COLOMBO SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIVARIATE DATA ANALYSIS THEORY & PRACTICE
E-ISSN: 2536-7935
P-ISSN: 2536-7927
PAGE NO: 01-08

An Analytical Model for Integrating Sustainability Competencies into TVE Teacher Preparation Programs: Insights from a Systematic Literature Review

Rakib Hossain
Green University of Bangladesh

Shuvo Das
Comilla University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Published: February 18, 2020
VOLUME: Vol.05 Issue 01 2020

Keywords:
Education for Sustainable Development, TVE Teacher Training, Sustainability Competencies, Analytical Model, Curriculum Integration, Vocational Education, Teacher Education, Sustainable Development Framework.

ABSTRACT

The growing urgency of global sustainability challenges has intensified the need to embed Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) within Technical and Vocational Education (TVE) systems. Despite policy-level commitments, a persistent gap exists in effectively integrating sustainability competencies into teacher preparation programs. This study develops an analytical model based on a systematic literature review of foundational and contemporary works in sustainability education, teacher training, and vocational systems. The paper synthesizes theoretical frameworks, pedagogical approaches, and institutional strategies to construct a multi-dimensional integration model tailored for TVE teacher education. The findings highlight critical dimensions including competency alignment, curriculum transformation, pedagogical innovation, institutional readiness, and assessment mechanisms. The proposed model offers a structured pathway for embedding sustainability competencies within teacher preparation programs, emphasizing both technical skills and socio-ecological awareness. The study contributes to bridging the disconnect between sustainability theory and vocational teaching practice while identifying implementation challenges and future research directions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of sustainable development has evolved into a central paradigm shaping educational policies and institutional reforms worldwide. Rooted in the seminal report by Brundtland (1987), sustainability emphasizes balancing economic growth, environmental protection, and social equity. Within this framework, education serves as a transformative tool to cultivate competencies necessary for addressing complex global challenges (Diesendorf, 2001).

Technical and Vocational Education (TVE) plays a critical role in workforce development and economic advancement. However, traditional TVE systems have been primarily skill-oriented, often neglecting broader sustainability dimensions such as environmental responsibility and social awareness (Majumdar, 2005). This gap is particularly evident in teacher preparation programs, where educators are not adequately equipped to integrate sustainability into teaching practices (Fien & Maclean, 2000).

The problem is further compounded by the lack of structured frameworks guiding the integration of sustainability competencies into TVE teacher education. While initiatives such as ESD emphasize transformative learning, their practical application in vocational contexts remains fragmented (Cebrián et al., 2015). Essel (2013) underscores that sustainability in TVET systems depends on strategic choices involving curriculum design, institutional policies, and competency development, yet these dimensions are rarely integrated systematically.

This study addresses this gap by developing an analytical model that synthesizes insights from existing literature to guide the integration of sustainability competencies into TVE teacher preparation programs.

Objectives

The study aims to:

1. Analyze existing literature on sustainability integration in teacher education.
2. Identify key sustainability competencies relevant to TVE.
3. Develop an analytical model for integrating these competencies into teacher preparation programs.
4. Examine implications for policy and practice.

Scope and Significance

The study focuses exclusively on literature related to sustainability education, TVET systems, and teacher training. Its significance lies in providing a structured, research-based model that can inform curriculum reform, institutional strategies, and policy development.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on sustainability education reveals a multi-layered conceptual evolution. Early works emphasize defining sustainability and its dimensions. Diesendorf (2001) presents models that conceptualize sustainability as an interplay of ecological, economic, and social systems. Similarly, Pearce et al. (1996) focus on measurable indicators, highlighting the need for operational frameworks.

2.1 Sustainability and Education

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) has been positioned as a transformative approach to learning. Fien and Tilbury (1996) argue that teacher education must go beyond knowledge transmission to foster critical thinking and ethical responsibility. This perspective is reinforced by UNESCO (2006a), which provides a framework for integrating sustainability into educational systems.

However, Hofman (2015) questions the clarity of ESD objectives, suggesting ambiguity in implementation strategies. Reid and Petocz (2006) further highlight variations in educators' understanding of sustainability, indicating a lack of conceptual coherence.

2.2 TVE and Sustainability Integration

The integration of sustainability into TVE has gained attention in recent decades. Majumdar (2005) introduces the concept of "greening TVET," emphasizing the alignment of vocational training with sustainable practices. Hofmann and Strietska-Ilina (2013) extend this by linking skills development with green economic growth.

Essel (2013) provides a critical analysis of sustainability in TVET, identifying key factors such as institutional commitment, curriculum relevance, and stakeholder engagement. This work is particularly significant as it highlights decision-making processes that influence sustainability outcomes in vocational systems.

2.3 Teacher Education and Competency Development

Teacher preparation is central to sustainability integration. Evans et al. (2017) synthesize literature on embedding sustainability in teacher education, identifying approaches such as curriculum infusion and experiential learning. Effeney and Davis (2013) demonstrate that pre-service teachers often lack confidence in sustainability teaching, indicating gaps in training programs.

Sleurs (2008) proposes a competency framework for ESD teachers, emphasizing skills such as systems thinking, anticipatory thinking, and collaborative problem-solving. These competencies align with broader educational goals but require contextual adaptation for TVE systems.

2.4 Research Gaps

Despite extensive literature, several gaps remain:

- Lack of integrated models specific to TVE teacher education.
- Limited focus on competency-based frameworks.
- Insufficient alignment between theory and practical implementation.

Essel (2013) reiterates that sustainability in TVET is contingent upon strategic integration, yet existing studies often address components in isolation.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a systematic literature review approach to develop an analytical model. The methodology involves structured analysis, thematic synthesis, and model construction.

3.1 Analytical Framework Development

The analytical model is constructed based on five core dimensions:

1. Competency Identification
2. Curriculum Integration
3. Pedagogical Strategies
4. Institutional Support Systems
5. Assessment and Evaluation

These dimensions are derived from recurring themes in the literature.

3.2 Competency Identification

Sustainability competencies are conceptualized as a combination of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes. Sleurs (2008) identifies key competencies including critical thinking and systems analysis. Essel (2013) emphasizes decision-making capabilities in sustainability contexts.

In TVE, competencies must align with industry requirements while incorporating sustainability principles. For example, engineering training programs can integrate energy efficiency and resource management concepts.

3.3 Curriculum Integration

Curriculum transformation involves embedding sustainability across subjects rather than treating it as an isolated topic. Fien and Maclean (2000) highlight the importance of interdisciplinary approaches.

The proposed model advocates for:

- Horizontal integration across subjects.
- Vertical integration across training levels.

3.4 Pedagogical Strategies

Effective pedagogy is crucial for competency development. Experiential learning, problem-based learning, and community engagement are identified as key strategies (Cebrián et al., 2015).

For instance, project-based learning can involve real-world sustainability challenges, enabling students to apply theoretical knowledge.

3.5 Institutional Support Systems

Institutional readiness plays a significant role. Factors include:

- Policy frameworks
- Faculty training
- Resource allocation

Essel (2013) stresses that institutional commitment is a critical determinant of sustainability integration success.

3.6 Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment mechanisms must align with sustainability competencies. Traditional exams are insufficient; alternative methods such as portfolios and project evaluations are recommended.

4. RESULTS

The analysis reveals that sustainability integration in TVE teacher preparation requires a multi-dimensional approach. The proposed analytical model demonstrates that competency development is most effective when aligned with curriculum design, pedagogy, and institutional support.

Key findings include:

- Competency-based approaches enhance teacher readiness for sustainability education.
- Interdisciplinary curriculum structures facilitate holistic learning.
- Experiential pedagogies significantly improve engagement and application.
- Institutional commitment is a critical success factor.
- Assessment systems must evolve to capture complex competencies.

The model also identifies interdependencies among dimensions. For example, curriculum integration is ineffective without appropriate pedagogical strategies and institutional support.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings align with existing literature while offering new insights into integration strategies. The emphasis on competency-based frameworks reflects the shift towards outcome-oriented education (Sleurs, 2008). However, the study extends this by contextualizing competencies within TVE systems.

The role of institutional support corroborates Essel's (2013) argument that sustainability in TVET depends on strategic decision-making. Without institutional alignment, even well-designed curricula may fail to achieve desired outcomes.

The study also highlights challenges such as:

- Resistance to curriculum change
- Limited faculty expertise
- Resource constraints

These challenges underscore the need for comprehensive implementation strategies.

Comparatively, while studies such as Evans et al. (2017) focus on teacher education broadly, this research provides a specialized model for TVE contexts. This specificity enhances its practical applicability.

6. CONCLUSION

This study develops an analytical model for integrating sustainability competencies into TVE teacher preparation programs. By synthesizing literature and identifying key dimensions, the model provides a structured approach to curriculum transformation, pedagogical innovation, and institutional development.

The research contributes to bridging the gap between sustainability theory and vocational education practice. It emphasizes the importance of competency-based approaches and highlights the role of institutional support.

Future Scope and Recommendations

Future research should focus on empirical validation of the model and explore its applicability across different cultural and institutional contexts. Policymakers and educators should prioritize:

- Faculty development programs
- Curriculum redesign initiatives
- Collaborative partnerships with industry

7. REFERENCES

1. Abdulrazak, S., & Ahmad, F. S. (2014). Sustainable development: A Malaysian perspective. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 164, 237-241.
2. Ahmad, R. H. (1998). Educational development and reformation in Malaysia: past, present and future. Journal of Educational Administration, 36(5), 462-475.
3. Aked, J., Marks, N., Cordon, C., & Thompson, S. (2008). Five ways to well-being: The evidence. A report. London: Centre for Wellbeing, New Economics Foundation.
4. Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). Handbook of leadership. Theory, Research & Managerial Applications, 3.
5. Bayani, A. (2010). Teacher education program: The Malaysian perspective. In: Academia. edu
6. Biggs, S. (1999). Community capacity building in Queensland: The Queensland Government service delivery project. Unpublished paper. Office of Rural Communities, Brisbane, Queensland.
7. Bosselmann, K. (2001). University and sustainability: compatibleagendas? Educational Philosophy and Theory, 33(2), 167-186.

8. Brown, M., Sack, F., & Piper Rodd, C. (2013). Student voice in 'skills for sustainability': A missing component from the demand side of Australian Vocational Education and Training. International Journal of Training Research, 11(3), 213-224.

9. Brundtland, G. (1987). Our common future: Report of the 1987 World Commission on Environment and Development. United Nations, Oslo, 1-300.

10. Cavaye, J. (2006). Understanding community development. Cavaye Community Development.

11. Cebrián, G., Grace, M., & Humphris, D. (2015). Academic staff engagement in education for sustainable development. Journal of Cleaner Production, 106, 79-86.

12. Christenson, J. A., & Robinson, J. W. (1989). Community development in perspective: Iowa State University Press.

13. Cloud Institute for Sustainable Education. (2016). Education for Sustainability. Retrieved from

14. Diesendorf, M. (2001). Models of sustainability and sustainable development. International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology, 1(2), 109-123.

15. Effeney, G., & Davis, J. (2013). Education for sustainability: A case study of pre-service primary teachers' knowledge and efficacy. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5), 32-46.

16. Essel, C. H. (2013). Sustainability of TVET: analyzing the critical choice factors. CAPA Scientific Journal, 18.

17. Evans, N., Stevenson, R. B., Lasen, M., Ferreira, J.-A., & Davis, J. (2017). Approaches to embedding sustainability in teacher education: Asynthesis of the literature. Teaching and Teacher Education, 63, 405-417.

18. Evans, N., Whitehouse, H., & Hickey, R. (2012). Pre-Service Teachers' Conceptions of Education for Sustainability. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37(7), n7.

19. Fien, J., & Maclean, R. (2000). Teacher education for sustainability. II. Two teacher education projects from Asia and the Pacific. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 9(1), 37-48.

20. Fien, J., Maclean, R., & Park, M.-G. (2008). Work, learning and sustainable development: Opportunities and challenges(Vol. 8): Springer Science & Business Media.

21. Fien, J., & Tilbury, D. (1996). Learning for a sustainable environment: An agenda for teacher education in Asia and the Pacific: Asia-Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development, Unesco Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

22. Fien, J., & Wilson, D. (2005). Promoting Sustainable Development in Tvet: 1 the Bonn Declaration. Prospects, 35(3), 273-288.

23. Flora, C., Flora, J., Spears, J., & Swanson, L. (1992). Rural Communities: Legacy and Change. Boulder, Colorado. In: Westview Press

24. Gough, A. (2009). Teacher Education for Sustainable Development within TVET: An Australian Perspective. Paper presented at the UNESCO-UNEVOC Regional Seminar on TVET Teacher Education for Sustainable Development, RMIT University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, RMIT University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

25. Guijt, I., & Moiseev, A. (2001). Resource kit for sustainability assessment. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

26. Hofman, M. (2015). What is an Education for Sustainable Development Supposed to Achieve—A Question of What, How and Why. Journal of Education for Sustainable Development, 9(2), 213-228.

27. Hofmann, C., & Strietska-Ilina, O. (2013). Skills for green jobs: Gearing up education and training for green growth. In (pp. 83-93,219,223). Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

28. Keiner, M. (2005). History, definition (s) and models of sustainable development. Retrieved from

29. Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. Social psychology quarterly, 121-140.

30. Madhavi, J., Shailaja, R., Gopal, K. J., & Keren, N. (2007). Sustainable Development: An Introduction. In Vol. Internship Series. (pp. 40). Retrieved from

31. Majumdar, S. (2005). Greening TVET: connecting the dots in TVET for sustainable development. Organization.

32. Majumdar, S. (2009). Major challenges in integrating sustainable development in TVET. Paper presented at the International Conference: Reorienting TVET Policy Towards Education for Sustainable Development, Berlin, Germany. Retrieved from

33. Marsden, J., Medhurst, J., & Irving, P. (2013). The case for a global green skills training action plan. In (pp. 29-40,219-221). Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

34. New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2015). Education for sustainability. The New Zealand Curriculum Online. Retrieved from

35. Openg, A. S. (2012). Developing Pre-service Teacher Education in Environmental Education for Sustainability in Papua New Guinea.(Doctor of Philisophy (PhD)), University of Waikato, University of Waikato.

36. Pearce, D., Hamilton, K., & Atkinson, G. (1996). Measuring sustainable development: progress on indicators. Environment and Development Economics, 1(1), 85-101.

37. Perraton, H., Creed, C., & Robinson, B. (2002). Teacher Education Guidelines: Using Open and Distance Learning. Technology, Curriculum, Cost, Evaluation.

38. Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2008). Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide: John Wiley & Sons.

39. Phillips, C. (1992). Changing Communities: A Practical Guide for Rural People and Community Leaders: Uniting Church in Australia.

40. Pickering, C., & Byrne, J. (2014). The benefits of publishing systematic quantitative literature reviews for PhD candidates and other early-career researchers. Higher Edu Research & Development, 33(3), 534-548.

41. Reid, A., & Petocz, P. (2006). University lecturers' understanding of sustainability. Higher Edu., 51(1), 105-123.

42. Sharma, R. (2009). Education for sustainability in certificate and vocational education at a New Zealand polytechnic.(Master of Education Master's Dissertation), UNITEC Institute of Technology, Auckland, Newzealand. Retrieved from

43. Shohel, M. M. C., & Howes, A. J. (2011). Models of education for sustainable development and nonformal primary education in Bangladesh. Journal of Education for Sustainable Development, 5(1), 129-139.

44. Sivapalan, S. (2016). Engineering Education for Sustainable Development in Malaysia: Student Stakeholders Perspectives on the Integration of Holistic Sustainability Competences Within Undergraduate Engineering Programmes. In W. Leal Filho & L. Brandli (Eds.), Engaging Stakeholders in Education for Sustainable Development at University Level(pp. 263-285). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

45. Sleurs, W. (2008). Competencies for ESD (Education for Sustainable Development) Teachers: A Framework to Integrate ESD in the Curriculum of Teacher Training Institutes—Comenius 2.1 Project 118277-CP-1-2004-BE-Comenius-C2. 1. 2008.

46. Thatcher, A. (2014). Theoretical definitions and models of sustainable development that apply to human factors and ergonomics. Paper presented at the 11th International Symposium on Human Factors in Organisational Design and Management, Copenhagen, Denmark.

47. Thompson, J. F. (2002). Foundations of vocational education: Social and philosophical concepts: Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

48. Underwood, C. (2002). Belief and attitude change in the context of human development.

49. UNESCO. (2006a). Framework for the UNDESD international implementation scheme. In E. Sector (Ed.), (Vol. ED/DESD/2006/PI/1).): Paris, FR: UNESCO.