

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 092

SP 040 431

AUTHOR Pickert, Sarah  
TITLE Changing Views about International Activities in American Teacher Education Programs.  
PUB DATE 2001-07-00  
NOTE 32p.; Portions of this paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Comparative and International Education Society (Washington, DC, March 14-17, 2001) and the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies (11th, Cheongju, Korea, July 2-6, 2001).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; Foreign Students; Higher Education; \*Institutional Cooperation; \*International Cooperation; \*International Education; Multicultural Education; \*Preservice Teacher Education; Study Abroad; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Participation

## ABSTRACT

This paper provides a historical overview of international education trends in U.S. colleges, including teacher education programs, comparing current research with data from the 1970s. In 2000, deans and department chairs of the American Association of colleges for Teacher Education's (AACTE's) 735 member institutions were sent a 31-item questionnaire, and 59 institutions from 29 states responded. The survey examined institutional demographics and the presence or absence of several international activities over the past 5 years (institutional profile; faculty involvement; international student enrollment; curriculum; inter-institutional, international agreements, distance education, and networking; and issues and priorities). Overall, most international activities increased with time, but not at the same rates or in the same places. The most frequent type of faculty involvement was travel abroad. Foreign student enrollment increased significantly since the 1970s. Study abroad programs were widely available at most institutions as compared to the 1970s. About 70 percent of institutions had signed inter-institutional agreements in the past 5 years, but only 45 percent had approved mutual recognition agreements. Respondents from all institutional types highlighted such priority issues as providing opportunities for students to study or work abroad, for faculty to study or work abroad, and admitting international students. Questionnaire from study is appended. (Contains 21 references.) (SM)

### Changing Views about International Activities in American Teacher Education Programs

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sarah Pickert*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Sarah Pickert, Ph.D.  
Professor of Education  
Catholic University of America  
Washington, DC 20064

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Portions of this paper have been presented at the following conferences:

Comparative and International Education Society annual meeting in Washington, DC, March 2001

World Congress of Comparative Education Societies meeting at the Korean National University of Education in South Korea, July 2001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

40431

## **ABSTRACT**

In 21<sup>st</sup> century schools, teachers must prepare students to live and work in an increasingly multicultural, multilingual and interdependent society. Calls for improved international competence for American teachers have come from presidents, governors, state education officers, and professional education associations. What changes have occurred in teacher education programs in response to these challenges? This paper provides a brief historical overview of international education trends in American colleges and universities, including teacher education programs. Then it reports the results of a recent survey of international activities in AACTE institutions and compares it with two earlier ones. Finally it offers a framework for understanding why international activities take their present form and suggests strategies for organizational change in the future.

# **CHANGING VIEWS ABOUT INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN AMERICAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 21<sup>st</sup> century schools, teachers must prepare students to live and work in an increasingly multicultural, multilingual, and interdependent society. Over the years many groups have warned of the dangers of parochialism and multicultural ignorance in teacher preparation programs. Calls for improved international competence for American teachers have come from presidents, governors, state education officers, and professional education associations. Yet administrators have reacted slowly to these calls for reform. What changes actually have occurred in attitudes toward international education among professional educators over the past thirty years? How can we account for the rate, scope, and location of these changes?

This paper provides a brief historical overview of international education trends in American colleges and universities, including teacher education programs. It then reports the results of a survey of international activities in American college and university teacher preparation programs conducted in 2000, noting what has and has not changed. Finally it provides a framework for understanding why international activities take their present form and suggests strategies for organizational change in the future.

## **DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION**

There is no universally agreed upon definition for the term international education because it changes with time and whenever it is applied in a particular context, it is immediately interpreted from national, political, cultural, sociolinguistic and institutional

perspectives. In order to make comparisons with earlier studies international education is defined here as international activities that are carried out by higher education institutions. Examples include offering a curriculum with an international focus, supporting student/faculty exchanges, admitting international students, or establishing international collaborative relationships (Knight & deWit, 1999; Van der Wende, 1995). International education has also been defined as a process rather than a set of activities, that is, the means by which the teaching, research and service functions of a higher education system become internationally and cross-culturally compatible (Knight, 1997; Ebuchi, 1988). Other definitions specify aims, goals, outcomes (Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 1998), curriculum (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Center for Educational Research and Innovation, 1994), and campus ethos (Knight & deWit, 1997). In the field of teacher education the concept is often linked to global and multicultural education (Merryfield, 1996).

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

In 1971 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education conducted its first survey of international initiatives in teacher education programs (Klassen, Imig, & Yff, 1972). During that time the U.S. government was sponsoring international projects that directly impacted schools of education like the Fulbright scholars program, the Peace Corps, and technical assistance projects with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) (Frankel, 1965). But the country had also become demoralized by the Vietnam War and racked by conflict over civil rights. With the focus increasingly on domestic issues, studies from this period

painted a bleak picture of American students' competency in foreign languages and their limited knowledge of world affairs (Pike, Barrows, Mahoney, and Jugeblut, 1979).

The authors of the AACTE survey reported that 60 percent of all institutions surveyed gave a low priority to international education. They cited lack of funds, competent faculty, and appropriate curriculum materials as the primary reasons. Administrators in the sample rated fewer than ten percent of faculty members as competent in international education. They noted that schools of education needed to be more responsive to domestic multicultural realities. Few institutions required foreign language study for education majors, and education students made only limited use of study abroad programs even though they were available. Only about half of the respondents noted that their institution required some international course content in their professional sequence. During this period Schools of Education appeared to rely primarily on courses from Arts and Sciences to provide international content but only ten percent of the institutions actually required such a course.

But some institutions were very active in this field, especially large public doctoral land grant universities and several others on the East Coast. Their interest appeared to be related to their involvement in government sponsored technical assistance projects. During this same period many individual faculty members also belonged to professional organizations that promoted international education through research and exchange opportunities. A surprising number of them traveled abroad to participate in academic conferences.

By the end of the 1980's, after a severe economic depression and a rising number of immigrant children entering school, international education re-emerged in the higher

education curriculum in a new form. This time it had an expanded focus encompassing international business in addition to multicultural awareness, cross-cultural communication skills and global environmental concerns (Pickert, 1996). With travel becoming easier, many campuses expanded their study abroad programs. Policy makers began arguing that foreign students were needed not just to help current and future leaders around the world understand American democratic values, but also to assist American students in developing intercultural and global understanding.

Higher education associations in the 1990's and up to today continue to voice their concern about how few American college students have access to programs to learn the language and cultures of other nations or the intercultural skills necessary for living in a global society (Hayward, 2000). This worry extends to the education of students who plan to be America's teachers. The Council of Chief State School Officers argues that pre-collegiate teachers need the capacity to communicate in languages other than English and a global perspective of other nations, cultures, and people. Teachers also need the capacity to compare educational systems and the opportunity to exchange educational practices with educators in other countries (CCSSO, n.d.). National discipline organizations including those from history, foreign languages, and geography are also revising guidelines recommending international subject matter for the K-12 curriculum.

AACTE completed a second survey of international education in teacher education programs in 1991. This survey covered faculty involvement, student activities, course opportunities to enhance international understanding, and collaborative relationships with institutions abroad (Glenn, 1992). The most common activities reported in this survey were faculty conference attendance abroad, visiting scholars on campus, cooperative

relationships with foreign colleges and universities, and student travel or teaching abroad. But like the survey twenty years earlier, the 1991 survey also reported many deficiencies. Programs continued to rely on liberal arts courses for international content and international education was not part of the education department offerings on most campuses. Only a fraction of pre-service teachers had opportunities to study or travel abroad in a way that was integrated into their major. Global education courses were available in only a few institutions. Multicultural education courses were the most common means of enhancing international understanding and awareness of diversity. The 1992 report noted that few Schools of Education had an international mission statement and urged readers to create one.

Approximately ten years later, in 2000, a third survey of AACTE institutions was conducted and its results are reported next.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### *Sample*

In spring 2000, the Deans and Department Chairs of AACTE's 735 member institutions were contacted by e-mail and asked to reply to a 31 item questionnaire that had been posted at the AACTE website ([www.aacte.org/global\\_international/survey\\_form1.htm](http://www.aacte.org/global_international/survey_form1.htm)). Paper versions of the survey were also distributed at the Association's annual meeting. Fifty-nine institutions responded from 29 states from all regions of the country. The sample was evenly balanced between public (58 percent) and private (42 percent) institutions. A third of the institutions offered doctoral degrees (31 percent).



### ***Survey Design***

The survey included items from earlier questionnaires about international education (Altbach & Lewis, 1996; Glenn, 1992; Klassen et. al. 1972). Several additional questions were added to reflect international activities that are now available through new technology. The survey included no country-specific questions so that it could be used with an international audience. Bilingual international education experts translated it from English into Chinese, Dutch, French, German, Japanese, and Spanish but only the results of the American respondents to the English version are reported here.

### ***Instrument***

The 31-item questionnaire asked about institutional demographics and the presence or absence of the following international activities over the past five years:

- a) *Institutional Profile* -size, governance-public/private, highest degree offered
- b) *Faculty* -international activities including academic travel abroad, engaging in international research, international expertise, foreign degrees & citizenship
- c) *International Students* -whether and in what programs international students enrolled; benefits offered
- d) *Curriculum* -international courses or degrees offered, availability of study/student teaching abroad, foreign language requirements, special programs for students who plans to teach abroad, courses with international topics
- e) *Agreements, Distance Education and Networking* -inter-institutional agreements, mutual recognition agreements, cross border distance education courses
- f) *Issues and Priorities* -reasons for having an international dimension and ways to achieve it

## **RESULTS**

### ***Data Analysis***

Data analysis included frequency distributions and cross-tabulations. Chi-squares were calculated to determine their significance where appropriate. The following sections report the results of the 2000 survey and compare it where possible to the two earlier ones.

### ***Faculty***

Six items asked about faculty involvement in international higher education. Questions included whether faculty members had obtained their advanced degrees in or were citizens of another country, whether they went abroad and for what purposes, and whether visiting scholars from abroad had been associated with their education programs. Questions also asked whether faculty members were involved in international research and whether they were qualified to teach about international education. A final question asked respondents their opinion on whether international expertise among Education faculty members like foreign language fluency, international experience, or possession of a degree from another country was important for hiring, tenure and promotion.

The most frequent kind of faculty involvement, regardless of institution type, was travel abroad, with 82 percent of respondents reporting that faculty members in their education programs had gone abroad to attend an academic conference. This is a robust finding that has persisted for thirty years. Doctoral institutions scored higher than other institutions on every faculty measure, noting significantly more activity on research related issues including travel abroad to conduct research, publishing research in another country, and conducting research with a foreign faculty member. Faculty members on

doctoral campuses were more likely to hold an advanced degree from another country. International scholars were also more likely to be on campuses that granted doctoral degrees as well. Institutions did not differ significantly on faculty travelling abroad to attend conferences or on faculty international expertise.

Regardless of institution type, fewer than five percent of the respondents said that international expertise was important for hiring, tenure and promotion. More than half of them said it was not important. These results are historically consistent with earlier surveys.

### ***International Students***

Four questions explored whether international students were currently enrolled in Education programs, where they came from, the degrees they sought, and what institutional support was available to them. In the 1970's approximately five percent of the foreign students studying in the United States were enrolled in Schools of Education, and many institutions offered them special services (Klassen, 1971). In 2000, foreign students from more than thirty countries were still enrolling in education programs. China, Japan, and Korea sent the most. Most institutions (92 percent) reported having some kind of benefit available for them compared to 64 percent in the 1970's. These findings provide evidence for the presence and continued support for foreign students on American campuses over the thirty-year period.

### ***Curriculum***

Eight questions covered issues of internationally oriented topics and programs, the opportunity for and destination of study abroad students, second language proficiency

requirements, student teaching opportunities abroad, and courses for Teaching English as a Second Language.

Study abroad is now widely available at most institutions in the sample (90%) compared with thirty years ago when it was present at fewer than half of the institutions in the sample (41 percent). Respondents listed 31 different destinations for American students going abroad. Mirroring the general pattern in the country, they went most frequently to English speaking countries like England and Australia. Student teaching abroad, while less common, also increased in frequency, from 13 percent in 1971 to 36 percent today. Unfortunately neither of the surveys asked respondents how many Education students actually took part in these programs. About half of the institutions in the present sample (55 percent) required international topics in required courses, about the same as thirty years ago. Only five percent of respondents reported that their institutions offered a specific course on international or comparative education. Proportionally more institutions noted a foreign language requirement, 29 percent compared to 17 percent thirty years ago. Doctoral institutions did not differ significantly from others on curriculum questions except that they were more likely to offer special programs for students who planned to teach abroad.

### ***Agreements, Distance Education and Networking***

Five questions asked about collaborative agreements with institutions in other countries as well as the availability and transferability of distance education courses. Most institutions had signed inter-institutional agreements in the past five years (70 percent), but fewer than half had approved mutual recognition agreements (45 percent). It appears that while many teacher education programs in the United States have created

arrangements to award credit for American students who take courses at foreign institutions, fewer of them recognize the equivalency of foreign credentials for international students seeking admission to their programs.

About half of the institutions surveyed (57.6 percent) offered distance education courses to a domestic audience, while only a quarter (25.4 percent) targeted an international audience.

In an open-ended section of the survey asking about specific international collaborations, many administrators described programs they had established with teacher education institutions in other countries. In some cases, exchanges were mutual, with faculty and students going from and coming to each country, but one-way exchanges continue to be more common. Some respondents noted an effort to send their students beyond Western Europe. They sometimes received help from consortia of American colleges and universities in doing so.

### ***Issues and Priorities***

Survey questions in this section asked respondents to check the three most important reasons for having an international dimension in their Education unit and the best way to achieve an international perspective there. They were asked to rank eight reasons or provide one of their own. Four reasons covered issues of scope: to improve the teaching profession worldwide; to prepare internationally knowledgeable and inter-culturally competent graduates; to encourage regional and/or national identity; to reflect domestic ethnic or cultural diversity. Two choices related to economics: to maintain economic competitiveness for the nation and to generate revenue for the institution. One choice, a popular motivation during the cold war, was to contribute to national security.

One choice asked whether an international dimension was important because it provides access to international knowledge.

A historical comparison of the answers provides some interesting findings. The 1971 study emphasized the need for teachers to become internationally knowledgeable and inter-culturally competent, and to be responsive to American multicultural domestic realities as well. These same two reasons appear among the three top choices of administrators in all institution types thirty years later. Almost all respondents (96 percent) selected the preparation of internationally knowledgeable and inter-culturally competent students as one of the most important reasons for having an international dimension in a teacher education program to prepare. The second most popular choice, not evident thirty years ago, was to provide access to international knowledge (72 percent). The third choice was to reflect domestic ethnic or cultural diversity (58 percent).

The authors of the 1971 survey proposed many ways to achieve an international perspective. Among them were to include more international content in required education courses and to revise the internationally oriented Arts and Science courses offered to Education students. They also recommended expanding students' overseas and domestic cross-cultural experiences, interacting with foreign students, and hiring faculty members from a broader range of cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

The 2000 survey included nine choices from which respondents were asked to select their top three. They also had the option of writing their own choices. Two choices were to provide opportunities to study or work abroad for faculty and for students. One recommended admitting more international students. One recommended

hiring faculty with international expertise. Two recommended changing the curriculum to include international content in required courses or offer specific international courses or programs. Two related to institutional changes including obtaining institutional support and having an international mission statement. One recommended gaining access to international knowledge via electronic and other networks.

The top three choices by respondents from all institution types were to provide opportunities for students to study or work abroad (73 percent), followed by providing opportunities for faculty go study or work abroad (67 percent), and finally admitting international students (48 percent). About a third of the sample (35 percent) recommended hiring faculty with international expertise even though on an earlier question they had indicated that such expertise was not valued by their institution. Almost the same number recommended including international content in required courses (38 percent). Even though respondents had indicated that a reason for having international education is to provide access to international knowledge, only thirteen percent of the respondents recommended gaining access to international knowledge as a strategy for achieving an international perspective. Interestingly, only about ten percent of the respondents chose the overall institutional changes of obtaining institutional support for international education (13 percent) and having an international mission statement (10 percent) as their preferred strategies. Almost no one recommended instituting specific international courses or programs (5 percent).

## **DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION**

Comparisons across the AACTE surveys indicate that most international activities have increased with time but not at the same rates or in the same places. Complimentary theories from sociology and political science provide a framework for explaining why historical change is so gradual and why institution types have different international education activity profiles.

Sociologists that study institutions have found remarkable similarities among education systems around the world (Meyer, Boli, Ramirez, & Thomas, 1997). They argue that organizations adopt institutional practices slowly because its members must match them with existing institutional values. For this reason, institutional forms that emerge are compatible or isomorphic with existing ones. Pressures to adopt new practices come from cultural expectations and politics within the general society (coercive isomorphism), from successful organizations (mimetic isomorphism), and from policies generated by communities with the cultural authority to impose standards on their members (normative isomorphism) (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). As similar practices become standardized they reduce uncertainty and increase legitimacy for the organizations involved.

These arguments help to explain why the standards for international education against which colleges and universities are measured in surveys of this type match the purposes and activities of doctoral granting institutions the best. These institutions have the power and authority to dictate what constitutes legitimate international activities in higher education.



But not all higher education policies conform to the same pattern of activities. Historians who study institutions have answers for why this is so. These theorists claim that institutional changes emerge from and are embedded in specific historical contexts (Cummings, 1999; Hall and Taylor, 1996; Thelen, 1999). Over time, institutions gradually create a unique set of shared understandings that affect the way they perceive problems and seek solutions. Historical institutionalists would not be surprised at the pace of change or with its continuity. The contrast in international activities that occurred by institution type might best be explained by the differences in purpose and mission between institutions offering the bachelor and masters degrees compared with those offering the doctoral degree.

Both sets of theories emphasize the importance of the long-term nature of shared understandings, identities and values in shaping policies and practices. They also help to explain the slow pace of change. The sociologists stress the difficulty in modifying entrenched values and the historians note how difficult it is to change institutional structures formed by earlier battles. Both sets of theories help to account for the preferred strategies for achieving an international perspective that were selected by administrators in this study. The top three strategies involve experiential activities that supplement but do not replace or challenge the current teacher education curriculum. The most extensively used strategy over the past thirty years has been faculty travel abroad. This activity, especially if conducted outside the school year, is easily achievable because it does not require participants to confront institutional values or priorities. Individual rather than an institutionally constructed motivation may be a better explanation for why teacher educators travel abroad and want to hire more faculty members with international

expertise in spite of what they perceive to be a lack of commitment on their own campuses. The next strategy, admitting foreign students, has already achieved social legitimacy in American higher education because the government has supported it for many years to showcase American democratic institutions. Finally, sending students to study abroad, the third most popular strategy, is already an option at most institutions and has long-standing public legitimacy. Education students who study abroad generally add this activity to their program while completing all other requirements. Confrontation with institutional values, once again, is kept to a minimum.

In contrast, educational administrators avoided selecting strategies that require a serious reconstruction of the curriculum. The teacher education curriculum embodies institutional values and is the result of hard fought political battles with state accrediting agencies and professional associations in addition to university faculty and administrators. Few respondents selected new international programs or international mission statements as their preferred means to achieve an international perspective. These two strategies require direct confrontation with institutional values, ideas and existing bureaucracies.

But change does occur over time, and both sets of theories include an active role for institutions and their members in bringing it about. Based on the theories just discussed, five approaches to institutional change appear possible, listed from the easiest to the hardest to accomplish. The first is to select and promote international activities that meet the standards created by professional accrediting agencies that have cultural and normative authority in the profession. A second is to locate and imitate international activities in successful colleges or universities that match your institution's mission and

purpose. The third is to seek advice, assistance, and consensus from teacher educators in other parts of the world in proposing new ways of initiating international activities, including the use of new technologies. These kinds of bilateral agreements can often be handled within existing administrative frameworks. The fourth is to engage other players on campus in reworking the teacher education curriculum. Overcoming the cultural differences among schools and departments is a daunting but not impossible task. Sometimes it takes an institution's president or dean to convince Arts and Sciences and Education faculty that they both bear responsibility for the education of future teachers.

The last strategy is to work toward new definitions of international education by becoming more explicit about desirable and internationally acceptable outcomes for future teachers around the world. The domestic agenda that drives teacher preparation programs makes this last strategy difficult. In addition, international organizations that can provide a forum for such cross-national discussions are themselves bureaucracies with vested interests. But increasing mobility of teacher educators coupled with powerful ways to access information make it possible to contemplate new contexts for transcending entrenched values and institutional structures. With time the term international education itself might become more internationally and cross-culturally compatible.

## REFERENCES

Altbach, P. & Lewis, L. (Eds.). (1996). *The international academic profession: Portraits of fourteen countries*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Council of Chief State School Officers, (n.d.) *International dimensions of education: Position paper & recommendations for action*. Washington, DC: Author.

Cummings, W. K. (1999). The Institutions of education: Compare, compare, compare! *Comparative Education Review* 43(4), 413-437.

DiMaggio, J.P. & Powell, W.W. (1991). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. In W.W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 63-83). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glenn, A. (1992). *International education activities: An AACTE survey*. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.

Ebuchi, K. (1988). The concept of internationalization: A view from the Japanese perspective. In K. Ebuchi (Ed.), *The flow of foreign students and internationalization of higher education*. (pp. 45-56). Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute for Higher Education

Frankel, C. (1965). *The neglected aspect of foreign affairs: American educational and cultural policy abroad*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.

Glenn, A. (1992). *International education activities: An AACTE survey*. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hall, P.A. & Taylor R.C.R. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44: 936-57.

Hayward, F. (2000). *Internationalization of U.S. higher education: Preliminary status report 2000*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education

Klassen, F. Imig, D., & Yff, J. (1972). *The international dimension of American teacher education: A survey of international education programs of American colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document ED 069 613).

Knight, J. (1997). Internationalisation of higher education: A conceptual framework. In Knight, J. and H. deWit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in Asia Pacific countries* (pp. 5-20). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Knight, J. & deWit, H. (Eds.). (1999). *Quality and internationalization in higher education*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Mestenhauser, J.A. & Ellingboe, B.J. (Eds.). (1988). *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus*. Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Merryfield, M. (1996). *Making connections between multicultural and global education: Teacher educators and teacher education programs*. Washington, DC: AACTE.

Meyer, J.W. Boli, J. Ramirez, F.O., & Thomas, G.M. (1997). World society and the nation state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 144-181.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Center for Educational Research and Innovation (1994). *Education in a new international setting: Curriculum development for internationalization*. Paris: Author.

Pickert, S (1996). Higher education in a new international setting: Perspectives from the USA. In K. Ebuchi (Ed.). *Curriculum development for internationalization from a comparative perspective* (pp.31-40). Fukuoka, Japan: Research Institute of Comparative Education and Culture.

Pike, L.W., T.S. Barrows, M.H. Mahoney, & Jugeblut (1979). *Other nations, other people: A survey of student interests, knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions*. Washington DC: U.S. Government printing office.

Thelen, K. (1999). Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2, 369-404.

Van der Wende, M. (1995). Internationalization of curriculum in higher education: Synthesis report. The Hague: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The author thanks Dr. Joost Yff for his assistance in coordinating the project at AACTE and distributing the questionnaires; Mr. Jun Choi for assistance in data analysis, and the following translators: Mr. Zhen Peng, Baylor University (Chinese), Dr. Jane Williams, Middle Tennessee State University (Japanese), Ms. Leslie Bowman, AACTE (Spanish), Dr. Hans Hooghoff, National Curriculum Development Institute, Netherlands (German, Dutch, French).

## **Appendix**

### **Questionnaire Items**



## Institutional Profile

1. In what kind of institution is your School, College, Department or Faculty of Education located?
  - a.  In a school or college for teachers only (education institute, normal school)
  - b.  In a college or university with several programs and a baccalaureate degree
  - c.  In a graduate institution offering advanced degrees (masters or doctoral level)
  - d.  Other. Please explain \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. What Education degrees do you offer? Please check all answers that apply.
  - a.  2-year diploma or certificate
  - b.  4-year (like BA, BS)
  - c.  Post baccalaureate (5 year program)
  - d.  Graduate Masters level (like M.A., M.S., M.Ed.)
  - e.  Graduate Doctoral level (like Ph.D., Ed.D.)
  - f.  Other. Please explain \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. What do the students who graduate from your Education programs become? Please check all answers that apply.
  - a.  Preschool teachers
  - b.  Primary or lower secondary school teachers
  - c.  Upper secondary school teachers
  - d.  Faculty members in higher education institutions
  - e.  Other- like physical education teacher, music teacher, vocational education teacher, counselor- Please list \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. How many full time equivalent (FTE) degree-seeking Education students are there in your institution? (Do not include non-degree students in your count.)
  - a.  Small (less than 100)
  - b.  Medium (100 to 500)
  - c.  Large (500 to 1000)
  - d.  Very Large (more than 1000)

## Faculty

5. Do any of your School, College, or Department of Education faculty members hold an advanced degree from another country (Masters Level degree, Doctoral Level degree)?
  - a.  NO
  - b.  YES, from 1%-30% hold degrees from institutions in another country
  - c.  YES, more than 30% hold degrees from institutions in another country
  - d.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

6. Are any of your regular (not adjunct) Education faculty members citizens of another country?
- NO
  - YES, from 1%-30% are citizens of another country
  - YES, more than 30% are citizens of another country
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
7. Have any of your Education faculty members traveled abroad for professional purposes in the past five years (1995-2000)? Please check all answers that apply.
- NO
  - YES, from 1%-30% attended academic conferences abroad
  - YES, more than 30% attended academic conferences abroad
  - YES, from 1%-30% taught at an institution abroad
  - YES, more than 30% taught at an institution abroad
  - YES, from 1%-30% conducted research abroad
  - YES, more than 30% conducted research abroad
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
8. Have any visiting scholars from abroad participated in the Education programs at your institution in the past five years (1995-2000)? Please check all answers that apply.
- NO
  - YES, to teach
  - YES, to consult
  - YES, to conduct research
  - YES, to administer or supervise a program
  - YES, to attend an international conference or seminar on Education
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
9. Have any of your regular (not adjunct) faculty members participated in research activities with an international dimension? Please check all answers that apply.
- NO
  - YES, from 1%-30% published an article or book in a language other than their 1<sup>st</sup> language.
  - YES, more than 30% published an article or book in a language other than their 1<sup>st</sup> language
  - YES, between 1% and 30% published an article or book in another country
  - YES, more than 30% published an article or book in another country.
  - YES, between 1% and 30% worked with a faculty member from another country on a research project
  - YES, more than 30% worked with a faculty member from another country on a research project.
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

10. Do any of your regular Education faculty members have a degree or conduct research in international, comparative, or international development education?
- NO
  - YES, from 1-30%
  - YES, more than 30%
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
11. Is international expertise among Education faculty members, like foreign language fluency, international experience, or possession of a degree from another country important for hiring, tenure and promotion?
- NO
  - YES, somewhat important
  - YES, very important
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

### International Students

12. Have international students (citizens of another country) enrolled in degree programs in your School, College, Department, or Faculty of Education in the last five years (1995-2000)? Do not include resident aliens or permanent residents as international students. Please check all answers that apply.
- NO (Skip to # 16 )
  - YES, between 1% and 30% of Education students are international
  - YES, more than 30% of Education students are international
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
13. Where are most international students in Education programs enrolled? Please include only students who are seeking an Education degree.
- In diploma or certificate programs (2 years or less)
  - In undergraduate programs (Bachelor level)
  - In graduate programs (Masters and Doctoral level)
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
14. Which countries do the international students enrolled in Education programs come from? Please write the top four countries here.
- \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_

15. What benefits does either your School College, or Department of Education or your institution offer international students? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  International students receive no special benefits
  - b.  International students are assigned an international student advisor
  - c.  International students are provided housing
  - d.  International students are eligible for academic scholarships
  - e.  International students are provided cultural experiences like home visits, travel around the country
  - f.  Examinations or papers are accepted in the student's native language
  - g.  Other, Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

### Curriculum

16. Does your Education School, College, Department, or Faculty offer internationally oriented topics, courses, or programs to students from your country? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  NO
  - b.  YES, international topics are included in several required courses
  - c.  YES, we offer a specific course on international or comparative education
  - d.  YES, we offer a degree program in comparative, international, or international development education.
  - e.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
17. Does your institution offer special courses or programs to people who are teaching or plan to teach in other countries?
- a.  NO
  - b.  YES, we prepare students to teach in private schools abroad
  - c.  YES, we prepare students to teach in our government-supported schools abroad (for example, Department of Defense or Ministry of Education)
  - d.  YES, we prepare international students to teach in public schools in our own country
  - e.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
18. Does your Education School, College, Department, or Faculty offer degree programs that include study/travel abroad for students from your country? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  NO (Skip to # 21)
  - b.  YES, study/travel abroad is an option for Education students
  - c.  YES, study/travel abroad is required for specific programs
  - d.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

19. If yes, which description(s) best match the programs for these students? Please check all answers that apply.
- Study tours
  - College courses for credit
  - Non-formal education
  - Service learning/community service
  - Practical training (including student teaching abroad)
  - Other
20. Which countries do most of your domestic students go to? Please list the top four countries here.
- \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_
21. What proportion of your Education students go abroad for student teaching?
- We do not send students abroad for teaching
  - Up to 30% of our student teachers go abroad
  - More than 30% of our student teachers go abroad
  - Other, please explain
22. Does your School, College, Department, or Faculty of Education offer Teaching English as a Foreign Language? Please check all answers that apply.
- NO
  - YES, we offer courses in this area
  - YES, we offer one or more degrees in this area
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
23. Does your School, College, Department or Faculty of Education require knowledge of a second language for any students who are preparing to be teachers? Please check all answers that apply.
- NO
  - YES, students must pass a second language proficiency test before entering the program
  - YES, students must pass a second language proficiency test before earning their teaching credentials
  - YES, students must take a second language as part of the degree requirements
  - Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

24. Does your School, College, Department or Faculty of Education receive funds to support international programs? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  We do not receive funds for these purposes
  - b.  Funding comes from revenue generated by the programs themselves
  - c.  Funding comes from the institution
  - d.  Funding comes from the government
  - e.  Funding comes from business firms
  - f.  Funding comes from private foundations
  - g.  Funding comes from foreign governments or international organizations
  - h.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

### **Agreements, Distance Education and Networking**

25. Has your institution implemented any inter-institutional agreements with a higher education institution in another country during the past five years (1995-2000)? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  NO
  - b.  YES, faculty travel, study, teach, or do research abroad under the agreement
  - c.  YES, students travel, study, or do research abroad under the agreement
  - d.  YES, for practical training (including student teaching abroad)
  - e.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
26. Has your institution or School, College, or Department of Education implemented mutual recognition agreements during the past five years (1995-2000)?
- a.  NO
  - b.  YES, a course equivalency/transfer agreement (credits from an institution in one country transfer to an institution in another country)
  - c.  YES, a bilateral twinning program agreement (students attend institutions in two countries but receive one degree)
  - d.  YES, a bilateral joint degree program agreement (students attend institutions in two countries and receive a degree from both institutions)
  - e.  YES, a multilateral degree program (a program administered by institutions in three or more countries)
  - f.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
27. Does your School, College, Department, or Faculty of Education offer distance education courses for credit including courses given over the internet? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  NO
  - b.  YES, to students inside the country
  - c.  YES, to students outside the country
  - d.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

28. Does your School, College, or Department, or Faculty of Education accept credits for Education courses taken abroad or via distance education? Please check all answers that apply.
- a.  NO
  - b.  YES, for courses taken abroad
  - c.  YES, for distance education courses from abroad
  - d.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
29. Does your institution or Education unit maintain an international alumni program for international students who attended your institution or other students who have moved overseas?
- a.  NO, we have no alumni program for any of our graduates
  - b.  NO, we have no international alumni program
  - c.  YES
  - d.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues and Priorities

30. Please check the three most important reasons for having an international dimension in your School, College, Department, or Faculty of Education:
- a.  It prepares graduates who are internationally knowledgeable and interculturally competent.
  - b.  It improves the teaching profession world-wide
  - c.  It encourages regional and/or national identity
  - d.  It generates revenue for the institution and/or program
  - e.  It maintains economic competitiveness for the nation
  - f.  It contributes to national security and peace
  - g.  It provides access to international knowledge
  - h.  It reflects domestic ethnic or cultural diversity
  - i.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_
31. Please check the three most important means to achieve an international perspective in your School, College, Department, or Faculty of Education.
- a.  Admit international students
  - b.  Hire faculty with international expertise
  - c.  Provide opportunities for students to study or work abroad
  - d.  Providing opportunities for faculty/staff to study or work abroad
  - e.  Gain access to international knowledge via electronic and other networks
  - f.  Include international content in required courses
  - g.  Offer specific international courses or programs
  - h.  Obtain institutional support for international education
  - i.  Have an international mission statement
  - j.  Other, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

32. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about international teacher education at your institution or in your country? We are especially interested in programs on other parts of your campus that benefit Education students and faculty. We will carefully review any comments you make. Please write them here.

---

---

33. Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you would like to find a partner institution to work with on international education initiatives, please describe the kind of institution or type of collaboration you are looking for here

---

34. If you like a copy of the results of this survey, please check below.  
a. \_\_\_ Yes, please send me the results of this survey

35. Your name \_\_\_\_\_  
36. Title \_\_\_\_\_  
37. Institution Name \_\_\_\_\_  
38. Institution Address \_\_\_\_\_  
39. Telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
40. FAX: \_\_\_\_\_  
41. E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_  
42. Institution Web site \_\_\_\_\_

---





**U.S. Department of Education**  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Changing Views About International Education in American Teacher Education Programs	
Author(s): Sarah Pickert	
Corporate Source: Catholic University of America	Publication Date: unpublished

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah Pickert

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**1**

Level 1

•

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**2A**

Level 2A

•

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**2B**

Level 2B

•

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, please**

Signature: <i>Sarah Pickert</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: Sarah Pickert, Professor Educ	
Organization/Address: Catholic University of America	Telephone: 202-319-5800	FAX: 202-319-5815

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:
---

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**  
4483-A Forbes Boulevard  
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200  
Toll Free: 800-799-3742  
FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>