certified teachers but to ensure teachers who are ready to work with young people to tackle the world’s problems. And while those world problems are “of the world,” they also are “of us,” such that the local and the global are reflective images, and one is tied to—and affects—the other. For example, over 7.5 million people in the world do not have access to safe drinking water (<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>), including those in our own backyard, the people of Newark, New Jersey (<https://time.com/5653115/newark-water-crisis/>). Globally, 736 million people live in extreme poverty; in the U.S., the richest nation on earth, this includes about 40 million people, over 12% of the population (<https://poverty.umich.edu/about/poverty-facts/>). What happens “out there” also happens right here. Today’s children are “citizens of the globe” and so “they need to be aware of the global nature of societal issues, to care about people in distant places” (Zhao, 2010, p. 426). Learning to develop this awareness and caring will require teachers who possess the same awareness and demonstrate the same caring. Moreover, the moral dimension of a global mindset is not just righteous, but is also pragmatic. We live in an aging society. By this year, those aged 60 and over will outnumber children under 5 (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact->



[sheets/detail/ageing-and-health](#)). We need and depend on every child everywhere in the world in order to survive; there are no children to waste. Thus, our well being is inextricably tied to the well being of our fellow humans. Globalization means there can be no *us*, only *we*, and teachers are in the best—and most privileged—position to forward that moral agenda.

Teachers are faced with moral dilemmas every day: “delivering” the curriculum to children who may be hungry or homeless; upholding government policies, such as immigration laws, that may put students and their families in danger; countering and augmenting instructional materials that may perpetuate stereotypes and biases; learning to recognize implicit misconceptions or discriminatory behavior in themselves; dealing fairly with co-workers and stakeholders who may express racist, sexist or xenophobic beliefs; planning field trips or other enriching experiences that may present a financial burden to some families; and on and on. Such moral dilemmas should be embedded in teacher preparation curricula as a matter of course if we intend to nurture new teachers who actually teach children and not subjects (pun intended). But teachers and their students are all in the “world stew” (Smith & Goodwin, 1997), and so every contemporary moral dilemma is automatically situated within a global context as fates and futures intertwine across multiple borders. One cannot talk about immigration policies for one country, for example, without examining immigration policies across countries, global migration patterns and push-pull factors, climate change and global warming and their effect on personal as well as state economies, issues of culture and identity versus nationalism, etc. Essentially, teacher preparation programs must become “global educational contact zones” (Singh & Doherty, 2004, p. 11), where teacher educators and teachers-to-be, wrestle with moral issues that lie at the heart of teaching, whether that teaching happens in the U.S. or anywhere else in the world, and that affect the lives and well being of all children in the global family.

**The Personal Dimension.** The final dimension of a global mindset for teachers is probably the most challenging to develop because it requires self work: self-reflection, interrogation and evaluation. The global environment has become more complex and conflicted than ever. The rise of populism and nationalism, the emergence of fake news as a persistent, daily phenomenon, ongoing refugee crises, widening income gaps, a loss of confidence in national leaders, xenophobia, digital crimes, and so on, are all shaping how each one of us thinks about, perceives and defines the world—and *Other*. Teachers are not immune; we too come into our classrooms, whether K-12 or higher education, filled with values, beliefs, biases (mis)conceptions, expectations and tacit knowledge that inform and shape who we are and what we do. Indeed, research on teacher thinking or cognition, variously termed expectations, beliefs, perceptions, attitudes, implicit theories, and so on (Pajares, 1992), does center on the ideas and conceptions that teachers bring into their practice from their backgrounds and lived experiences. These personal understandings about learning and learners, social structures and meritocracy, racial hierarchies and class, have been shown to shape and influence decisions about instruction, students, curriculum, and privilege certain students and ways of knowing over others (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Goodwin, 2010; Rios, Montecinos, & van Olphen 2007). The same applies to conceptions of globalization—what it is, what it means, and whether it is even an important aspect of curricula for youngsters or for teachers-to-be. We cannot teach what we do not know. We also will not teach what we do not value—and we might teach what we believe to be right, but actually isn't. A global mindset must necessarily include a personal dimension, the question is what does that personal dimension tell us and how do we vigilantly remain conscious of its messages?

The self work that is the prerequisite to “sociocultural consciousness” (Villegas and

Lucas, 2002) should be initiated during teacher preparation. The personal dimension of a global mindset requires teacher education programs to create space for preservice teachers to “[restructure] their cognitive maps with reformed and/or new understandings” (Richardson, 1998, p. 147). In becoming a teacher, preservice students must also be engaged in a process of redefining their ‘emotional geographies’ (Hargreaves 2001) as they make the transition from student to teacher. The moral dilemmas and tensions described earlier are fruitful opportunities for exploring values and unearthing beliefs, “re-constructing a professional identity” (Bullock & Christou, 2009, p. 78) through autobiographical analysis (Genor & Goodwin, 2005). They allow student teachers to both locate themselves *within the narrative* because they are dilemmas that many teachers around the world experience and so are recognizable and familiar. At the same time, they enable student teachers to sit *alongside the narrative*, learning through the lenses of different global contexts that frame common moral questions with diverse and unfamiliar cultural perspectives, values, and world views.

This is not easy work, confronting ourselves is hard as we shed or revise the long-held “truths” that have governed our thinking and our actions. It is also hard because we are not always able to see ourselves, to discern and make visible to ourselves what was previously not explicitly known or apparent. The personal dimension of a global mindset develops through confrontation with *other*—the reflective mirror presented by other people, practices, ideas, norms and realities, that causes us to re-examine what we thought we knew. Teacher preparation must become both a safe and an uncomfortable place for this self work.

#### A Global(ized) Teacher Education Community

Just as social justice has become a “central animating” force in teacher education (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 45), globalization is similarly and frequently invoked in

current conversations about teacher preparation curriculum and goals. Whether we have made concrete progress in relation to these two imperatives is debatable; most evidence would suggest not. So I conclude with a call for two actions that we might take as a teacher education community in the U.S., to become 1) global, and 2) globalized. Becoming a global teacher education community means our conversation needs to be expanded beyond the U.S. context, and beyond internationalization efforts. A first step to becoming global might be to join (or convene) global conversations around teacher education, by, perhaps, substituting one local conference for an international one. And not just to learn *about* what happens outside the U.S. (i.e., to add knowledge), but to learn *through* the practices of global peers (to change knowledge—what and how we know).

A first step to becoming globalized might be to use the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals as a conceptual anchor for our teacher preparation curriculum, to focus our preservice students—and ourselves—on global challenges that affect every person on earth. This might help our students deliberately build bridges between the holistic (and oftentimes generic) nature of learning to teach, with the very real issues we are struggling with as a world society, to use the power of education to ignite the ingenuity of young people to not just study the challenges we face, but to solve them.

There exist examples of global communities that have become forums for the international sharing of educational practices and research. One example is the World Federation of Associations of Teacher Education ([https://www.worldfate.org/docpdf/wfate\\_overview.pdf](https://www.worldfate.org/docpdf/wfate_overview.pdf)), which began in 2010 with the mission to “build a global community of teacher educators and to promote trans-national collaboration, support, and research and development in teacher education.” Another is WERA (<https://www.weraonline.org/page/MemAssocs>), the World

Educational Research Association, which brings together “major national, regional, and international specialty research associations dedicated to advancing education research through an international lens.” Such organizations could be seen as seeds from which more comprehensive global teacher education communities might develop, ones that move beyond the exchange of research and programs located within member countries, to the collaborative design of unique research and programs that aim to create and support new intertwined futures as well as mutually and globally informed knowledge.

Indeed, dilemmas inherent in teaching and also in teacher education, are begging for collaborative inquiry among the international community of teacher educators. Many of us are asking the same questions and struggling with the same challenges; in our separate countries we are imagining novel solutions and testing different innovations to shared problems. There is much we can teach one another, and much we can learn and discover together. In today’s global community, collective work and research must be the norm. By cultivating a global mindset along the four dimensions, we can integrate the curricular, the professional, the moral and the personal, so as to attend to significant global questions of teaching and learning while simultaneously embracing our shared humanity and vulnerability.

#### References

AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education). (1973). No one model American: A statement on multicultural education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 24(4), 264-265.

APA (American Psychological Association), Presidential Task Force on Educational Disparities. (2012). *Ethnic and racial disparities in education: Psychology’s contributions to understanding and reducing disparities*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/ed/resources/racial-disparities.aspx>

Arbaugh, F., Ball, D.L., Grissman, P., Heller, D., & Monk, D. (2015). Deans' corner: Views on the state of teacher education in 2015. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(5), 435-445.

Au, K., & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie, & K. H. Au (Eds.), *Culture in the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 139–152). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Banks, J. A., Carlos, E. C., Garcia, R. I., Gay, G., & Ochoa, A. S. (1976). *Curriculum guidelines for multiethnic education*. Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Bennett, C. (1990). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Betts, A. (20 September, 2015). Human migration will be a defining issue of this century. How best to cope? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/20/migrants-refugees-asylum-seekers-21st-century-trend>

Brown, R. A., Lycke, K. L., Crumpler, T. P., Handsfield, L. J., & Lucey, T. A. (2014). Editors' notes. *Action in Teacher Education*, 36(4), 261-263.

Bullock, S. M., & Christou, T. (2009). Exploring the Radical Middle Between Theory and Practice: A Collaborative Self-Study of Beginning Teacher Educators. *Studying Teacher Education*, 5(1), 75–88.

Carter-Andrews, D., Richmond, G., & Stroupe, D. (2017). Teacher Education and Teaching in the Present Political Landscape: Promoting Educational Equity Through Critical Inquiry and Research. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(2), 121–124.

Chong, T. T-L., & Li, X-Y. (2019). Understanding China-US trade war: Causes, economic impact and the worse case scenario. Retrieved from [https://www.igef.cuhk.edu.hk/igef\\_media/working-paper/IGEF/igef%20working%20paper%20no.%2071%20english%20version.pdf](https://www.igef.cuhk.edu.hk/igef_media/working-paper/IGEF/igef%20working%20paper%20no.%2071%20english%20version.pdf)

Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). *Policy, Practice, and Politics in Teacher Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., Baker, M., Burton, S., Chang, W-C., Carney, M.C., Fernández, B., Keefe, E.S., Miller, A., & Sánchez, J.G. (2017). The accountability era in US teacher education: looking back, looking forward. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(5), 572-588

Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A.M. (2015). Framing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part 1. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(1), 7-20.

- Cushner, K., & Mahon, J. (2002). Overseas student teaching: Affecting personal, professional, and global competencies in an age of globalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(1), 44-58.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., McIntyre, A., Sato, M., & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Empowered Educators: How Leading Nations Design Systems for Teaching Quality*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Evans, D., & Yuan, F. (2018). The working conditions of teachers in low and middle income countries. *World Bank 2018 World Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.riseprogramme.org/sites/www.riseprogramme.org/files/inline-files/Yuan.pdf>
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103, 1013–1055.
- Gay, G. (1993). Building cultural bridges: A bold proposal for teacher education. *Education and Urban Society*, 25(3), 285-299.
- Genor, M., & Goodwin, A. L. (2005). Confronting ourselves: Using autobiographical analysis in teacher education. *The New Educator*, 1(4), 311-331.
- Goodwin, A. L. (2016). Who is in the classroom now? Teacher preparation and the education of immigrant children. *Educational Studies*, 53(5), 433-449
- Goodwin, A. L. (2012). Teaching as a profession: Are we there yet? In C. Day (Ed.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* (pp. 44-56). Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Goodwin, A. L. (2010). Globalization and the preparation of quality teachers: Rethinking knowledge domains for teaching. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 19-32.
- Goodwin, A. L., & Kosnik, C. (2013). Quality Teacher Educators = Quality Teachers? Conceptualizing essential domains of knowledge for those who teach teachers. *Teacher Development*, 17(3), 334-346.
- Graham, E. (Nov 7, 2013). Clearing the path to academic success for minority students. *NEA Today*. Retrieved from <http://neatoday.org/2013/11/07/clearing-the-path-to-academic-success-for-minority-students-2/>
- Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1989). *Turning on learning. Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional Geographies of Teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1056–1080.

Heckmann, F. (2008). *Education and the integration of migrants*. Retrieved from <http://www.efms.uni-bamberg.de/pdf/NESEducationIntegrationMigrants.pdf>

Huwart, J-Y., & Verdier, L. (2013). The 2008 financial crisis – A crisis of globalisation? In *Economic Globalisation: Origins and consequences*, OECD Publishing, Paris.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264111905-9-en>

Irvine, J. (1991). *Black students and school failure*. NY: Praeger.

Jackson, L. (2016). Globalization and education. *Oxford Research Encyclopedias*. Retrieved from <https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-52?print=pdf>

King, J. E. (1995). Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action. In J. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 265-290). New York: Macmillan.

Kissock, C. & Richardson, P. (2010). Calling for action within the teaching profession: It is time to internationalize teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 89– 101

Knight, J. (2012). Five truths about internationalization. *International Higher Education*, (69), 4-5. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2012.69.8644>

Kopish, M. A. (2016). Preparing Globally Competent Teacher Candidates Through Cross-Cultural Experiential Learning. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 7(2), 75-108

Kosnik, C., Beck, C., & Goodwin, A. L. (2016). Managing reform in teacher education. In J. Loughran, & M. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Teacher Education*, Vol. 1 (pp. 267-308). Singapore: Springer.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dream-keepers: successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lau, S. (Aug 13, 2019). “United Nations human rights body takes aim at Hong Kong police over use of weapons.” *South China Morning Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3022623/united-nations-human-rights-body-takes-aim-hong-kong-police>

Ledger, S., Thier, M., Bailey, L., & Pitts, C. (2019). OECD’s approach to measuring global competency: Powerful voices shaping education. *Teachers College Record*, 121(8).

Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: testing times in Australian schools. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(2), 129-147.



Livingston, K., & Flores, M.A. (2017). Trends in teacher education: a review of papers published in the European Journal of Teacher Education over 40 years. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(5), 551-560.

Londoño, E., Andreoni, M., & Casado, L. (Aug 23, 2019). “As Amazon fires become global crisis, Brazil’s President reverses course.” *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/23/world/americas/brazil-military-amazon-fire.html>

Mahon, J. (2010). Fact or fiction? Analyzing institutional barriers and individual responsibility to advance the internationalization of teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 7-18

Maxwell, L. (2014, August 19). U.S. school enrollment hits majority-minority milestone. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/08/20/01demographics.h34.html>

McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 136-150.

McGaha, J. M., & Linder, S. M. (2014). Determining Teacher Candidates’ Attitudes Toward Global-Mindedness. *Action in Teacher Education*, 36(4), 305-321.  
DOI: [10.1080/01626620.2014.948225](https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2014.948225)

Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers’ thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342- 379.

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

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.

O'Connor, K., & Zeichner, K. (2011). Preparing US teachers for critical global education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 521-536.

OECD (2019). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume I): Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>.

OECD. (2018). *Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world: The OECD PISA global competence framework*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/Handbook-PISA-2018-Global-Competence.pdf>

OECD. (2016). *Supporting Teacher Professionalism: Insights from TALIS 2013*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264248601-en>

OECD (2015), *Immigrant Students at School: Easing the Journey towards Integration*, OECD Reviews of Migrant Education, OECD Publishing, Paris.  
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264249509-en>.

Olmedo, I., & Harbon, L. (2010). Broadening our sights: internationalizing teacher education for a global arena. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 75-88.

Paine, L., Blòmeke, S., & Aydarova, O. (2016). Teachers and teaching in the context of globalization. In D. Gitomer & Bell, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp. 717-786). Washington, DC: AERA

Pajares, F.M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332

Pauwels, L. (2019). Exposing globalization: Visual approaches to researching global interconnectivity in the urban everyday. *International Sociology*, 34(3), 256-280.

Richardson, V. (1998). Teacher education and the construction of meaning. In G. Griffin (Ed.), *The education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (pp. 145–166). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rios, F., Montecinos, C., & van Olphen, M. (2007). Lessons Learned from a Collaborative Self-Study in International Teacher Education: Visiones, Preguntas, y Desafios. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 43, 57–74.

Roser, M. (2019). Teachers and Professors. Published online at OurWorldInData.org. Retrieved from <https://ourworldindata.org/teachers-and-professors>

Sachs, J. (2015). Teacher professionalism: Why are we still talking about it? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 22(4), 413–425.

Sahlberg, P. (2012). *Global Education Reform Movement is here!* Retrieved from <https://pasisahlberg.com/global-educational-reform-movement-is-here/>

Schleicher, A. (2018). *World class: How to build a 21<sup>st</sup> century school system*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Singh, P., & Doherty, C. (2004). Global cultural flows and pedagogic dilemmas: teaching in the global university contact zone. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 9-42.

Smith, Y., & Goodwin, A. L. (1997). The democratic, child-centered classroom: Provisioning for a vision. In A. L. Goodwin (Ed.), *Assessment for equity and inclusion: Embracing all our children*, (pp. 101-120). New York: Routledge.

Standish, A. (2014). What is global education and where is it taking us? *The Curriculum Journal*, 25(2), 166–186.

- Sugarman, J. (2017). *Beyond teaching English: Supporting high school completion by immigrant and refugee students*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Sugarman, J. (2019). *Legal protections for K-12 English learner and immigrant background students*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute
- Tyson, K. (2011). *Integration interrupted: Tracking, black students, and acting white after Brown*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Villegas, A.M. & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32.
- Weber, E. (2007). Globalization, “glocal” development, and teachers’ work: A research agenda. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(3), 279-309.
- White, S. (2016). Teacher education research and education policymakers: an Australian perspective, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(2), 252-264
- Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 422-431.
- Zeichner, K. (2007). Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 36–46.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). *Preparing globally competent teachers: A US perspective*. Colloquium on the Internationalization of Teacher Education, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Kansas.