

*For presentation at
Wisconsin International Outreach Conference
April 28, 2006*

Preparing Internationally-Oriented Teachers: Some Research Findings

My plan today is to give you a preliminary report on some of the findings from my current research on the problems and prospects for internationalizing the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers here in the U.S. Since some of my data come from current teachers – some of the people to whom you provide services – I will focus on those findings in this presentation, and will also share some thoughts about the implications of these findings for your outreach work – under Title VI or any other auspices.

Let me back up a bit. What got me involved in this project? After many years as a program officer at the U.S. Department of Education, urging Title VI-funded grantees to forge effective curricular linkages with professional schools, and particularly Schools of Education, I became part of a research team evaluating the long-term impact of one of those programs.¹ Although that project included one or two questions about teacher training, the responses to those general “teacher education” questions seemed to focus on faculty development or on outreach to the current K-12 teacher rather than on the preparation of future teachers. So when the press was giving increasing attention to the deficiencies of K-12 education in the late 1990s, research seemed needed to learn more about the obstacles to an internationalized (and thus improved) curriculum for prospective teachers – and ways to overcome them. My first grant, completed in 2003,² focused mainly on the undergraduate, pre-service training of the secondary school teacher. The current grant builds on the first, with emphasis now on undergraduate preparation for elementary level teaching. All three grants have been funded – competitively – under the Department of Education’s Title VI International Research and Studies Program.

Methodology

The methodology has been similar for both teacher education projects. The data were collected in nearly 400 structured but open-ended interviews (conducted by myself) with deans, faculty, and advisors in both Arts and Sciences and Education, with Education students, and with senior administrators. Although many of the questions were similar for all groups, somewhat different protocols were used for Arts and Sciences, for Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs), and for senior administrators. Most questions were the same in both phases, but the original interview protocols were revised somewhat for the second phase; the main difference was that, drawing on the data from the first phase, a number of second phase questions included menus of possible responses. Another difference in the second phase is that, when the interview time was too limited, in nearly all instances I completed the conversation later by telephone. Both of these adjustments probably elicited more systematic and complete data on several topics for the second phase interviews.

In addition, using still another set of questions (also somewhat revised in the second phase), views were collected by interview (by volunteers, several of whom are NRC outreach experts), or by

¹ Ann Imlah Schneider, and Barbara B. Burn, *Federal Funding for International Studies: Does it Help? Does it Matter? Long-Term Impacts of Federal Funding on International Studies and Foreign Language Programs: A Research Report*, University of Massachusetts (Amherst), 1999.

² Ann Imlah Schneider, *Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?*, April 2003 (available from the author) and summarized in *International Studies Perspectives*, April 2004, vol. 5, #3.

questionnaire, from well over 100 current teachers, the majority of whom are working at the elementary level. These are the sources of most of the information discussed in this paper.

The total number of teacher and university respondents is over 500. All the second phase protocols will be included in a final report.

The university interviews were conducted on 41 campuses (actually 42, with one dropped in the second phase) at both research (20) and comprehensive (17) universities and at liberal arts colleges (4), located in 19 states plus DC, on the west and east coasts, in the midwest, and in the southeast and southwest. For the 23 institutions included in both phases, additional second-phase interviews were conducted either by telephone or in second site visits. The average number of interviews per campus was more than six. However, because the numbers of respondents in several sub-categories (such as Education advisors) are relatively small, the study must be considered an exploratory one, pointing to topics that need to be studied further, and more systematically. Nonetheless, the result is a daunting amount of data, only a small part of which I can summarize for you today.

Another important part of the project's methodology has been a small group of advisors who have met at several points in the process and have contributed as well through electronic discussions. They were drawn from the ranks of Education faculty, the K-12 teaching community, NRC directors and outreach coordinators, and senior university administrators. They have helped enormously in refining the interview protocols and procedures and in reviewing the findings, recommendations, and dissemination strategies.

Defining Internationalization

Findings from a few earlier studies seemed to indicate that internationalization efforts in teacher training programs concentrated on only two types of activity – sending a few students abroad for a semester, or less, and sending faculty abroad, although with no special assignment or mandate. Because other research has shown that fewer than 5% of all undergraduates are able to study abroad,³ and because no research has demonstrated that faculty travel automatically affects course content,⁴ our internationalization definition was broadened to include a wide range of on-campus activity as well as various overseas experiences. To set the stage accordingly in the campus interviews, the first question asked about a series of activities that might be taking place at the institution. Most were direct questions, but respondents were invited to report other activities as well.

I don't want to burden you with the details on responses to that question, since they will of course be included in whatever final report I do and in the meantime are available on my website, as part of a paper prepared for an International Studies Association meeting last November.⁵ The activities listed include a broad range of campus activity, but what is interesting for today's discussion is that barely 7% of the people interviewed cited "outreach" as a relevant activity – and most of those who did are in Offices of International Programs, not Schools of Education and not Colleges of Arts and Sciences. I might note also that 14 of the institutions visited have Title VI NRC funding – so, even at those institutions, very few interviewees mentioned outreach. Some of the low response rate can be explained by the fact that outreach was not on the menu of possible activities and was rather one of the activities that interviewees

³ Madeleine F. Green, "Joining the World" in *Change*, May/June 2002

⁴ Findings in this study indicate that faculty members seldom travel for course development reasons, although many interviewees noted that an indirect impact of overseas travel would likely be some course revision.

⁵ Ann Imlah Schneider, "Educating Prospective K-12 Educators – and Others – Internationally" (November 2005) available at www.miami.edu/main/isas05 and www.internationaledadvice.org.

volunteered. Nonetheless there are lessons that might be learned from the low figure – about the status of outreach activity on many campuses, about the strength (or lack thereof) of connections between outreach and internationalization efforts, and simply about the visibility of internationally-oriented outreach activity. Indeed, it was interesting to read in the April 14 *Chronicle of Higher Education* that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is now planning to include community engagement as an elective classification category for its data collection about higher education.

About the Current Teachers

The current teachers come from a variety of settings. Most have attended internationally-oriented workshops in California, Connecticut, North Carolina, and Ohio; another thirteen states are also represented. Most of the teachers participating in the first phase of the project are secondary school teachers, but a few were working at the elementary school level. The total number in the first phase was 65, and the total in the second, more recent phase is 54. Of the 119 in both phases, 64 are, or have recently been, elementary school teachers. Their average number of years of teaching experience is about 13, ranging from none (one or two just graduated, and had completed practice teaching only) to 37. Half of the teachers in the second phase have completed their undergraduate work since 1989, while half of those in the first phase got their bachelor's degrees after 1980.

The undergraduate training reported by the teachers is varied. Of the phase one teachers, most of whom were secondary school teachers, only 14 had majored in a field of education and 53 (including a few double majors) – more than 80% – had done Arts and Sciences majors. Well more than half reported electives in the social sciences, and nearly half had done electives in the humanities and/or a foreign language.

For the second phase, focusing on elementary school teachers, however, the picture is rather different. Only about 36% did majors in Arts and Science, and the remainder majored in education, mostly elementary or early childhood. They also reported on their electives, and (in contrast to phase one) less than half did social science electives, less than half reported humanities electives, and only about 25% reported elective foreign language study. The elementary school teachers were also asked about undergraduate minors and about half reported doing them, but 10% chose a second Education field, while the remaining 40% (of the 64 total) were in Arts and Sciences subjects, combined with an Education major. This could indicate that for the prospective elementary school teacher a pretty high proportion of whatever content, or “subject,” courses they had were taken to meet general education requirements. I'll come back to questions about general education in a bit.

We also asked about graduate work. Nearly all of the first phase (mostly secondary school) teachers reported doing graduate work, but most switched choices of field. More than half were in Education, while less than half of them continued study in Arts and Sciences or other professional fields such as public administration, with a few reporting both Arts and Sciences and education fields. Again the situation changes for the second phase teachers, when nearly 20% report no graduate work (compared with some 5% in the first phase), and less than 15% report doing further study in the Arts and Sciences – the remainder (nearly 65%) continuing work in various fields of Education.

All the teachers were asked whether they felt they had enough pre-service training in the subjects they are now teaching. Only about half responded positively to this question, in both phases. Looking more closely at the data, it seems that of those in the first phase who felt they were well enough prepared in their subjects, 90% had been Arts and Science majors and/or minors and/or had done graduate work in the

Arts and Sciences. In the second phase, the comparable figure is 70% -- still well over half of those who felt sufficiently prepared by their course work. Of those who felt they did not have sufficient pre-service preparation for their teaching, the numbers of Arts and Science majors, minors, and/or graduate work are somewhat lower (roughly 80% and 60% respectively for phases one and two). Perhaps other research shows more definitive data on the relationship of undergraduate work in the “content” fields with teachers’ – and others’ – impressions about the effectiveness of their preparation. I certainly learned that an increasing number of states are now requiring an Arts and Sciences major for all prospective teachers. For purposes of outreach planning, the key data here is probably that only half felt well enough prepared as teachers-in-training in the subjects they were to teach.

Another question will also interest this audience: Why were the teachers attending the workshop? Most responded that they wanted to learn more about other parts of the world. Many, however, did not answer the question, and a few simply noted that it was an “in-service day” or that they needed it for licensure reasons. Still others related the workshop topics to their work with a diverse student body.

International Exposure in the Undergraduate Experience of Current Teachers

The phase one participants were asked generally what special activities they undertook as undergraduates to get international exposure. Many, perhaps nearly half, did go abroad for study or other reasons, but they also listed a great variety of other activity, ranging from courses taken, special lectures attended, and living in a foreign language house to volunteer work with Amnesty International to international cuisine, friends, and “none!” One, in the New England area, cited (only) a trip to Montreal! Phase two participants were also asked whether they have ever lived or studied outside the United States at any time, and less than half have done so.

All the teachers were asked questions about specific aspects of their undergraduate experience, and, on each point, were also asked whether they recommend it for future pre-service teachers.

1. **Study abroad** was the first activity on this list. Only about a third of the respondents had been able to do it – and more than 80% of those who responded to this question felt that their undergraduate experience should have included study abroad.
2. **Practice teaching abroad** was done by even fewer – less than 10 percent. Interestingly, less than half of the total cohort felt that practice teaching overseas should be part of teacher training; the percentages in Table 1 are higher because many did not answer this question.

Table 1
Current Teachers: Responses about Study and Internships Abroad

	<u>Study Abroad</u>		<u>Internships Abroad</u>	
	<u>All</u> N=119	<u>Elem.</u> N=64	<u>All</u> N=119	<u>Elem.</u> N=64
UG program included	32%	34%	8%	11%
UG program should include	82%	74%	59%	55%
Foreign language (as applicable) should be required for	91%	95%	97%	96%

NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages refer to the number of respondents for each question.

3. About half of the teachers reported meeting a **general education requirement of one or more non-US. courses**, and only two of the current teachers recorded any disagreement with the idea of having such a requirement – put differently, some 97% of the respondents considered this a good idea.
4. Fewer – less than a third – remembered any inclusion of **“international” or comparative modules in their courses**, and again all but a very small number (i.e., about 96% of the responses) found it to be a good idea. A few specified that they wished they had had a comparative education course.
5. Only about a sixth of the participants had been required to complete a **minor that included non-North American-oriented courses**, yet some 75% found this to be a good idea.
6. Similarly, less than a quarter were required to complete a **major that included non-North American-oriented courses**, while about two thirds liked the idea.
7. Were the students, as undergraduates, able to **attend in-service teacher workshops on international topics**? Only about 10% had had this opportunity, and nearly 90% felt that it should be an option for the teacher-in-training.

An important ingredient of the “internationalization” mix is **foreign language study**. Here again, the reality and the ideal are not the same, for any of the cohorts. First, in the university interviews, only about 36% reported a university-wide language requirement. An additional 32% reported a requirement for some programs, which usually meant only students doing Arts and Sciences majors – and exceptions are often made for A&S majors who are concurrently enrolled in teacher training programs. Less than half of all the current teachers had had any kind of language requirement as undergraduates.

When university interviewees were asked whether they would like to have a foreign language requirement either added or increased, an amazing 88% replied positively – including more than half of the Education respondents and about 80% of the senior administrators. And by a ratio of nine to one the current teachers also felt that teachers in training should meet some kind of foreign language requirement as undergraduates. In connection with preparation for study or internships abroad, a large majority of current teachers think that foreign language competence would maximize participants’ benefit from the experience – and here it is interesting that the elementary school teachers’ responses were even more often positive than the combined cohort. Furthermore, another interesting finding is that while all respondents, in both the university and current teacher categories, were asked how they would target (hypothetical) additional funds for internationalizing the training of teachers, strengthening foreign language instruction was mentioned only by the current teachers and Education advisors and students!

Another foreign language issue that may be of interest to this audience emerged from the university interviews. Having heard that language enrollments are increasing in American elementary schools, I asked Education respondents in the second phase whether foreign language teachers are being prepared for elementary education. The majority answered “no.” Most foreign language teachers must do a K-12 certification, with possibly an elementary certification, or licensure, added to it. This may be a gap for you to ponder as you plan in-service training programs for teachers.

Foreign language issues are discussed in more detail in a paper presented last summer at the Inter-Agency Roundtable Showcase⁶ and will be covered again, of course, in my final report. Meanwhile it may be useful for you to know particularly about teachers' responses on this important topic.

In my thinking **advising** has long been an issue that should be included in any discussion of internationalization in the undergraduate curriculum, so it is a topic included in all the interviews, including current teachers.

Who does undergraduate academic advising? As often as not, I learned, it is not done the same way throughout the institution. The patterns vary not only from institution to institution but also from college to college, and even department to department, within institutions. Most academic advising is done by faculty, although increasingly, even for departmental majors, it is done by professional advising staff, with faculty serving a “mentoring” role. The advisors – faculty or professional staff – are most likely based in Arts and Sciences, at the college level for “undeclareds” and in departments for majors.

Table 2
Interview Responses about Advising Sources
by types of institutions, with comparisons to SCDEs and current teachers' experience

<u>Source</u>	<u>Comprehensive Universities</u> <i>N=161</i>	<u>Liberal Arts Colleges</u> <i>N=34</i>	<u>Research Universities</u> <i>N=191</i>	<u>Current Teachers</u> <i>N=119</i>	<u>Elementary Teachers</u> <i>N=64</i>	<u>SCDEs</u> <i>N=162</i>
Faculty	91%	100%	78%	79%	81%	77%
Professional advising staff	79%	32%	76%	51%	56%	78%
Website	71%	79%	67%	11%	16%	68%
Special offices, such as OIP	66%	91%	64%	31%	41%	65%
Peers/TAs	28%	38%	38%	31%	34%	25%

The practices described are generally similar to those reported by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA).⁷ However, for Education students, many of whom may be first generation college students and who are likely to have transferred from other institutions, usually community colleges (70% was the proportion of transfers cited in one interview), the advising pattern becomes increasingly confusing and is all the more important. In the university interviews, Education participants were asked whether advisors are sufficiently trained with respect to the international options for students, and more than 70% of the respondents, at all types of institutions and including advisors, replied that they are not. So it is perhaps not surprising that some current teachers reported that their best advice came from peers, and not through the formal system at all.

In the university interviews, more than 70% of the interviewees felt that international components of the advising system could be improved. Similarly, some 80% of the responding teachers said that their international preparation might have been helped by a better advising system. The teachers were also asked if they had had special advising about international components for their training. Less than 10% answered “yes.” Should such advising be available to them? Yes, said 95%; a somewhat lower response from the

6. Ann Imlah Schneider, “Language Instruction and Prospective Teachers: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations,” presented at the ILR Showcase, July 29, 2005, and available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

⁷ Wesley R. Habley, and Ricardo H. Morales, *Current Practices in Academic Advising: Final Report on ACT's Fifth National Survey of Academic Advising* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1998), 13. NACADA, 1998)

elementary school teachers is probably not very significant, since the large majority agreed. This too is a topic that I'll be writing about in more detail in other reports in the coming months.

Certification issues

Realizing more than ever the controlling roles of state certification requirements and newly developed subject standards, we asked questions about both in the conversations with teachers, particularly in the second phase. Also in the second phase, we added some questions on this to the protocol for use in university Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education. The university Education interviewees were asked first whether their elementary education program included international courses – and only 31% said they did. Although the response was about the same for the SCDEs' foreign language requirements, only 6% of the Education interviewees told me that certification requirements include some foreign language competence. Asked whether the state's certification requirements for elementary education specify international knowledge, the respondents were a little more encouraging, with 26% saying they did. This is perhaps some improvement from the phase one teachers' responses, when only 20% reported an international component in certification requirements.

The teachers' responses to questions about certification and subject standards are summarized in Table 3. It is not really possible to explore changes from the first cohort to the second because only two questions on these topics were asked in both phases. In both inquiries, nearly 90% of the current teachers reported that certification requirements have changed in recent years and a large majority do not think that

Table 3
Certification and Standards Information from Current Teachers

	<u>Phase 1 Teachers</u>		<u>Phase 2 Teachers</u>	
	<i>N=65</i>		<i>N=54</i>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Certification requirements include an international component	20%	80%		
Certification changes since you began teaching?	82%	18%		
Certification requirements changed in recent years?	89%	11%	85%	6%
Do the certification changes reflect globalization?	29%	71%	18%	82%
Subject standards modified to reflect increasing globalization?			30%	64%
Have subject standards required additional training?			45%	55%
Are adequate resources available on international topics?			54%	46%
Do you use internationally oriented web-based materials?			48%	52%

the changes reflect globalization issues – indeed, the percentage saying that certification changes reflect globalization is a fair bit lower in the more recent interviews. And about two thirds of the responding teachers reported that the recently modified standards which they are required to meet (and also the standards for the tests that their students must pass) do not reflect increasing globalization. Furthermore, of

those who said the changes do reflect globalization, few could specify what the changes have been, and a few mentioned “multicultural.” At least one said the change was actually a deletion of a world history requirement. Might this have an impact on the demand for the workshops that so many of you at this conference organize?

Here I’d like to interject an anecdote. While trying to set up an interview with a key person in teacher education at a research institution, I received a message that I took to be a stalling tactic: “...please send me information on why international content is important in undergraduate education....” I responded with the briefest of bibliographies, the interview was arranged, and then I learned that the interviewee was trying to make the case to NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education), as they prepared for an accreditation review, for inclusion of international activity and requirements in their programs. Are you and your colleagues in touch with any of the policy-setting organizations that could change the criteria for certification and accreditation? This may well be a determining factor in furthering internationalization in both SCDEs and the schools.

Now we come to the questions that are likely to be of most interest to you, at this conference on outreach. First, have subject standards required additional training? It may be a little surprising, given the previous responses, that more than half of the teachers did not feel that they needed more training to help their students meet the new standards. Perhaps they were thinking of internationally-oriented training, which the standards do not require. Several mentioned technology, reading, and math and science as the subjects in which more training is now needed – not international. And since so many found that the standards do not reflect globalization, perhaps it is also not surprising that more than half found that they have adequate resources on international topics. Nonetheless, and without requirements to include international elements in their teaching, nearly half reported using internationally oriented web-based materials – although a few teachers commented that extra effort (and time) are needed to find such materials. One teacher wrote simply “I don’t teach international topics.”

Another question asked only in the second phase – and unfortunately answered by relatively few teachers – was whether international experience as part of their training had helped in getting their jobs. Only about half thought it did. On the other hand, more than 70% of those responding did feel that their international experience helps as they carry out their teaching responsibilities.

Communications and Governance

The remaining questions in the survey of current teachers really focus on the undergraduate experience of the teacher-in-training, but both were open-ended and did yield some ideas that could be useful for you. Most suggested ways to strengthen the pre-service curriculum and overseas options. Several teachers suggested that the “internationalizing” of their outlooks, as undergraduates, might have been strengthened by having more internationally-oriented festivals, and/or by more visiting international faculty and lecturers. Visiting lecturers were also suggested in response to a question about how to target some hypothetical outside funding. Here, for this last question, outreach was at last mentioned by the current teachers, but not by many.

On most campuses, a key player in the internationalization process is the Office of International Programs. The functions of such offices are likely to include a variety of services as well, including several that may be related to outreach, such organizing the events such as lectures and film festivals mentioned by the current teachers. The OIPs may also provide assistance for outside grant applications, and even passport application acceptance, oversight of international alumni relations, and Eurail pass issuer. OIP

directors were almost always among the interviewees for this project on each campus; the discrepancies between their reports of what they do and the other information garnered on the same campus were the subject of another paper.⁸ That there are discrepancies related to outreach seems likely given the data mentioned earlier, when I noted how many OIPs cited outreach as an international activity compared with the very limited number in other parts of the university. The information flow about internationally-related activity and potential sources of help – and even funding – for many aspects of the internationally oriented outreach activity could probably be improved. You may want to think about this on your own campuses.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The foregoing report mentions several suggestions about activities for you to ponder. In addition, we have developed a fairly extensive set of formal recommendations from the study – for state and local governments, for accrediting agencies, for professional associations, for outside funders, for Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, and for institutions of higher education generally. All will be included in the final report, which I hope to have ready by next fall. For purposes of this presentation, I include a partial list of the recommendations related (now or prospectively) to outreach, as they are probably most relevant to participants in this conference. In editing the list, I have assumed that many of you are working with state and local entities and accrediting agencies as well as colleagues within your institution and in related professional associations. Here is the pared down list of recommendations for you:

For state and local governments:

- include international and global perspectives in requirements for endorsements and certification, to recognize interrelationships of disciplines and cultures;
- remove exemption for significant foreign language competence in teacher training in all humanities and social science fields, at all education levels;
- add an endorsement for K-6 foreign language instruction; and
- facilitate integration of international content in continuing professional development for current teachers, through workshops and special courses.

For accrediting agencies:

- include requirements for international exposure, through coursework, foreign language study, faculty qualifications, and study and internships abroad, in accreditation criteria for all teacher education programs; and
- recommend distinctly different programs for training foreign language teachers at the elementary and secondary levels.

For institutions of higher education generally:

- implement a wide range of strategies for increasing international exposure for pre-service teachers, among them –
 - add formal international components to student advisory services, beginning in the pre-application phase, to assure the feasibility of maximum international exposure within normal time-to-degree constraints;

⁸ Ann Imlah Schneider, “Research on Internationalizing Teacher Education: The Role of OIPs, and Underrepresented Groups” presented February 25, 2006, at meetings of the Association of International Education Administrators and available at www.internationaledadvice.org

- provide training, and website support, on international options for students, faculty, and professional advisors; and
- strengthen the role of campus-wide offices for international services and programs, and effectively provide information about them.

For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:

- include international orientation in the criteria for selecting cooperating teachers for students' observation and practice teaching placements.

For professional associations:

- give increased attention to needs and strategies for improving international components in testing standards and in the preparation of teachers, in publications and at meetings; and
- increase attention to solutions for the demand and supply problems of foreign language teachers, at all levels of instruction (K-12 and postsecondary).

For outside funders:

- disseminate more widely, and particularly to the teacher education community, information about funding available to strengthen and initiate international studies and foreign language programs and
- develop more effective networks for disseminating information about options and resources for prospective and current teachers.

Thank you for your attention to this important topic.

Ann Imlah Schneider, Ph.D.
International Education Consultant
Washington, DC
www.internationaladvice.org