

A Case Study: Teachers Education Program in a Global Context

In Hoi Lee, Seong Baeg Kim, Je Eung Jeon, Gwang Yong Choi, Joo Sub Lee, Ik Sang Kim

Abstract—Recently, the interest of globalization in the field of teacher education has increased. In the U.S., the government is trying to enhance the quality of education through a global approach in education. To do so, the schools in the U.S. are recruiting teachers with global capability from countries like Korea where competent teachers are being trained. Meanwhile, in the case of Korea, although excellent teachers have been cultivated every year, due to a low birth rate it is not easy to become a domestic teacher. To solve the trouble that the two countries are facing, the study first examines the demand and necessity of globalization in the field of teacher education between Korea and the U.S. Second, we propose a new project, called the ‘Global Teachers University (GTU)’ program to satisfy the demands of both countries. Finally, we provide its implications to build the future educational cooperation for teacher training in a global context.

Keywords—Educational cooperation, globalization, teachers education program, teacher training institutions.

I. INTRODUCTION

GLOBALIZATION defines the 21st century. It has created a great deal of debate not only in the field of economics, but also in political and cultural studies. However, many implications and applications of the phenomenon still remain in the further discussion. Education is at the center of it [1], [2]. Therefore, education’s challenge will be to shape the cognitive skills, interpersonal sensibilities, and cultural sophistication of children and youth growing up today whose lives will be both engaged in local contexts and responsive to larger transnational processes.

While the influence of globalization has increased the necessity and demand of social changes nationally and internationally, it has challenged educational dimension and teacher education in particular. According to Thomas (2005), teachers will need to be trained in the years ahead in different cognate areas in order to meet the challenges of globalization.

I. H. Lee is with the Department of Education, Graduate School of Education, Jeju National University, Jeju-city, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province, 690-756 Korea (corresponding author; phone: +82-64-754-2163; fax: +82-64-724-5501; e-mail: tomlee@jejunu.ac.kr).

S. B. Kim was with Seoul National University, Seoul, 151-742 Korea. He is now with the Department of Computer Education, Jeju National University, Jeju-city, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province, 690-756 Korea (e-mail: sbkim@jejunu.ac.kr).

J. E. Jeon and J. S. Lee are with the Department of Elementary Korean Education, Jeju National University, Jeju-city, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province, 690-756 Korea (e-mail: jje@jejunu.ac.kr, ljs@jejunu.ac.kr).

K. Y. Choi is with the Department of Social Studies Education, Jeju National University, Jeju-city, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province, 690-756 Korea (e-mail: tribute@jejunu.ac.kr).

I. S. Kim is with the Department of Elementary English Education, Jeju National University, Jeju-city, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province, 690-756 Korea (e-mail: kimiks@jejunu.ac.kr).

Teachers also should be trained in changing patterns of training and education, and emphasis on the acquisition, use and application of knowledge as well as the generation of new ideas [3].

Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) emphasized that teacher education institutions have played a major role of educating pre-service teachers about their teaching abilities and administrative skills for the various educational settings [4]. For Korea, the increase of foreign labor, multicultural families, and students with international experience have urged teachers to be prepared with global competence. In light of globalization, the creation of educational needs inevitably brings teacher education into international cooperation. It is quite suggestive and critical that teacher training intuitions should discuss the cooperation and develop internationalized programs of teacher training in order to cope with the demand and necessity of qualified teacher supply. Thus, new and broader global visions of teacher education are needed to prepare children and youth to be informed, engaged, and critical citizens in the future global society.

The study aims to examine the demand and necessity of globalization in the field of teacher education between Korea and the U.S. To do so, this paper compares the teacher training institutions of the two countries, introduces a new ‘Global Teachers University (GTU)’ program, and provides its implications to build future educational cooperation for teacher training in a global context.

II. COMPARISONS OF THE TEACHER TRAINING SYSTEM BETWEEN KOREA AND THE U.S.

A. Teacher Training Institution

The Korean modern educational system was imported from the U.S. after the liberation from Japan in 1945. A secondary teacher training system also started in 1945, although there had been elementary teacher training institutions during the Japanese occupation.

Now, 12 teachers colleges serve to train 5,825 new students for elementary school teachers, 40 colleges of education equip 10,778 new secondary school teachers every year in Korea. Other teacher training institutions are shown on Table I.

As illustrated in Table I, the Korean teacher training system is relatively objective-type, while that of the U.S. is open-type. In Korea, this means that those who intend to become a teacher enroll in this system from the beginning of the teacher training. They become teachers through the teacher's certificate examination for, which is under total authority of the Government.

In the U.S., each state has different teacher training and accreditation systems. Also, there are alternative routes to teacher certification such as the MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching Program offered in 12 southern states). These types of teacher training systems have roots in the shortage of well-qualified teachers [5].

TABLE I
COMPARISONS OF TEACHER TRAINING SYSTEM

	U.S.	Korea
Teacher Training Institution	-Teachers college -Dept. of Education -College of Education -Graduate School of Education -Alternative routes to teacher certification	-Teachers college (4 Years) -Teacher Education of -Non-Teachers College (2 Years) -Dept. of Education (4 Years) -College of Education (4 Years) -Graduate School of Education (2.5 Years)
Accreditation of Teacher Training	-National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) -State Council for Teacher Education (SCTE)	-the Government (Ministry of Education)
Type of Teacher Training System	-Open-type teacher training	-Objective-type teacher training -Open-type teacher training

B. Teacher Shortage

During the 1980s and 1990s, it had been said that the U.S. would need as many as two million new teachers. Some researchers disagree with it by insisting that if the U.S. considered only the number of qualified candidates and the number of job openings, there would be an overall surplus of trained teachers [6], [7].

On the contrary, climbing student enrollment, new laws requiring smaller class size, and impending retirements indicate that the U.S. will need to attract more teachers over the next decade. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2013), there are teacher shortage areas such as mathematics and physics in public schools [8]. In fact, teacher shortage is one of the essential educational issues in the U.S. On the other hand, there is surplus of potential teachers in Korea. Korean teacher training institutions discharge about 70,000 trainees every year. However, the ratio of successful candidates for a teacher is very low as shown on Table II.

Becoming a teacher and retaining their teaching profession is not an easy task in Korea as well as in the U.S. Therefore, the imbalance of supply and demand of teachers is becoming an issue in the two countries.

TABLE II
STATUS OF THE EXAMINATION FOR A SECONDARY TEACHER'S CERTIFICATE IN KOREA

Year	Applicants	Successful Candidates	Ratio (%)
2008	66,993	4,964	7.4
2009	74,444	5,215	7.0
2010	70,956	3,151	4.4

C. Teacher Salary

An international comparison of U.S teacher salary level and Korean teacher salary level is shown on Table III.

TABLE III
COMPARISONS OF TEACHER SALARY

Year	U.S.	Elementary School Teacher	Secondary School Teacher	All Teachers	Living Cost Index
2001	\$43,187	\$32,049	\$33,745	\$33,030	726.97
2002	\$44,367	\$37,111	\$38,675	\$38,078	733.84
2003	\$45,578	\$36,233	\$38,888	\$37,872	780.47
2004	\$46,565	\$39,402	\$40,961	\$40,327	784.15
2005	\$47,602	\$43,534	\$45,848	\$44,942	769.01

Table III indicates that the average salary of the U.S. teachers is higher than that of Korean teachers (shown in the column of all teachers), and the difference in the salary reduces year by year. However, according to Lee (2008), Korean teachers receive relatively higher salary than the U.S. teachers. The relative low level of U.S. teacher salaries has caused a high turnover rate in the U.S., while the moderate level of Korean teacher salaries and job security increase the attractiveness of teaching [9].

III. GLOBAL TEACHERS UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

A. Overall Structure

The Global Teachers University (GTU) program proposed in the study has been derived through periodic meetings and workshops of a task force team that consists of several experts at Jeju National University (JNU) and related overseas universities since 2011.




Fig. 1 The overview of GTU program

The overall structure of the GTU program is composed of 4 phases, as shown in Fig. 1. In the 'input' phase, we have been building a cooperative system between the related institutes, drawing organizational cooperation including financial support and the selection of outstanding students. We have developed three processes for the 'process phase': 3+2 at undergraduate level, 1.5+1.5 at graduate level, and a global training program for in-service teachers. As a result of the 'process' phase, the 'output' phase shows that students, who complete each process, can acquire dual diplomas including teacher certificates or a certificate of training completion. Eventually, the 'result' phase signifies that our students who have global capability can go into the universities of the U.S., international schools, and domestic schools, and can contribute to boosting global education.

There are similar programs currently built by other universities in Korea comparable with the JNU approach. However, the GTU program has several distinguished features. First, the GTU program is different from other programs in that the program has little impact on the existing curricula and student's selection. In conventional approaches, developing a special curriculum and a separated student selection are required. However, we apply the GTU program to only less than 10% of students among total students per subject, which does not focus on nurturing specific subject-oriented global teachers like mathematics or science teachers. Through the differentiated approach, we can minimize the opposition of professors and students in JNU.

Second, the GTU program has an expandability that enables us to build multiple partnerships in various ways. For example, we can easily add an overseas university to cooperate for a dual-degree major without changing the basic framework.

Third, there is connectivity. The GTU program can make synergy by connecting primary education to secondary education. Also, senior students at the undergraduate level can gracefully enter into the dual-degree master program because they can prepare for it by taking the related courses in advance.

Fourth, the GTU program provides a unique 3+2 dual-degree track considering on-/off-line courses and customized ELI programs. We developed the track roadmap from freshman to fifth year adding on-/off-line courses and ELI programs during both summer and winter vacations.

Fifth, there is high flexibility in dual-degree process. For example, we can provide a variety of 3+2 forms like the 2.5+2 or the 3+2 in summation to students who want to take the dual-degree track. This means that the students can choose a proper dual-degree form based on their situations.

Finally, the management of students is systematic. We developed a mileage system to draw participation into the GTU program, mentoring programs between students, a supervisor system for long-term whole charge coaching, etc.

B. GTU Tasks

The following is a brief introduction to the major tasks that are needed to achieve the objective of the GTU program.

-Educational program development: Developing customized education programs (elementary and secondary) with the overseas joint universities.

-Volunteering and practicum in Jeju Global Education City: Volunteering in Jeju Global Education City helps GTU volunteers to enhance their global minds and education skills. Currently there are three international schools (KIS, NLCS, BHA), where education volunteering and practicum are being prepared under agreements.

-Dual-degree and exchange programs with overseas universities: Supporting students to get dual-degrees with three years studying in JNU and two years in an overseas university.

-Offline lectures by prominent overseas scholars: By inviting erudite overseas scholars during summer or winter vacation, students may experience their lectures and raise their confidence to study abroad.

-Online lectures by visiting scholars: By taking online lectures of famous overseas scholars at JNU, students can get qualification for applying for overseas teaching practicum and dual-degree programs with tuition supported.

-Establishing a global teacher education center: Training in-service teachers in Jeju and teachers of developing Asian countries who want to study global teaching skills in Korea.

First of all, developing a dual-degree program is most important one among these tasks. To do this, we are in the mist of developing dual-degree curricula considering transferable courses between JNU and the U.S. universities including the Boise State University (BSU).

C. Cooperation with Overseas Universities

Cooperating closely with overseas universities is the key making the GTU program successful. To date, we have made an agreement for educational cooperation with 7 universities in the U.S. as shown on Table IV. There are a few common features of the partner universities. First, they are mostly education-oriented institutes rather than research-oriented. Second, at an initial step, the universities have been built for the purpose of cultivating teachers. Third, the tuition fee is cheaper because they are mostly state universities. Finally, they are located in small cities where the living cost and danger of accidents is relatively low.

TABLE IV
COOPERATION WITH OVERSEAS UNIVERSITIES

University	Fields of Cooperation
Boise State University	- Development of education programs for dual degrees
Salisbury University	- Human resource exchange for education program development and operation
Delaware State University	- Administrative exchange for educational management
Westfield State University	- Exchange students' teaching practices in overseas universities
University of Wisconsin	- Supporting students to get teacher certification in overseas
Western Illinois University	- Supporting students to become teachers in overseas
Richard Stockton College	

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to examine the demand and necessity of globalization in the field of teacher education between Korea and the U.S. The conclusions drawn from the study are as follows:

First, it is quite possible to build international cooperation for teacher training in a global context, and the educational cooperation will bring mutual benefits to both Korea and the U.S. in balancing the supply and demand of teachers. Therefore, the teacher education institutions are required to create new and broader objectives and effective strategies towards this direction.

Second, the GTU program takes five years to fulfill all the requirements from both universities for a dual degree. Five years refers to two and a half years at JNU, two years at BSU, and half a year for the teaching practicum. When the two institutions' curricula are compared, many of the general education courses do not match each other's even if most of the credits get mutually accepted. This means that further discussions and analyses are needed to make the GTU program successful.

Third, from the long term perspectives, the teacher training and accreditation system needs for drastic reforms to enhance public education as well as to cope with the demand of social changes toward globalization.

For further study, we will evaluate the GTU program and evolve it through analysis. Furthermore, we will analyze the changes of students and professors as well as specific programs as time goes on.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Global Teachers' University Project at Jeju National University through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Korean Government (Ministry of Education-2013-0933).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. M. Suarez-Orozco, D. B. Qin-Hilliard, "Globalization: Culture and Education in the New Millennium," In Suarez-Orozco, & Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization*, Berkeley: CA, University of California Press, pp. 1-37, 2005.
- [2] A. Green, "Education, Globalization, and the Nation State," In Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J., Halsey, A. H. (Eds.), *Education, Globalization, Social Change*, Oxford University Press Inc., pp. 192-197, 2006.
- [3] E. Thomas, "Globalisation, Cultural Diversity and Teacher," In Cullingford, & Huddersfield, *Globalisation, Education and Culture Shock*, Ashgate Publing Lit., UK, pp. 124-138, 2005.
- [4] L. Darling-Hammond, J. Bransford, *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*, San Francisco: CA, Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- [5] S. K. Yang, "Teacher Preparation Program in the US," *Korean Journal of Comparative Education*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 77-103, 2006.
- [6] L. Darling-Hammond, *Solving the Dilemmas of Teacher Supply, Demand, and Standards*, New York: National Commission on Education and America's Future, 2000.
- [7] National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), *The Numbers Game: Ensuring Quantity and Quality in the Teaching Workforce*, Alexandria, VA: Author, 1998.
- [8] U.S. Department of Education, *Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing: 1990-1991 trough 2013-2014*, Retrieved at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/pol/tsa.pdf>. 2013.
- [9] K. H. Lee, "International Comparison of Teachers' Salary between the U.S. and South Korea," *Journal of Local Education Management*, vol. 13, Dec., pp. 21-43, 2008.