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Abstract: This article discusses two education abroad programs that afford pre-service teachers with purposeful opportunities to enhance their intercultural competence through immersion in teaching internships in British schools. The programs, in London and Nottingham, provide pre-service teachers with direct experiences that engage them with diverse instructional perspectives and challenge their ideas underpinning U.S. norms for teaching and learning. The Nottingham program focuses on the discipline of history and about how the past is taught, while the London program has an urban education focus that serves participants across a variety of disciplines. Both programs are a 15 week semester abroad for teaching interns following their domestic student teaching semester. Focused on teacher leadership and intercultural learning, this value-added semester builds upon four prior semesters of school placements, requires a master-level research project, and directly engages interns in school-based activities. This paper highlights the two programs with specific attention paid to purposefully facilitating intercultural learning. Implications for both initiating and sustaining international experiences for pre-service teacher education are addressed.

This article explores the goals and implementation of two education abroad programs for pre-service teachers that aim to promote intercultural understandings in a way that directly improves their practice.
as educators. These programs, designed to bring to life the mission of preparing globally competent teachers at the Neag School of Education at the University of Connecticut (UConn), send one group of students to London, England and a second to Nottingham, England to intern in schools and become immersed in British society. The international experience and related course work prepares pre-service teachers to deeply consider how they are developing their intercultural skills as they collaborate with K-12 students and teachers, university staff and students, and museum personnel, while they engage as teaching interns following their student teaching semester. For the group in Nottingham there is a specific emphasis on examining how the past is represented and commemorated across cultures. Fostering intercultural competence through direct international experiences promotes the development of historical empathy, particularly the understanding of multiple perspectives.

Student participants in both programs, from an integrated bachelors/masters teacher preparation program (IB/M), take on the role of professional educators working in schools and museums and are also enrolled in graduate-level classes. These programs provide intercultural learning opportunities not available in their U.S.-based school placements. For each program we address the program aims and activities as well as the approach of each program in developing the participants’ intercultural competence. We also contrast the London program, which has successfully run for over twenty years, to the Nottingham program, which is in its first year and by design only targets the secondary social studies pre-service teacher population. Thus, we will address the implications of initiating a new program as well as how to sustain a program for long-term success. Our primary aim for this paper is to encourage readers to think strategically about how to increase opportunities for pre-service teachers to study abroad as part of their formal professional preparation.

II. Education Abroad, Teacher Education, and Intercultural Competence

The vast majority of teachers in U.S. schools are European-American and monolingual in English, and thus, culturally different from many of the students they teach. These teachers often hold ethnocentric beliefs that may negatively influence the educational experiences of their diverse students (Gay, 2000). Marx & Moss (2011a) note, teacher educators must challenge teachers’ ethnocentric worldviews and prepare them to successfully teach culturally diverse student populations. To these ends, teacher education programs typically include a combination of multicultural course work and clinical placements within schools that serve such culturally diverse student populations. However, research cautions that without guided reflection, these experiences may reinforce existing beliefs, confirm stereotypes, and hinder pre-service teachers’ ability to seek alternative ways of teaching (Irvine, 2003; Sleeter, 2001). Multicultural course work and diverse field placements alone may not be enough to develop teachers’ skills and knowledge to thrive in diverse contexts. Cushner (2011) contends that a purely multicultural approach, particularly one imbedded in the notion of social justice, is insufficient to prepare pre-service teachers to serve their students. An additional set of experiences built around intercultural understanding or competence could build on and complement social justice education. Cushner refers to intercultural competence as “the critical knowledge and skills that enable people to be successful within a wide range of culturally diverse contexts” (Cushner, 2011, p. 606). This includes promoting pre-service teachers’ perceptions and skills to enable them to effectively collaborate with people of different cultural groups. Designing experiences that allow pre-service teachers to immerse themselves in cultures outside of their home country is one important way to develop intercultural competence.
Moving beyond domestic school placements and course work, the literature describes teacher education study abroad programs that afford candidates an opportunity to immerse themselves in an international school setting, but also with the primary aim of participation in a teaching practicum (Cushner & Mahon, 2002). Advocates for such teacher education study abroad experiences suggest that the opportunity to live and work in a foreign culture serves as a catalyst to transform pre-service teachers’ ethnocentric worldviews and begin them on a path towards culturally responsive teaching (Cushner & Brennan, 2007). We believe these experiences also have the potential to enhance students’ intercultural competence more broadly by providing them with experiences that require them to both observe and actively participate in collaboration with education colleagues and students. The students’ non-academic experiences also necessitate daily interaction with people from different cultural backgrounds and perspectives.

Although we strongly support such international programs and aims, we contend that the primary design of cross-cultural study abroad work in teacher education needs not be limited to experiences that involve practice teaching. There are further ways to promote important aspects of culturally responsive pedagogies and increase intercultural understanding in our next generation of teachers. One such approach is semester-long education abroad programs that immerse pre-service candidates in experiential programming coupled with more traditional course work prior to, during, and after, the time abroad, but does so after the students have already completed the traditional student teaching. These programs still require school-based placements and add even greater value when combined with classroom experiences and a student-led research component. We advocate that programs follow a trajectory that includes a pre-departure/classroom phase, a semester abroad with field-based experiences, class, and school-based research, and a semester-long re-entry phase. This design has the potential to greatly enhance pre-service teachers’ intercultural skills and knowledge.

One conceptual frame for considering intercultural competence is the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) which can identify where someone is situated along a continuum from highly ethnocentric to highly ethnorelative by capturing one’s orientation to cultural difference (Hammer & Bennett, 2003). According to Cushner (2011), studies show that both pre-service and in-service teachers are “stuck on the ethnocentric side of this scale and may not have the requisite disposition to be effective intercultural educators nor possess the skills necessary to guide young people to develop intercultural competence” (p. 5). An ethnorelative outlook is desirable yet requires a significant shift in thinking (Hammer & Bennett, 2003).

Walton, Priest and Paradies (2013) propose four factors that foster intercultural understanding. These include working with students from majority and minority backgrounds, critical reflection on biases and assumptions in addition to building cultural knowledge, cultural reflexivity that includes perspective taking as well as empathy more broadly, and direct contact experiences that promote positive interpersonal and intergroup collaborations (Walton et al., 2013). These factors can be enacted through the model of post-student teaching, semester-long experiences we propose. Walton et al. (2013) found that if students participate in experiences related to their lives and that involve deep connections with individuals of different cultural groups, intercultural competence can be developed. These authors also observed that in order for teachers to effectively develop intercultural understanding in their own students, they need support for their own personal and professional intercultural aptitude.
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Self-identification along with how one identifies others is a critical part of the process of developing intercultural competence. It is through intercultural encounters that one can critically view one’s own identity and others’ identity in relation to themselves (Kramsch, 2009). It is in this self-reflective space that one can move beyond stereotypical identities of themselves and others and realize that identity is not limited to “nationhood, ethnicity, or language(s) spoken” (Holmes, Bavieri, & Ganassin, 2015, p.17) but rather, promotes understandings of otherness that view identification more broadly to include features such as “gender, age, social class, language, power positions, geographical location, history and memory, religion, family, etc.” (Holmes, Bavieri, & Ganassin, 2015, pp. 17–18). Thus, intercultural experiences can help one to contest, negotiate and (re)construct identity (Holmes, Bavieri, & Ganassin, 2015).

Unfortunately, pre-service teachers are an underrepresented group in study abroad. According to a recent report (Institute of International Education, 2012), only about four percent of all students studying abroad from the United States are education majors (out of over a quarter of a million students who study abroad each year). With a pressing need to produce teachers who are on the path to an ethnorelative worldview, in an ideal position to develop as culturally responsive practitioners, and who show significant change in intercultural competence, well designed post-student teaching study abroad programs can offer significant potential to respond to this urgent call. To purposefully engage students in discourse, reflection and action planning regarding their intercultural learning, the Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer & Bennett, 2003) and myCAP (my Cultural Awareness Profile) (Marx & Moss, 2011b; Wilder & Boer, 2015) are administered to participants prior to their departure. Both resources afford explicit opportunities to engage students in dialogue underpinning their intercultural learning and offer clear steps they can take to purposefully engage in such important professional learning.

In the following section we will address the aims of the IB/M teacher education program at the UConn, describe the two semester-long international internship programs offered to pre-service teachers, and explore the implications for initiating and sustaining international experiences for pre-service teachers that promote intercultural competence.

III. Program Context

Students in UConn’s IB/M teacher education program acquire a strong liberal arts background, develop general and subject-specific pedagogical knowledge, and participate in high-quality clinical placements in a variety of settings. Admission to the IB/M program is highly competitive, keeping with the program goals of preparing outstanding educators to be decision makers, leaders and innovators. The program is organized around three themes—student as learner, student as teacher, teacher as leader—that require progressively more complex and demanding course work and clinic placements (Howard, Levine, & Moss, 2014). Each cohort takes 3 years to complete their program while engaging in course work, clinic placements, and seminars during each of the six semesters. Participant students teach full-time during the spring semester senior year (second year in the program as they are admitted as juniors). During the final year of study, students engage in graduate-level course work and research, and school-based internships.
As part of this fifth year of the program, students can opt to participate in the international internship programs in London or Nottingham. Consistent with the teacher as leader theme for that year, internships are designed to build upon student teaching and afford students direct experiences as leaders-in-training. For example, internships directly involve 5th year interns in school reform projects such as after school academic support programs or the planning and implementation of special initiatives such as “History Day” and in Nottingham, at museums writing educational materials for exhibits and supporting exhibit design. Internships are often school and department-wide as opposed to tied to an individual classroom, and are associated with a graduate-level research project involving timely and relevant questions that encourage students to pursue formal inquiry as a teacher-researcher.

This leadership lens is layered onto a cultural immersion experience. All program requirements for this international experience are essentially identical to the domestic options, except that students going abroad in the fall term of the 5th year are required to initiate their research project earlier and study intercultural learning and development in the summer term prior to their departure. In that sense, the so-called full-semester education abroad program is actually a whole calendar year program beginning in the summer term with a research methods and cultural theory course. It continues as students travel abroad for the fall term and intern in schools, take graduate-level classes, and conduct the research project. Finally, the experience extends into the re-entry spring semester where students are required to take a seminar that both supports their intercultural reflection and the completion of their research project (Marx & Moss, 2015). Although this teacher education model is non-traditional in the sense that it extends the pre-service experience to an internship year beyond student teaching, the school-based work remains the hallmark of the program. In the case of these programs, interns are immersed in the culture of schools in London or Nottingham. Cultural immersion and reflection are the keys to these programs. Supported by significant opportunities for reflection, the programs are designed to help pre-serve teachers develop ethnorelative perspectives in support of culturally responsive teaching (Marx & Moss, 2011a) and intercultural competence that requires significant reflection on self-identity and the identity of others and meaningful intercultural collaboration.

It is important to note that the two education abroad programs are designed around a similar model which requires pre-departure, study abroad, and re-entry experiences. The key is that in both the planning and execution of each distinct program the outcomes are clearly articulated and experiences are designed to promote such aims. The major difference between the two programs are that the London program sends elementary, secondary, music, and special education pre-service teachers while the Nottingham program is focused on secondary social studies pre-service teachers. As a result, the pre-service teachers in Nottingham intern one day a week at a history museum in addition to the school placements. Furthermore, the Nottingham program has some discipline specific objectives, which are discussed below.

IV. Program Design and Features

Both programs include a number of components that are cited as important characteristics of study abroad program design: (1) experiential learning situations that provide opportunities for intensive immersion into the local culture, (2) credit-bearing course work related to cross-cultural issues, and (3) support for guided cultural reflection (Engle & Engle, 2004). The structure of both programs also
requires pre-departure and re-entry experiences which are critical for supporting and learning from the time abroad (Byram & Feng, 2006)

**Nottingham Program**

An overview of the program in Nottingham is provided in Table 1. This experience is open to students enrolled in the social studies/history education program at the UConn and is part of their graduate year of study. All students have completed their content course work (history and social sciences) as well as a semester-long student teaching experience. Nottingham was chosen because of a pre-existing relationship between faculty at the University of Connecticut and the University of Nottingham and the availability of school and museum sites to host students (both universities are also members of the Universitas 21 higher education consortium).

Table 1. *Nottingham Program Outline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pre-departure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key Components</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assessments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer course work</td>
<td>Intercultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content preparation (British History)</td>
<td>Inventory (IDI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural understanding and communication training</td>
<td>On Line Journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team/Community building</td>
<td>Research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum education preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IDI administration and analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online work with University of Nottingham instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Nottingham schools and museums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of research proposal question, literature review, and methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Abroad</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key Components</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assessments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldwork: two days a week in local schools; one day a week in history museums. Students work in secondary history classrooms developing curriculum, teaching students, and collaborating with teachers on various projects. In museums students work with staff and visiting student groups.</td>
<td>Weekly journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classwork: two classes at the University of Nottingham and one class taught through UConn. Includes two week visit by UConn supervising faculty.</td>
<td>Research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel: Students are provided with long-weekends to travel.</td>
<td>Presentation/orientation of museums to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry</td>
<td>Full semester course</td>
<td>Journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum education work in Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Research project final paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Film Viewings</td>
<td>Formal presentations to faculty and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural understanding and communication</td>
<td>follow-up analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final analysis of research results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nottingham program has several goals specific to pre-service social studies teachers which include preparing social studies teachers who, as a result of increased intercultural competence:

- Understand and incorporate global perspectives and dispositions into their teaching.
- Explore their role as global citizens and strengthen their capacity to participate in a global community.
- Practice and promote the habits of historical thinking including asking compelling questions, developing historical empathy, connecting the past and present, and evaluating sources of evidence.
- Model and promote civic engagement.

First, the pre-service social studies teachers are asked to be both historians and teachers from a global perspective. Studying world cultures and history is already a part of the social studies curriculum. The shift we ask pre-service teachers to make as part of this program is to consider culture and history from the point of view of non-American cultures. This shift does not exclude American views, but adds to and enhances them and helps pre-service social studies teachers to see through and use multiple lenses in their teaching. For example, with WWII we ask teachers to consider how the British, French, Germans, and Russians experienced the war and how their cultures remember and commemorate the war today. This forces students to confront their American identity, not just personally, but in the context of the content they teach.

Next, the program works with pre-service social studies teachers to practice and promote the habits of historical thinking. Historical thinking involves deep content knowledge that is integrated with specific skills (Wineburg, 2001; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Seixas, 2006). First, the pre-service teachers must practice these habits themselves as “historians.” Inquiry—asking questions, researching, evaluating sources, using evidence to make claims, and taking informed action—is a core component to historical thinking (National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS], 2013). In addition, the ability to develop K-12 students’ historical empathy, particularly the ability to recognize others’ perspectives, is an essential element to our social studies education program (Barton & Levstik, 2004). Recognizing other perspectives is directly connected to the goal of learning about and understanding global perspectives.
Finally, we model and promote issues of civic engagement (Hess, 2009; Parker, 2010). We strive to encourage teachers to practice civic engagement and to help their students do so as well. Civically engaged citizens are aware of and understand contemporary issues—local, regional, national, and international—can weigh evidence and analyze other points of view, and can communicate and act upon what they learn in order to promote the common good. The content and skills promoted in a rigorous social studies curriculum are critical to promote civic engagement and maintain democracy.

All of these goals promote and encourage teachers who value and actively consider issues of intercultural competence in their teaching and in the education community more broadly. Issues of intercultural competence are important beyond the borders of the social studies classroom, but also hold a particular relevance as we can explore these issues through the social studies content covered in class.

Pre-Departure

Prior to departure students complete a three credit graduate-level class that prepares them to carry out a research project while abroad, introduces them to intercultural theory and practice, and requires them to prepare for the specific schools and museums where they will complete field work. For research preparation the students develop a question, complete a literature review, and develop data collection instruments. For example, during the first year of the program (2015–2016) students chose to examine how teachers in England conceive of, and teach, citizenship to their pupils. Students are administered the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the results are used to facilitate intercultural reflection and action planning. The students also study British history and research the schools and museums where they will intern.

Experience Abroad

While in Nottingham the students intern two days a week in secondary history classrooms/history departments in a variety of local schools where they help teachers write curriculum, teach various lessons, and collaborate on other department and school-wide projects. They also intern one day a week in area history museums and archives where they collaborate with staff on exhibit design, create educational materials to support museum education, and work with visiting school groups.

In addition the students enroll in two classes at the University of Nottingham including one focused on history content where they explore British and European history from a European perspectives and a second centered on history education in the United Kingdom. For this second course the students are in class most days with pre-service history teachers from the University of Nottingham. Taking class alongside their British colleagues affords additional opportunities to collaborate with different cultural groups. Finally, the students take one class with their UConn advisor and program director.

The students have 3 day weekends to enable them to further immerse themselves in European culture and they travel almost every weekend to various locations throughout the United Kingdom and Europe.
The Nottingham experience for pre-service teachers specifically promotes experiences that require an examination of identity, enhances the ability to consider others’ perspectives, and creates multiple opportunities for positive collaboration. It does so by having the pre-service teachers think about and experience similarities and differences between their home culture and their host culture in societal cultural traditions, in teacher preparation, in historical perspectives presented and analyzed, in K-12 curricular educational practices, in museum education customs, and in behavior/classroom expectations.

*Re-Entry*

Students return home for the spring semester where they take a three credit graduate seminar focused on analyzing their abroad experiences, further reflecting on cultural learning, and presenting the findings of their research (Marx & Moss, 2015). The students enroll in field experiences in Connecticut schools as well as complete additional museum education work via a trip to Washington, D.C.

*London Program*

The London Program would be classified as an “island program” (Norris & Dwyer, 2005), where students stay together as a cohort for classes and living accommodation while abroad and are not affiliated with a host country institution. In the London Program students remain together as a cohort through the initial summer class, their study abroad in London, and during the seminar in the re-entry spring semester back on their home campus. See Table 2 for an overview of the London Program.
Table 2. *London Program Outline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-departure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer course work</td>
<td>IDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings on teacher leadership and research methods</td>
<td>myCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural teaching and learning theory and practice</td>
<td>Research literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDI administration and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abroad</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork: 3 days per week in urban state schools</td>
<td>Blog entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork: three graduate-level classes: Seminar to support internship reflection; cultural learning and curriculum; comparative international education</td>
<td>Research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students afforded extended weekends for London-based and international cultural immersion experiences</td>
<td>Course grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re-entry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full semester seminar course to support cultural reflection</td>
<td>Research project final paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal presentation to faculty and peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pre-Departure*

In the summer prior to departure, students enroll in a three credit graduate-level class with the dual aim of introducing intercultural theory and practice while preparing students methodologically to engage as teacher leaders by conducting a research project in schools. The time together also affords the group explicit community building opportunities along with an overall program orientation to issues of safety.
and other key aspects of London living. Students are administered the IDI and myCAP, and the results are used to facilitate intercultural reflection and action planning.

**Experience Abroad**

The core of the program is a 15-week semester in London, where students complete 20-hour-a-week internships in city schools. London was chosen as the international site for this program because it affords ample opportunity for the interns to engage in an urban cultural context while being able to side-step significant linguistic barriers; the students enrolled in the teacher education program are almost exclusively speakers of English. Partner schools have been selected that consistently perform at a high level according to the league tables (published rankings of schools). Thus, within their internships the London Program participants have experienced many best practices of education in culturally complex urban settings.

The London Program course work that compliments the internship makes the study of culture explicit, with a clear focus on unpacking cultural differences that might otherwise go unnoticed by students. For example, students explore the role of mandated religion education in London schools, and are encouraged to consider the cultural norms and realities that make such a course possible—even desirable—in London and yet fraught with challenges back in the United States.

**Re-Entry**

Upon re-entry for the spring semester students are required to enroll in a three credit seminar as a cohort. Within this intellectual space they reflect upon cultural learning, issues underpinning social justice, and finalize their inquiry project for presentation at a formal event at the conclusion of the semester.

**V. Program Planning Implications – Developing Intercultural Competence**

**Developing and Sustaining International Programs**

The two programs described here were developed two decades apart, but revolve around core principles of developing pre-service teachers’ intercultural competence and teacher leadership. Both programs also are grounded in intensive immersion into the local culture, course work related to cross-cultural issues, and support for guided cultural reflection. However, the programs serve different groups of pre-service teachers and have some different academic goals for students. The Nottingham program is built for pre-service social studies teachers with an emphasis on developing and discovering historical empathy, exploring roles in a global community, and promoting civic engagement. The placements include museums as well as school internships. Meanwhile the London program serves a multi-disciplinary group of pre-service teachers with the aim of enhancing their ability to work in urban settings. In Nottingham students are formally connected to a university while in London it is an island program.

Both programs receive significant support from the Education Abroad office at UConn; however, these programs were developed by education faculty and the academic curricula are part of the education
program. This home base in an academic department is part of what makes the programs successful. Key faculty hold the primary responsibility for each program, and since the pre-post model of both programs involves substantial faculty involvement, our programs would not be possible without both significant faculty effort and institutional support. For example, the re-entry seminars are assigned to faculty as routine elements of their teaching load. In that way, the Neag School has institutionalized both programs by supporting faculty in all aspects of its implementation.

As these programs demonstrate there is not a one-size-fits-all when it comes to successful international programs, the programs differ so that they can best meet the needs of particular pre-service teachers and to best utilize available resources in the host country/city.

One of the hurdles faced by all education abroad programs is the increasing difficulty of providing genuinely challenging and unsettling cultural experiences (Engle & Engle, 2004). There are a number of features of the Nottingham and London programs that we believe increase the likelihood of success. For both programs the faculty advisors visit school (and in Nottingham, museum) sites each spring to strengthen collaboration and identify and build new partnerships. No different than finding student teaching placements domestically, the quality of the school site and cooperating teachers is critical for a successful placement. Getting to know the school and teachers also facilitates the process of matching students to appropriate schools. Second, both programs require three credit courses for both pre-departure and re-entry experiences. These are critical for preparing students and for helping them to make sense of the experience as much of their learning will occur upon re-entry (Vande Berg, Paige, & Hemming Lou, 2012).

The quality of faculty teaching the courses in the host country is also critical. For the Nottingham program the teaching is done by university faculty who were already collaborating with UConn professors. The curriculum was developed jointly by faculty from both universities. In London, adjunct faculty are carefully vetted, hired by UConn and are experienced K-12 teachers and administrators. Another important aspect to the program is how the UConn faculty advisors monitor and support the students. For both programs the advisors teach a hybrid course during the semester abroad which includes online work and Skype meetings as well as face-to-face instruction for a week more in country with the students. While abroad UConn faculty also supervise field placements (school/museum sites), and in that sense, the labor intensive work of teacher educators does not change significantly from what is done domestically.

One difference between the two UConn international programs is the manner in which the students are chosen. For Nottingham, an already existing cohort of up to 15 pre-service social studies teachers is invited to participate. There is a rigorous admissions program to join the cohort at the outset of the program, but no additional admissions are required for the Nottingham program. Meanwhile, the London program is drawing from a much larger pool of candidates across all programs so there is a special admissions process and screening. On average 16 students are admitted to participate from a pool two to three times that size. Finally, we are quite fortunate to have an Education Abroad office and a School of Education (faculty, teacher education program, Dean) who are fully supportive of these programs. For example, teaching within these programs is not an overload but reflects the assigned standard load for each faculty member.
Yet, both programs remain a work in progress. Partnerships with the Office of Global Affairs at our university, especially Education Abroad, have been instrumental in assisting with the logistical design and execution of each program. The division of labor required to facilitate such programs is clearly understood by all parties, with the academic side housed within the teacher education faculty and logistical considerations (including risk management and student insurance) with Education Abroad. Each facet of the institution brings their expertise to bear in the running of the programs. It is important to note the academic component of each program evolves along with the literature in the fields of intercultural studies, study abroad, and teacher education—to name but a few. As such the London program has evolved consistently over the decades to leverage the latest thinking in these fields, and it is expected that both programs will continue to do so.

At the time of the writing of this article, as a teacher education program at our university we find ourselves in program-wide discussions regarding the further internationalization of our programs to enhance our ability to foster globally competent teachers who implement culturally and linguistically best practices in their classrooms. In a recently developed internal report at our university titled, *Rationale for the Implementation of Expanded Cultural Immersion Experience Programs* (Moss, Rojas, Kaufman, Roselle, & Wagner, 2014), we addressed the motivation for expanding our study abroad programs in teacher education and that an ethnorelative worldview is a key element of the broader construct of global competence and, for educators, globally competent teaching. As such, we advocate that teacher education candidates should pursue the purposeful development of knowledge, skills, and beliefs that promote intercultural competence. Bennett (2004) describes an ethnorelative worldview as one that allows for “the experience of one’s own beliefs and behaviors as just one organization of reality among many viable possibilities” (p. 62). The ethnorelative developmental stages are “ways of seeking cultural difference, either by accepting its importance, by adapting perspective to take it into account, or by integrating the whole concept into a definition of identity” (2004, p. 63). Our programs are designed to pursue these 21st century goals.

**Conclusions**

A key aim for this article was to present and discuss central elements of two semester-long education abroad programs as a means for enhancing pre-service teachers’ intercultural competence and thus preparing globally competent teachers. The development of intercultural competence is explicitly promoted by enhancing pre-services teachers’ exposure to global perspectives while also encouraging a critical examination of sources of information, by supporting cultural reflexivity that includes perspective taking, by promoting collaborative experiences to better see how others view and experience the world, and by reflecting on the advantages and limitations of their own experiences and privilege as Americans.

It is important to recall that the two study abroad programs discussed are both designed around the pre-departure, study abroad and re-entry model. We assert that such a model is necessary to achieve our aims for promoting intercultural competence as operationalized for each distinct program. Both programs require cultural immersion and reflection in an internship supported by a teacher-as-researcher project with differences in location and content focus. The construct of intercultural competence is broad, and the key message is that there are multiple ways to design and implement
study abroad programs specifically designed for pre-service teachers—it depends upon which aspects of global competence you prioritize and it is likely that no single program can meet all the various aims. Although many successful programs involve student teaching or other school-based activities, semester-long programs that take place following student teaching offer a viable option to help the next generation of teachers develop as globally competent leaders and professionals.
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