

PROFESSIONALIZATION AND THE REFORM OF TEACHING, TEACHERS, AND
TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA: A
CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

by

Min-Ho Yeom

B.A., Chonnam National University, 1988

M.A., Chonnam National University, 1992

Ph.D., Chonnam National University, 1997

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
the School of Education in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2005

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Min-Ho Yeom

It was defended on

17 March 2005

and approved by

Cynthia E. Coburn, Ph.D., Policy, Organization, Measurement, and Evaluation, Assistant
Professor, University of California, Berkeley

Akiko Hashimoto, Ph.D., Sociology, Associate Professor,
University of Pittsburgh

David M. Post, Ph.D., Comparative and International Education, Associate Professor,
Penn State University

Clementina Acedo, Ph.D., Administrative and Policy Studies, Assistant Professor,
University of Pittsburgh
Dissertation Co-Director

Mark B. Ginsburg, Ph.D., Administrative and Policy Studies, Professor,
University of Pittsburgh
Dissertation Co-Director

Copyright © 2005 by Min-Ho Yeom

PROFESSIONALIZATION AND THE REFORM OF TEACHING, TEACHERS, AND
TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA: A
CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Min-Ho Yeom, Ph.D.

University of Pittsburgh, 2005

This study compares how the U.S. education and Korean education reform documents conceptualize teaching, teachers, and teacher education and examines how, if any, the discourses of one country influence those of the other. Attention is given especially to the ways in which reform documents incorporate the ideology of professionalism in framing the problems with teaching, teachers, and teacher education and in proposing the remedies for them.

Eighteen specific reform documents issued by the two countries' governmental and non-governmental organizations at the national level since the 1980s were selected and analyzed by employing critical discourse analysis primarily and interpretative text analysis. Both an inductive and a deductive process were used in order to identify the problems identified, the remedies suggested, and versions of the ideology of professionalism articulated. For a cross-country analysis, a juxtaposition approach was employed to classify the similarities and differences with respect to major themes.

The findings show that there exist some continuing global convergences and a rare case for local divergence to construct reform discourses on teaching, teachers, and teacher education. A few major common themes found when examining the problems identified and the remedies suggested in the two countries are: The insistence of the weakness of pre-service teacher

education; Perpetuation of the image of the teaching occupation as a profession; Extending the length of pre-service teacher education; Increased control; Contesting the idea of teacher autonomy; Failure of the market oriented compensation system; Questioning of differentiating staffing patterns; and Increasing U.S. influence on the Korean education reform. Overall, the way in which the two countries construct educational reform discourse are similar in terms of drawing explicitly on elements from a functionalist (or trait theory) version of the ideology of professionalism. However, the Korean documents put more emphasis on the autonomy of teachers compared to the U.S. documents, where this issue was less visible. Regarding the direction of influence between the U.S. and Korea, Korea shows a tendency to appropriate ideas and move toward a structure and set of practices evidenced in the U.S. at an earlier period.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The last six years have been a period full of challenges, patience, and courage, which I could not have imagined before getting started in the program of Social and Comparative Analysis in Education on the Department of Administrative and Policy Studies at the University of Pittsburgh. I, as an international student, have been a person who must adjust in accordance with a life style, rule, and culture that don't seem to consider the time and experiences I had had in my mother language. Therefore, I had to be born again as a person who could survive in this academic environment or fail. Unfortunately, in considering the language barriers facing me every moment, it never turned out that I would be comfortable with language issues and be able to command English. However, I came to realize that both learning the language and working in second language were not as important as the people in my life who helped me accomplish my goals. I could not make anything of myself without advisors, family, and friends.

Having Prof. Mark B. Ginsburg as my academic/research advisor as well as a co-director of my dissertation committee has been both a great honor and a joy. He has challenged me and guided my studies along the right track as accurately as he could, and supported my taking part in various research projects during my time of study. With his feedback on my study, I could be clear on the ideas, knowledge, and methods I put into it, and I could learn how important having dialogue with colleagues is. I was always nervous and excited whenever I heard his promise that "I am going to read your draft soon" as he was asked to review my manuscripts. From the first stage of incubation of this study to the final stage of my writing, he has read every word I wrote with care and commented on most of it with passion and helped me finalize the dissertation. He has my endless gratitude.

Working with Prof. Clementina Acedo, as a co-director of my dissertation committee, has also been an invaluable experience in considering she encouraged me to push forward to finalize the dissertation along with thoughtful feedback on this study. Also, thanks to the Indonesian secondary case study that I did under her direction in the Secondary Education Case Studies Project, I could learn more about international education reform policy analysis. Prof. Cynthia Coburn gave me insightful feedback to make the argument of the study clear. I had a great learning experience with her when I was involved in the project of reading policy and practice in California at Learning Research and Development Center. With a careful reading, she gave me perceptive guidance to get through the dissertation. Prof. Akiko Hashimoto was a person who gave me a warm encouragement when I faced a hard situation. Taking her class, Global and Comparative Seminar, having the experience to learn various nations' national identification formation and history was a memorable time. Being able to have Prof. David Post on my dissertation committee was serendipitous when Mark made a decision to leave for a Project in Egypt. I am truly honored to have him on my committee.

My friends, Prof. Anthony Petrosky and his wife, Prof. Allen Bishop deserve my full appreciation for this dissertation. In a time of economic difficulties or of deep skepticism about my capabilities, Tony and Allen with brotherhood and friendship gave me great care, helping me to focus on my work. Thanks to their unwavering support, I at least could retain my confidence to work and study without any trouble. My teachers and friends in Chonnam National University and in Munyon in Korea deserve my deep gratitude for encouraging me to study at the University of Pittsburgh. Special thanks go to Prof. Jong Sul Kim, Prof. Hong Gil Lee, Prof. Kyung Soon Lee, Prof. Jee Hun Lee, Prof. Jae Cheol Shin, and Prof. Kyu Chul Ahn whom I admire for guiding me into the world of the global academia.

My special gratitude goes to two friends, Dr. Son Ku Kim and Dr. Yong Sook Park, for their contribution collecting reform documents, proposals, and related research articles. Son Ku used his own time to collect the Korean data I was looking for while he was busy working for the Presidential Commission for Educational Innovation in 2004. Dr. Park, senior researcher specializing in teacher policy and working for the Korean Educational Development Institute, was willing to share valuable materials and articles she had while she was working on the Department of Administrative and Policy Studies at the University of Pittsburgh as a visiting scholar. Moreover, she contributed her time to review my dissertation in order to make sure of the accuracy of translation for particular terms as well the citation of Korean data into English, issues raised by the committee during the Overview defense. Without their cooperation, this study would not be shaped as it is.

My family in Korea, especially my father Kum Sop Yeom, the best man I have ever known, who supported me unconditionally to be a free man as a scholar in this global academia, my two brothers, Tae Hun and Sun Ho, my sister Tok Hee and my brother in law Kyong Rae Son, and my sisters in law deserve my thanks. Their continued supports of my work, both emotional and economic, during the times of difficulty were especially critical. Finally, I have two women I have to give my utmost gratitude to for their endless love for me. My mother, Hyo Shim Kwon, who raised me with compassion and patience but missed confirmation of this product, deserves my respect and love that she could not get during my younger years. I thank my wife Mi Sun Kim, who started enjoying a new life with the great challenge of pursuing a Ph.D. at the University of Pittsburgh. She has wholly shared all the ups and downs of my journey with her extraordinary sincere heart and her diligence. I dedicate this product of my long journey to Mi Sun for keeping my life well balanced over the last twenty five years.

Dedicated to my family and friends and to teachers and teacher educators in Korea and the
United States

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
ACRONYMS	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Problem	1
1.2 A Historical, Social, and Educational Context of the United States of America.....	5
1.3 A Historical, Social, and Educational Context of Korea	11
1.4 The Relations Between the United States and Korea	16
1.5 Problem Statement and Research Questions.....	19
2. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES AND RELATED RESEARCH	21
2.1 Introduction.....	21
2.2 Educational Reform as Framed in Different Paradigms	22
2.2.1 Equilibrium Perspectives on Educational Reform.....	22
2.2.2 Conflict Perspectives on Education Reform	24
2.3 World System Level and Globalization of Educational Reform	27
2.3.1 World System Level Equilibrium Perspective.....	28
2.3.2 World System Level Conflict Perspective	29
2.4 Profession, Professionalization, Deprofessionalization/Proletarianization, and.....	31
Professionalism	31
2.4.1 Profession.....	31
2.4.2 Professionalization	35
2.4.3 Deprofessionalization/Proletarianization	36
2.4.4 Professionalism	38
2.5 Teachers' Work and Status	41
2.5.1 Teaching as a Profession.....	41
2.5.2 The Professionalization of Teaching	43
2.5.3 The Deprofessionalization/Proletarianization of Teaching	45
2.5.4 Professionalism in Teaching.....	47
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	49
3.1 Introduction.....	49
3.2 Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis.....	49
3.2.1 The Meaning of Discourse.....	49
3.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis.....	52
3.2.2 Analytical Framework of Critical Discourse Analysis and Interpretative Text	55
Analysis.....	55
3.3 Selection of Documents	56
3.4 Data Analysis.....	62

4. THE U.S. CASE OF REFORMING TEACHING, TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATION.....	64
4.1 Introduction.....	64
4.2 The Documents.....	64
4.3 Comparisons of Documents.....	97
4.3.1 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the Documents.....	97
4.3.2 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed in the Documents.....	105
4.3.3 Analyzing Some Versions of the Ideology of Professionalism.....	113
5. THE KOREAN CASE OF REFORMING TEACHING, TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATION.....	118
5.1 Introduction.....	118
5.2 The Documents.....	119
5.3 Comparison of Documents.....	153
5.3.1 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the Documents.....	154
5.3.2 Comparison of Remedies Proposed in the Documents.....	161
5.3.3 Analyzing Some Versions of Ideology of Professionalism.....	169
6. CROSS-COUNTRY ANALYSIS.....	174
6.1 Introduction.....	174
6.2 Comparisons of Problems Identified.....	174
6.3 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed.....	182
6.4 Comparison of the Ideologies of Professionalism Presented.....	190
6.5 Cross-Country Influences.....	198
6.6 Summary.....	202
7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	206
7.1 Introduction.....	206
7.2 Summary of the Problem, Conceptual Issues, and Methodology.....	206
7.3 Summary of Findings and Implications for Policy Makers: Global Convergence versus Local Divergence.....	213
APPENDIX A.....	227
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	229

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Key Documents Selected for Primary Sources.....	61
Table 2 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the U.S. Documents.....	103
Table 3 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed in the U.S. Documents.....	111
Table 4 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the Korean Documents.....	159
Table 5 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed in the Korean Documents.....	167
Table 6 Comparisons of Problems Identified Between USA and Korea.....	180
Table 7 Comparisons of Remedies Suggested Between USA and Korea.....	188
Table 8 Comparisons of Ideology of Professionalism Incorporated Between USA and Korea.....	197

ACRONYMS

ACDE Australian Council of Deans of Education

AFT American Federation of Teachers

CTFTP Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession

DOE U.S. Department of Education

INTASC Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium

KEDI Korean Educational Development Institute

KFTA Korean Federation of Teachers' Association

KTU Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union

KUTE Korean Union of Teaching and Educational Workers

MOE Ministry of Education

MOEHRD Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development

NBPTS National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

NCATE National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

NCEE National Commission on Excellence in Education

NCES National Center for Educational Statistics

NCLB No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

NCTAF National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

NEA National Education Association

OECD Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

PACER Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Policy

PCNEC Presidential Commission for New Education Community

PCER Presidential Commission on Education Reform

PDS Professional Development Schools

SCNCM Special Committee for National Security Measures

UNDP United Nations Development Program

USMGIK United States Military Government in Korea

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Educational reform has periodically been a major focus of rhetoric and sometimes action in many countries around the world; often such reform efforts have highlighted the need to develop the knowledge, skill, and attitudes of youth to become “good” citizens and “productive” workers (Ginsburg et al., 1991a, 1991b; Guthrie, 1990; Lee, 2003; Popkewitz, 1991; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993; Sadovnik et al., 2002; Shin, 1995; Slavin, 1989). Moreover, at least in recent years educational reform discourses appearing in documents in many countries often identify teaching, teachers, and teacher education as the problem and then offer proposed solutions to change them. The solutions identified in recent years include the increase of teacher professionalism and the professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education.

In particular, the agenda to professionalize teaching, teachers, and teacher education has been evident in the United States (the Carnegie Task Force, 1986; the Holmes Group, 1986, 1990; the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future [NCTAF], 1996) and in the Republic of Korea (hereafter Korea, the Korean Teachers’ and Educational Workers’ Union [KTU], 2002; the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development [MOEHRD], 2001; Presidential Commissions for Education Reform, 1987, 1992, 1995, 2000). However, one can recognize a similar agenda around the world over years articulated in various educational reform documents (see Gore & Morrison, 2001; Hargreaves, 2000).

In the United States, during the 1980s, proposed changes in teaching, teachers, and teacher education were framed in terms of increasing the quality of teachers’ professional attitudes as behavior and raising their professional status. Even though academic debate over

whether or not teaching is a profession dominated the field in the 1960s and the 1970s (Covert, 1975; Jackson, 1970), an increased attention on “teacher professionalism” was at the heart of the reform agenda in the 1980s (Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989; Labaree, 1992a, 1992b, 1995). Spurred by the release of *Nation at Risk* (1983) by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), the status of teachers has received more widespread attention with the publication of the school and teacher education reports of *A Nation Prepared* by Carnegie Forum (1986) and *Tomorrow’s Teachers* by the Holmes Group (1986).

In the 1990s, with the report, *Tomorrow’s School* by the Holmes Group (1990), the educational reform discourses that appeared in reform documents emphasized the need to improve processes of teaching and learning, the school environment, and especially the quality and status of teachers (Sadovnik et al., 2002) and the report *What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future* (1996) by the NCTAF considered important documents to influence professionalization of teacher education by setting standards created by the profession to guide education, entry into the field, and ongoing practice (NCTAF, 1997, p.63). Moreover, various reform reports issued by nationally recognized and respected commissions and organizations have emphasized “quality teachers” as the most important variable in student learning (*No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* [NCLB], 2001) and have suggested numerous recommendations for improving the quality and effectiveness of teacher education programs (the American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2000; the U.S. Department of Education [DOE], 1999).

Since the 1980s the quality of teaching, teachers, and teacher education and the status of teachers have also been major issues for educational reform discourse in Korea. In fact, reforming teaching, teachers, and teacher education is not new. Many reform efforts in Korea have attempted to produce better teachers in the name of increasing teacher “professionalism.”

The term “professionalism” or the agenda of the “professionalization” of teaching, teachers, and teacher education has remained one of major elements in educational reform documents by both governmental and nongovernmental organizations, which serve to guide and influence policy and practice in education, teaching, teachers, and teacher education in Korea.

However, the key terms of teacher professionalism and professionalization have not been given much attention until recent reform proposals by the MOEHRD (2001) and the KTU (2002) were issued, although the terms have been a part of educational reform discourses during the past two decades. The recent reform documents publicly declared teaching as a “profession” and have identified various measures for increasing teachers’ “professionalism” (KTU, 2002; MOEHRD, 2001).

In the field of comparative international education studies, there is ample evidence of transnational knowledge transfer about educational reform efforts among the core countries (Bidwell & Kazamias, 1962; Davies & Guppy, 1997; Gaffield, 1994; Heidenheimer, 1974; Peterson, 1973; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993) and between the core and the periphery countries (Arnove, 1980; Clayton, 1998; Ginsburg et al., 1991; Samoff, 1993). Some studies have illuminated this trend by investigating how the Korean education system has been influenced by the US education theories and practices (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993; Kim, 1974; Kim, 1982; Lee, Adams, & Cornbleth, 1988; Yoo, 1983). However, few comparative studies have explained how teaching, teachers, and teacher education have been conceptualized with regard to the notion of professionalism in educational reform documents issued in both countries.

At least during the last two decades, notions of professionalism in teaching and professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education, which have been well represented in the advanced industrialized “core” or “center” societies (e.g., North America and

Western Europe), have been transferred to or appropriated by the so-called ‘developing’ or semi-periphery or periphery countries (Clayton, 1998; Elliott, 1999; Ginsburg et al., 1991). Such an educational reform discourses often function as a source model for national education reform programs or agendas elsewhere in the world (Gottlieb, 1988, p. 317). In line with cultural as well as economic and political globalization (Burbules & Torres, 2000; McGinn, 1996; Martin, 1991; Morrow & Torres, 2000; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993; Wirt & Harman, 1986), educational reform discourses in one societal context may circulate to or be appropriated through various ways in another country, even if the context is different culturally, educationally, economically, and politically (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993; Clayton, 1998; Ginsburg et al., 1991a; Lee, Adams, & Cornbleth, 1988). This phenomenon has been characterized by a certain degree of convergence in educational ideology, educational practices, and educational structure across countries.

Among the research done, a critical approach, exploring what is meant by the terms “professionalism” and “professionalization” and what implications the terms have for the teaching occupation and teacher education, has received little attention in the United States (see Densmore, 1997; Ginsburg & Chaturvedi, 1988; Ginsburg, 1996; Popkewitz, 1991) and even less in Korea. In fact, the large amount of attention has been paid to a technical approach of how to address issues around the terms and how to develop them for teaching, teachers, and teacher education (see Darling-Hammond, 1990, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1995; Hargreaves, 2000; Kim, 1998; Kwag, 1998; Kwag, 2001; Park, 2001; Roh, 2003; Song, 2001; Yang, 2000). Moreover, considering that the way in which the issues to reform teaching, teachers, and teacher education were framed using these terms might be different across documents from country to country and over time (Ginsburg & Chaturvedi, 1988; Ginsburg, 1996; Gottlieb, 1991; Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1988; Labaree, 1992b; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993), comparisons of the discourses

will contribute to understanding the way in which the two countries frame the issues of teacher professionalism and what relationship exists between the two countries with respect to transferring knowledge of education reform.

The following sections offer brief accounts of the historical, social, and educational contexts in the United States and in Korea in the 20th century as well as the relations between these two societies since the end of the 19th century. These are important not only to get a general picture of educational changes but also to understand modern educational reform efforts which have taken place in the two countries.

1.2 A Historical, Social, and Educational Context of the United States of America

The United States, founded in 1776 from British colonies, plays an enormous role both in shaping the world today with respect to economic, political, and cultural dimensions (Strikwerda, 2000). The United States is the world's foremost economic and military power and is also a major source of entertainment (BBCNEWS, 2004a, p. 1). The US market is home to around 4 percent of the world's population, approximately 273 million people, and comprises 50 states and 1 federal district ("USA Country profile", 2004, p. 1). Ethnic and racial diversity, sometimes called the "melting pot," is celebrated as a core element of the American ideology. The 1964 Civil Right Act outlawed racial and other discrimination, but race and ethnicity continue to be divisive issues. Despite relative prosperity in the 1990s, the gap between rich and poor is a major challenge. More than 30 million Americans live below the official poverty line, with a disproportionate percentage of these being members African-American and Hispanic racial/ethnic groups (BBCNEWS, 2004a, p. 1).

During the 20th century the United States was involved in many international military operations, including two World Wars, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. During World

War I (1914-1918), with American and USSR's help, Great Britain, France, and Italy won the war against Germany. Also, America's active involvement in World War II (1939-1945) was vital to the allies' victory against Japan, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany. During the Korean War (1950-1953), US forces played a leading role against North Korea supported by USSR and Chinese troops and in 1973 the Vietnam ceasefire agreement was signed and the campaign had claimed some 58,000 American lives (BBC NEWS, 2004a, pp. 3-4).

During most of 1920s the United States enjoyed a period of unbalanced prosperity: prices for agricultural commodities and wages fell at the end of war, while new industries, including radio, movies, automobiles, and chemicals flourished. At the end of 1920s and during the 1930s, the United States experienced severe economic depression, marked by punishing levels of unemployment, negligible investment, and falling prices and wages ("History of the United States", 2004, p. 3).

Since the end of World War II, the United States has been at the center of the world history. According to Wallerstein's world system theory, capitalist leadership shifted from Italy to Spain to the Netherlands to Britain and to the United States (Strikwerda, 2000). For example, "in 1992, as measured by market value, 12 of the world's top 25 corporations were U.S.- based firm ... [I]n percentage terms, this means that approximately 50% of the world's top corporations are located in the United States" (Corbridge, 1997, p.300 cited in Spring, 1998, p. 121). But the hegemony of the United States in the world's economic and political order was challenged to an extent by the legacy of its "defeat" in Vietnam (Martin, 1991, p. 346).

In education, Progressive Education Movements have been evident in the 1930s and 1940s and as well as in the 1960s and 1970s (Martin, 1991, p. 342). In the early 20th century, the United States introduced major concepts affecting world level education that included vocational

guidance, vocational education, standardized testing, ability grouping, and tracking in high school. The vision was a corporate state where schools educated students for specialized work roles (see Newman, 1998; Spring, 1998). In fact, the United States is one of major sources for the free market and human capital concepts incorporated into the educational reform policies taking place around the world (see Spring, 1998, pp. 120-157). In this regard, government involvement in education has something to do with achieving economic goals.

The United States has achieved almost universal access to education at the primary level and enrollment at the secondary level is quite high. For example, the proportion of children aged five to 17 enrolled in school has grown steadily, from 72 percent at the turn of the last century [nineteenth century] to 91.7 percent in 1995-96 (Fiske & O'Grady, 2000). And in 2000, 84.1 percent of the population had a high school diploma or at least some higher, compared with 75.2 percent in 1990 (US Department of Education, 2004, p.8). The U.S. public school system is huge. In the year 2000, the U.S spent roughly \$314 billion on education. The school system included 5.4 million employees (2.7 million of which were teachers) and 46 million students (Long & Riegle, 2002, p. 147).

There are two key characteristics that significantly influence the American education system: (1) the highly decentralized governance system and (2) the increasing diversity of the student population. According to Conway et al. (2002, pp. 81-108), the decentralized governance structure has 15,000 school districts, almost all with their own curriculum and instruction, evaluation and research, human resource, and professional development units. The diverse ethnic background of student shows marked geographic differences. The majority of rural areas consist of white students, while most student diversity occurs in urban and suburban settings. In 1976, twenty four percent of the students in US schools were non-whites, that is, not

of European origin. However, by 1984, twenty nine percent were non-white, and by the year 2020 they were predicted to be about forty six percent (Gage & Berliner, 1998 cited in Conway at al., 2002, pp. 84-85). Moreover, poverty in the United States is one of big issues for children's education (see Kozol, 1991). For example, nearly 20 percents of U.S. children are in poverty. So, scholars and policy makers contend that poor-student academic performance in the United States results of socioeconomic conditions, such as poverty or inadequate parenting, not by the fault of education system (Berliner & Biddle, 1996; Long & Riegle, 2000, p. 144).

At present, the chief characteristic of American teacher education is precisely the same one as for its public school system in general, that is, its extreme diversity and decentralization (Long & Riegle, 2002, p. xv). During the 2001-02 academic year, 4,197 accredited institutions offered degrees at the associate degree level or above. These included 2,364 four-year colleges and universities, and 1,833 two-year colleges Institutions awarding various degrees in 2000-01 numbered 2,580 for associate degrees, 2,009 for bachelor's degrees, 1,508 for master's degrees, and 544 for doctor's degrees; of these, 1149 institutions offered education degree, 944 offered at least a master's degree in education, 249 offered doctoral degree in education (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2004, table 243, table 258). Sixty percent of teacher preparation institutions are private, thirty seven percent are public institutions that receive substantial financial support from state, and three percent are for-profit institutions. While public institutions make up a smaller share of the teacher preparation programs in the nation, their graduates account for seventy four percent of newly trained teacher in the United States. Another twenty five percent graduates from private nonprofit institutions, while just one percent graduates from for-profit institutions. The 243 higher education institutions with total

enrollments greater than 18,000 students account for forty six percent of all newly trained teachers (Feistritz & Chester, 1999 cited in US department of Education, 2004, p. 31).

Regarding educational reform, the 1980s and 1990s were decades of significant debate and reform in U.S. education. In particular, while the 1960s and 1970s were marked by a push for more equity in schools, with attacks on racial segregation and class-based tracking (Labaree, 1992, p.129), the last two decades reflected more business concerns for excellence and relevant preparation for the world of work (Spring, 1998, p. 151). Beginning in 1983, with the National Commission on Educational Excellence's report *A Nation at Risk*, government leaders, educational reformers, teacher organizations, administrators, and various other interest groups attempted to improve the quality of U.S. students and schools for the global labor market. The decade included two specific waves of reform, the first beginning in 1983 was concerned primarily with the issue of accountability and achievement, and the second beginning in 1985 targeted the structure and processes of the schools themselves. Both waves, however, can be understood as a conservative response to the progressive reforms of the 1960s and 1970s (Sadovnik, 2002).

The use of educational reform policies for a free market creates a situation where the individual worker is emphasized by the state in the interest of the marketplace, though the blend of free market economics, religion (Christianity) and nationalism was central to the education efforts of the Reagan administration in the 1980s (Spring, 1998). In the 1990s, a common theme of Bush and Clinton administrations was raising academic standards. Here "standards fit into a model of educational achievement based on competition similar to economic competition" (Spring, 1998, p. 138). In sum, the major trend, mainly reflecting a conservative perspective was in emphasizing national control of the curriculum and academic standards and assessment to

increase academic competition and performance in a global arena (see Spring, 1998, pp. 138-152).

The terrain of US educational reform is complex and fluid, yet patterned. Conway et al. (2002, pp.83-108) identify five significant and interrelated and often contradictory trends in educational reform in the United States. They are: (1) the prominence of neo-liberal policies that drive school reform via beliefs in the power and primacy of market forces, for example, the movements for increased assessments and choices in US schools (charter schools and vouchers); (2) the move toward systems approaches to educational reform, for example, curriculum frameworks, alignment of state education policies, and schools' access to greater resources, flexibility, and responsibility through a restructured governance system; (3) the increasing recognition of teachers' mediation role in the change process, for example, seeing teachers as central agents in implementing innovations in the classroom; (4) the central role accorded assessment, not merely as an indicator of change but as a lever for change, for example, standards-based accountability systems; and (5) enduring struggles surrounding equity, given the documented inequities in district finance and educational achievement between various ethnic groups in the United States.

With respect to the agenda of the professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education, a professional model has been paid attention and developed over the past decades at the national level (see Sykes & Plastrik, 1993). The most prominent "professionalization" reforms include a) the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), which is creating a process for voluntary, advanced certification of teachers; b) the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) of the Council of Chief State School Officers, which is developing national guidelines for the reform of state licensure;

c) the PRAXIS series developed by the Educational Testing Service for teacher licensure; and d) the recent and ongoing reforms of the policies and procedures of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Also, expanding education period, for example, developing a graduate professional program or taking a five-year teacher education program, has been recommend in order to construct a genuine “profession” of teaching (US Department of Education, 2004, p.31)

1.3 A Historical, Social, and Educational Context of Korea

Korea’s modern history of economic, political, and educational development can be understood in relation to its experience of Japanese colonial rule (1910-1945); the division of the nation into South Korea controlled by the United States and North Korea controlled by the USSR (1945-1948); and the Korean War (1950-1953) that cost two million lives, destroyed much infrastructure, and consolidated two countries (see Adams & Gottlieb, 1993; Lee, 1997; Shin & Robinson, 1999). Korea has about the same number of people as but is half the size of England; Korea’s population was 47.6 million in 2002 and a territory of about 98,480 square kilometers (The World Bank, 2004). Today, Korea can be considered to have a democratic political system, but only after two military coups and several popular rebellions. Korea has enjoyed a greater degree of democracy since 1997, when was the first completely peaceful transfer of power in Korean history (Seth, 2002, p. 234). Nevertheless, the historic handshake in Pyongyang, North Korea in 2000, coming after five decades of hostility, the demilitarized zone between South and North Korea remains the world’s most heavily fortified border (BBCNEWS, 2004b, p. 1).

Korean achievements differ from that of most other developing nations in the sequential nature of its development. The United Nations Development Program ranks Korea as a country

of “high human development,” higher than 80 percent of the 162 listed countries (see UNDP, 2002). Particularly, Korea’s pursuit of education clearly contributed to its industrial transformation from the position it held in 1960 as one of the world’s poorest nations to its membership in 1996 in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an organization of industrially advanced states (Seth, 2002, p. 3). For example, in 1945, when the Japanese rule in Korea ended, the majority of adult Koreans were illiterate. Mass primary education had only recently begun, and less than five percent of the adult population had more than primary school education. The rate of literacy was ninety eight percent in 2000, and enrollment and graduation rates are admirable high at secondary as well as university levels. In 2000, 83.9 percent of Korea’s high school graduates entered a university or college, while almost all children had at least a high school diploma. Among a total 372 higher education institutions, there are 158 two-year junior colleges, and 161 four- year universities, 11 four-year teachers’ universities, and other types of four- year institutions (MOE & KEDI, 2000).

The school system is outwardly very similar to that of the United States, providing six years of primary education, three years of middle school, and three years of high school, followed by two or four more years of college or technical school (MOE, 1994, p.49). The average primary school class in 1996 had 36 pupils, while the average secondary school class had 48. The MOEHRD is seeking reduce these sizes to 30 for primary school in 2010 and 24 for secondary schools in 2020, bringing them closer to classroom sizes in Western Europe. University student-faculty ratios fared worse in comparison, averaging 34:1 in four-year universities, in contrast to 8.4 students per faculty members in Britain and 9.9 students per professor in Japan (Seth, 2002, pp. 235-236).

Until 1962, elementary school teachers were trained at secondary-level normal schools. Selected normal schools were upgraded to two-year post-secondary education institutions in 1962. During 1981-4 these two-year training institutions were upgraded to four-year colleges, granting the first degree (B.A.) to graduates preparing to become elementary school teachers (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993, p. 67). Secondary school teachers are trained at colleges of education including the Korea National University of Education, department of education in general colleges and universities with teaching certificate programs and graduate school of education (MOE, 1996, p. 96). In 2001, there were 13 teacher education institutions for elementary school teachers and 41 teacher education institutions, 33 department of education of general colleges, 126 university teacher training course, 328 graduate school of education for secondary school teachers (MOE, 2001 cited in Koo, 2002, p. 260).

The Korean educational system is highly centralized one, originally designed to ensure dissemination of, and compliance with, the rules and regulations established by MOE (see Adams & Gottlieb, 1993, pp. 43-67; MOE, 1996, pp. 48-74). After the military coup of 16 May 1961, local educational autonomy as well as local government autonomy did not exist until 1991 (Yeom, 1992). Now the central government has tried to transfer its power to local governments and local educational authorities (Park, 2003), but the long-standing of centralized experiences seem to be not easy to create what the government wants. The central government still has power to control curriculum so the curriculum is essentially uniformed throughout the country. Also the government has power to control teacher certification and compile and approve textbooks. The government spelled out detailed regulations or controls for all schools, public and private.

The other thing demonstrating rapidly changing Korean society in the 1990s is that the emergence of independent labor unions and a number of viable citizen groups advocating social and political change (Kim, 1996). Among them the legalization of the teachers' union in 1999 marked a great achievement for Korean democratization. Since then, teachers have become more involved in policy making and the political system has become more responsive to public opinion, so it appears that the state has less control over education that it had in the past (Park, 2001; Seth, 2002, p. 255).

Another big issue in Korean education and society is private tutoring (see Lee, 2003, pp. 81-83). Private tutoring operates to prepare students for super competitive examinations, especially the university entrance examination, held at the end of senior high school. Since the feverish competition for entry into the best colleges did not let up in the 1990s and the nation became more affluent, the demand for and expense of after-school instruction only rose (Seth, 2002, p. 187). The total amount of spending on private tutoring and its proportion in the GNP over the last two decades shows that private spending has increased drastically (Han, 1999, p. 9). This has not only placed a great burden on most families, but has also caused various distortions in the economy and has generated tension between egalitarian ideals and the reality of discrepancies in wealth and financial resources (Seth, 2002, p. 254). For example, half of the all students of elementary school age were enrolled in private English-language schools in 1997, although only 4 percent had been in 1990. According to a 1998 MOE study, the amount of money spent on private lessons to prepare students for the higher education entrance exam rose 70 percent from 1994 to 1997. When tutoring was included, parents and students absorbed 69 percent of the cost of education and Korea spent as much as 12 percent of its GNP on education (Seth, 2002, p. 188). In reality, the cost of education is much greater than even these figures

suggest, because the cost of private tutoring is very hard to estimate since a great deal of it lies outside the formal economy.

Even though Korea is recognized for its economic achievements during the last half century, Korean education reform efforts have been perceived by the public since the 1980s as making conditions worse (Shin, 1995), in part because they are seen as having lack of relevance and having been influenced by a global neo-liberal economic paradigm (see Chun & Kim, 1998, pp. 56-85). Considering the fact that Koreans complained about the inadequacy of the nation's schooling, reform efforts before 1995 by the government included mainly technical approaches to solving educational problems attributed to social issues, such as how to eliminate private tutoring, how to change instruction based on rote memorization or how to merge departments in universities or increase university enrollment (Shin, 1995).

However, *Education Reform for a New Education System Leading Toward a Globalization and Information Era* released in 1995 by PCER differed a little from previous reform efforts in framing the issues and strategies. It is a very comprehensive and all-encompassing measure of education reform under the slogan of constructing a new education system in which: a) everyone can receive the kind of education he or she wants anywhere, anytime and b) the maximum cultivation of individual aptitude and ability is possible (PCER, 1995). It adopted market principles in education, for example, introducing private high schools, called self-financed schools, and as such required an overhaul of the entire education system from the users' perspective. However, it was criticized by some stakeholders, since the reform was heavily dependent upon a trend of neo-liberalism in Korean economic policy, focusing on privatization decentralization. From the neo-liberal perspective market mechanisms can solve educational and social problems caused by a centralized and bureaucratic system, which others

consider to be the driving force that led to the current achievements in Korea (Chun & Kim, 1995, pp. 57-61).

1.4 The Relations Between the United States and Korea

Korea's relations with the United States have been most extensive and intense since 1948 (see Adams & Gottlieb, 1993, pp.17-19, 97-105; Lee, 1997, pp. 171-181; Yoo, 1983). This relation was perhaps inevitable because Korea was primarily established by the United States and was received United Nations-backed support from the United States from a total collapse during the Korean War (The Library of Congress, 1990, p.1; BBCNEWS, 2004b, p. 1). Over the last five decades Korea came off age economically, politically, and even militarily. With this achievement, by the 1990s Korea was seeking to establish a partnership for progress ("The Library of Congress", 1990, p. 1), but Korea still seems to be very dependent on the United States economically. For example, the United States is Korea's largest export market, second-largest source of import, and largest supplier of foreign direct investment (Manyin, 2002, p. 1).

The official relationship between the United States and Korea started with signing the Korean American Trade Treaty in 1882 and ended November 24, 1905, when the United State recognized the Japanese Protectorate over Korea (see Burnett, 1989; Lee, 1997, pp. 129-130). During that period of time, American civilians played a pivotal role in Korean affairs. American missionaries not only built churches, but also established schools, colleges, hospitals, and orphanages (Yoo, 1983). Also, American entrepreneurs and engineers played a very important role at the end of nineteenth century. For example, in 1896 a financial firm represented by the American James R. Morse was given a contract to build Korea's first railroad, running from Seoul to Incheon (Lee, 1997, p. 130).

After the end of the Japanese colonial rule in 1945, the United States came back to Korea and Korea was deeply influenced by the United State Military Government in Korea (USMGIK), which ruled the country until 1948. According to Adams & Gottlieb (1993, pp. 93-101), during the period of the USMGIK, at least three types of new or expanded transnational networks between the United States and Korea emerged: (a) institution-building through the U.S. technical assistance, (b) direct technical assistance by the U.S. advisors, and (c) higher education of Koreans in the United States.

Since then, the United States has deeply influenced in education system as well as economic and military affairs in Korea (see Yoo, 1983). For example, during the Korean War (1950-1953), the United States and other UN forces intervened to defend South Korea from North Korean attacks supported by the Chinese and currently the United States maintains some 37,000 troops in South Korea (BBCNEWS, 2004b). Also, following the Agreement on Economic Co-ordination, signed by the United States and the Republic of Korea in May 1952, direct U.S. aid contributed considerably to the construction of educational facilities. For the next decade, Korea received a massive infusion of American aid that became one of the main sources of government revenue and stimuli for economic development. From 1953 to 1962 about \$2 billion in nonmilitary aid was given to Korea by the US, an amount equal to about 8 percent of Korea's GNP, financing 70 percent of Korea's imports (Mason et al, 1980, pp. 165-205). Currently, the United States absorbs up to half the nation's exports although this figure declined steadily in the 1980s through 1990s. Nevertheless, after Japan, the United States is Korea's most important source of foreign investment and technical cooperation (Seth, 2002, p. 226).

An early influence on Korean education with regard to teaching, teachers, and teacher education was found in a series of education missions to Korea underwritten by the U.S. State

Department and contracted by Unitarian Service Committee, Inc. during 1952-1955. The first mission's contribution was in introducing a life-centered curriculum movement, advising on the establishment of a democratic education administration system, and guiding or reforming teaching methods (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993, p.100; Yoo, 1983, p.9). The second mission from September 1953 to June 1954 focused on in-service teacher training, exposing teachers to Western professional educators and to new ways of teaching. In 1953, a U.S. educational mission worked with the MOE to launch a three-year project for in-service training; by the end of 1955, 18,300 out of 59,365 teachers had participated (Korean Commission for UNESCO, 1960, p. 146 cited in Seth, 2002, p. 85). In 1954, the MOE announced a plan to upgrade all teachers' school to two-year colleges (Tonga ilbo, 1954 cited in Seth, 2002, p. 85). All most all Korean leading educators at this time participated in these training (Yoo, 1983, p. 9). During this time, the Korean government prepared a national curriculum which was made effective from 1955 (Lee, 1986, p. 233). The third mission included assistance in (1) developing instrument to measure the academic achievement of Korean students; (2) curriculum planning and preparing textbooks; (3) planning in-service teacher training programs; and (4) designing programs for upgrading the professional knowledge of administrators. Between 1956 and 1962 a faculty team from George Peabody College of Education continued to provide technical aid to reform teacher education and to the preparation of educational administration (see Adams & Gottlieb, 1993, pp. 100-101; Yoo, 1983, p.9).

Moreover, through various scholarships Korean received to study in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s, hundreds of American-trained scholars staffed the research institutes and education departments at Korean universities and served in the MOE. For example, by the 1970s the MOE and the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), a research institute

designed to advise the MOE, were virtually dominated by US-trained educational experts. The U.S. trained experts often pushed for more American-style reforms (Lee, 1986; Seth, 2002, pp. 93-96). Therefore, Korea is known as a country where knowledge and practice transferred from the United States have deeply influenced in Korean educational theories, models, and methods, which sometimes share little with Korea in terms of cultural heritage, historical experience, developmental stage, or economic and political conditions (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993, p. 97). According to Adams & Gottlieb (1993, pp. 97-98) and Lee (1986), Korea has become increasingly dependent on importing knowledge and Korean education is linked to the United States as part of a transnational knowledge system in which the core countries are engaged in producing new knowledge while peripheral countries are mainly consumers of knowledge produced elsewhere.

1.5 Problem Statement and Research Questions

In this study I analyze and compare how the two countries' educational reform documents conceptualize teaching, teachers, and teacher education with regard to the ideology of professionalism and how they draw on different versions of the ideology of professionalism. More specifically, this study seeks to address the following questions:

- 1) What problems about teaching and teacher education are identified in selected reform documents in the United States and Korea?
- 2) What remedies are proposed to deal with these problems?
- 3) How, if at all, do such documents draw explicitly or implicitly on some versions of the ideology of professionalism in framing the problems about and in proposing the remedies for teaching and teacher education?

- 4) How similar and/or different are the discourses presented in documents within each country and between countries with respect to the problems identified, the remedies proposed, and the version of ideology of professionalism articulated?
- 5) What evidence do the documents provide that indicate the problems, remedies, and version of the ideologies of professionalism presented have been influenced by rhetoric and action based in the other country or other countries?

2. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES AND RELATED RESEARCH

2.1 Introduction

Extensive rhetoric and activity identified as “educational reform” has been taking place across countries over time, but the practices, purposes, and consequences of “educational reform” may be treated and/or interpreted differently according to various theoretical approaches or different local, national, international levels (Ginsburg et al., 1991). In this chapter, with an assumption that educational reform is a phenomenon occurring in economic, cultural, and political contexts (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Conway, Goodell, & Carl, 2002; Ginsburg et al., 1991a; Griffin, 2002; Gumbert, 1985, Merritt & Coombs, 1977; Paulston, 1977), I first discuss the nature of “educational reform” based on approaches developed within equilibrium and conflict paradigms. I also discuss how education reforms can be understood as dynamics occurring not only within nation-state but also at the levels of the world system (Clayton, 1998; Ginsburg et al., 1991; Inkels & Siroway, 1984; Ramirez & Bennett, 1982; Strikwerda, 2002; Wallerstein, 1974) and globalization (Burbules & Torres, 2000, Kellner, 2000; Strikwerda, 2002; Tikly, 1999). Finally, I discuss the terms of profession, professionalization, deprofessionalization/proletarianization, and professionalism with different perspectives for analyzing those terms both as concept and practices and as an occupation/work. Drawing upon a review of theoretical, policy-oriented, and case studies, I discuss the way in which teaching has been defined and classified with these key terms and how these terms are related to structural features of teaching occupation.

2.2 Educational Reform as Framed in Different Paradigms

The analysis of “educational reform” may be grounded in both equilibrium and/or conflict paradigms¹ and may be focused on national and world system level dynamics (Clayton, 1998; Ginsburg et al., 1991; Ginsburg & Cooper, 1991; Martin, 1991; Merritt & Coombs, 1977; Paulston, 1977; Simmons, 1983).

2.2.1 Equilibrium Perspectives on Educational Reform

The basic assumption of equilibrium theories is that change² in a system is an orderly process which can occur either by an adaptation of new or existing elements to the system in need of repair, or a relatively harmonious progression of evolutionary stages towards greater differentiation and specialization of the different parts of the system (Sack, 1981). For example, functionalist theory, representing the equilibrium perspective, is concerned especially with the conditions that maintain social order and stability and was pioneered by the classical sociologist Emile Durkheim. The most famous versions of this approach is the structural functionalist theory of Talcott Parsons in the United States (Morrow & Torres, 1995, p. 20).

According to the assumption of the equilibrium paradigm, education is changed because the needs of modern, industrialized, and urbanized society are not being fulfilled by the existing organization, content, and processes of education (Ginsburg et al., 1991, pp. 9-10). The education system, as part of a larger homeostatic and consensual social system, is seen to evolve

¹ Kuhn (1971) defines paradigms as the way a scientific/professional community views a field of study, identifies appropriate problems for study, and specifies legitimate concepts and methods.

² Educational reforms may focus on changes in the following aspects of education systems: a) size or number of students, teachers, administrators, and buildings; b) goals and objectives; c) policy making and the administrative and/or managerial system or power structure; d) the financing and budget making process; e) the level of funding; f) system organization: the types, statuses, and levels of, as well as links and ages of transition between, educational institutions; g) the curriculum: content and organization of what is taught; h) pedagogy: social relations of teaching and learning; i) the selection, evaluation, and promotion criteria and procedures for students; and j) the selection, evaluation, and promotion criteria for educational workers (teachers, administrators, etc.) (Ginsburg et al., 1991a, p. 5).

as society evolves or to adapt as functional incompatibilities or dysfunctions arise (Archer, 1979). This means that more and more individuals and groups are making demands up on the education system and these demands for changes and institutional efforts to meet those demands produce educational reform (Merritt & Coombs, 1977). In other words, as societies become “modern” and “rational” their needs change, and educational systems must adjust to this change (Ginsburg et al, 1991, p. 10).

In this regard, educational reform denotes simply an attempt to change things for the better. Such a broad notion of educational reform, according to Merritt & Coombs (1977, pp. 254-257), implies a great variety of specific measures: correcting abuses; enhancing efficiency; improving effectiveness; reforming the policy process; accommodating new groups; reforming goals. Largely, educational reforms are in the direction of accomplishing greater efficiency in the educational system with respect to some particular outcomes considered relevant for economic development (Merritt & Coombs, 1977; Sack, 1981, p. 41).

Even when change is examined, the focus is on how equilibrium is reestablished or how aspects of society evolve to better forms. Researchers adopting functionalist perspectives, in turn, believe that change/reform in education must be understood as progressive movements toward higher states of societal development, which attempts to respond to societal needs or system imbalances (Paulston, 1977, 1983). In this regard, educational reform has often been conceived in terms of permanent evolution and progress, which involves incremental adjustments in the system within given structure, purpose, and normative framework of educational institutions and systems (Buchert, 1998; Espinoza, 2002; Neave, 1988). Paulston (1977, p. 28) illustrates the structural-functionalist variant of an equilibrium perspective when he says that education reform:

follows five steps: (1) a need arises in society; (2) the school is assigned the task of meeting the need; (3) change in the educational structure take place to accommodate the new function; (4) the new role is assumed by the schools; (5) latent and manifest changes take place in society as a consequence of the new educational functions.

From equilibrium perspective, the analyses of educational reforms tend to focus on the efficiency of the educational system, hoping to increase it in one way or another (Paulston, 1977; Sack, 1981). Merritt and Coombs (1977, p. 247) provide an example of this approach in explaining why “education in Europe and North America changed from a cottage industry into a gigantic, highly bureaucratized enterprise” and then clarifying that “the growth of capital-intensive industry meant a great need for workers with such basic skills as reading, writing and arithmetic. National leaders... also realized the need for men who could handle the increasingly complicated technologies and tactics of warfare.”

2.2.2 Conflict Perspectives on Education Reform

Conflict theories,³ in contrast, “emphasize the inherent instability of social systems and the conflicts over values, resources, and power that follow as a natural consequence” (Paulston, 1976, p. 7). According to the conflict paradigm (Apple, 1986; Carnoy & Levin, 1986; Ginsburg et al., 1991; Paulston, 1977; Popkewitz, 1988; Sack, 1981), change or non-change is the result of the confrontation between groups involved in the conflict over resources and control of the system. From a conflict perspective educational change occurs through conflict and competition between social class, ethnic, national, religious, and gender groups, whose interests are incompatible or when structural contradictions (e.g., in the economy) are not being successfully mediated.

Ginsburg et al. (1991a, p. 27) state that:

³ Conflict theories include neo-Marxist theories, analytical conflict theories, and critical theory (Morrow & Torres, 1995).

at the world system and national levels the social formation is inherently conflict-laden and characterized by fundamental contradictions. Different nations, classes, ethnic/racial groups, and gender groups occupy different positions in extant relations of domination and subordination. Thus, because of this and because of the contradictory dynamics within the economy, the state, and education, there are always groups who would like to or are trying to restructure education to serve better their interests. At any time there are likely to be various groups (both inside and outside of education) expressing different criticism about education and articulating the “reforms” that should be implemented.

Within conflict approaches, one can contrast Weberian or status group conflict models (e.g., Archers 1979; Banks, 1987), which give primacy to cultural spheres, and Marxist class/imperialist conflict models that emphasize economic relations. According to Ginsburg et al. (1991, pp. 31-32), the Weberian approaches tend to analyze educational reform in terms of struggles between ethnic/racial or economic status groups based on competition for scarce resources, e.g., educational credentials, but also jobs, income or wealth, status, and political power. Although Marxist approaches also attend to struggle, more emphasis is given to structural contradictions in the economy, ideology, and the state, and the focus is not so much on the distribution of resources as on exploitation, alienation, and control over the means of production.

From Marxist perspective (Apple, 1986; Carnoy, 1982; Ginsburg et al., 1991a), the state and other superstructural institutions mediate contradictions in the economic base of society, and, as a result of this, education and the state in capitalist societies contain contradictions as well. It is important to clarify that from Marxist perspective educational reform efforts are not some natural evolutionary development or functionally necessitated adaptive response to the “need” of the capitalist political economy (Ginsburg, 1991 et al., p. 11). Rather the contradictions within and between the economy and superstructural institutions, such as the state and education, constitute the terrain on which the bourgeoisie and the proletariat struggle (Carnoy, 1982, pp. 84-85).

According to Ginsburg et al. (1991, p. 11), during periods of economic crisis in capitalist societies, the tensions produced by these contradictions are heightened, thus shaking up the terrain of struggle. When possible, capitalists and their allies within a national context are seen to shift the focus of the crisis away from the economy to the state and education (Carnoy & Levin, 1976; Ginsburg, Wallace, & Miller, 1988; Ginsburg et al., 1991, p. 11).

Those researchers identified with the conflict perspective argue that while educational reform seems to involve change, in fact, it may serve as a kind of ritual, which provides a powerful symbolic form of legitimation, giving the appearance of scientifically controlled change and masking the current ways in which the status quo is reproduced (Popkewitz, 1988). What is sometimes labeled “educational reform” is better understood as reform rhetoric not necessarily associated with any real, sustained efforts to bring about changes in education. Moreover, sometimes the absence of correspondence between rhetoric and action may be the result of an elite group lacking any commitment to change and also the result of educators’ and other groups’ resistance (Ginsburg et al., 1991). As Ginsburg and Cooper (1991, p.371) observe:

Reform proposals are at times not implemented because the society and the state suffer from an economic and fiscal crisis. In this case, there were insufficient resources to even begin implementing the educational reform plans, or at least this is what was claimed by state elites. In other cases, reforms were implemented but fiscal problem halted its full implementation. Other times reform rhetoric is not followed by the implementation of reform because educators and others resist effort to change by elites.

Thus, educational reform rhetoric and action are not necessarily targeted fundamentally on “problems” in education but may have more to do with national and global economic crises and/or crisis of legitimation of the state (Ginsburg & Cooper, 1991, p. 374). This means “reform rhetoric and action only arise on a grand scale at certain times, while these “problems” exist before and after educational reform is on the local, national, or global agenda” (p. 375).

2.3 World System Level and Globalization of Educational Reform

During the past two decades educational reforms have crossed national boundaries around the world. The major agendas included in educational reform efforts are curriculum changes, standardized and centralized testing, school governance (Davies & Guppy, 1997; see Cookson, Sadovnik & Semel, 1992) and professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education (Gottlieb, 1988; Ginsburg & Chaturvedi, 1988; Gore & Morrison, 2001; Hargreaves, 2000; Megahed, 2004). According to Davies & Guppy (1997), while never identical in content, reforms under these broad rubrics have been borrowed and disseminated. One thing common to such educational reform discourses at the global level is that “phrases like *increasing global competition, international trade, and transnational exchange* dominate” (Davies & Guppy, 1997, p. 435). In common with some of national level explanations of change and reform in education, world system level analyses⁴ have focused on the state, specifically in terms of global trends of decreasing national government in control of education (Ginsburg et al., 1991, p. 12). Behind this statement there is an assumption that “while the expansion and reform of education take place within national boundaries, the stage on which these national units develop and compete is an international one” (Arnové, 1980, p. 48).

At its broadest level, the world-system equilibrium perspective is similar in its explanation of educational phenomenon to that associated with economic perspectives on globalization on education. Globalization⁵ refers to the description and explanation of social process that

⁴ World-system theory provides concepts and language for a critical understanding of transferring, diffusing, and/or borrowing educational ideas and practices (Ginsburg, 1991; Clayton, 1998).

⁵ The term globalization is a theoretical construct that is itself contested and open for various meaning . It can be described positively or negatively or multivalently to describe highly complex and multidimensional processes in the economy, polity, culture, and everyday life (Kellner, 2000, p. 303). In order to understand globalization adequately it would be better to mention a comprehensive approach for the definition of globalization. Kellner (2000) introduces diverse efforts to define the word from actors and policy makers to theorists and researchers. The following provides an overview to understand its complexity: “The conception of globalization deployed, the

transcend national borders. From an equilibrium perspective economic globalization is focused on the increasing significance of global market forces and transnational corporations over national economies as well as a new international division of labor (Tikly, 1999, p. 616). Thus, “nation-states must increasingly react to these pressures and battle constantly to improve their comparative advantage, which leads to a key proposition: the ever-expanding web of market relations fosters a standardization of knowledge system in all core industrialized nation states. Because nation-states organize and distribute knowledge through formal education, this logic implies a tendency for school system to converge across these developed nations” (Davies & Guppy, 1997, p. 436).

In this section, I discuss different approaches to world-systems level analysis⁶ and globalization as they contribute to understanding the nature of educational reform efforts and the process of diffusing and borrowing educational reform rhetoric and practice across countries across times.

2.3.1 World System Level Equilibrium Perspective

From an equilibrium perspective, world system level analysis focuses on how the functional need for integration of the increasingly differentiated global system is met (Boli, Ramirez, &

purpose for which the concept is used, and the evaluation of the structures and process described by the concept vary wildly. For some, globalization entails the Westernization of the world, while for others it involves a cover for ascendancy of capitalism. Some see globalization as generating increasing homogeneity, while other see it producing diversity and heterogeneity through increased hybridization. For business, globalization is a strategy for increasing corporate profits and power, for government it is often deployed to promote an increase in state power, while many non-government social organizations see globalization as a lever to produce positive social goods like environmental action, democratization, or empowering of disempowered groups through new technologies and media. Some theorist equate globalization with modernity, while other claim that the ‘global age’ follows and is distinctly different from the ‘modern age.’ For many theorists, we live in an age in which globalization is the defining concept, while other find claims for the novelty and centrality of globalization exaggerated” (Kellner, 2000, p. 300). For additional discussion of globalization, see Burbules & Torres (2000) and Kellner (2000).

⁶ World system level explanations of education have been grounded in world system theory, which was originally proposed by Fernand Braudel and Immanuel Wallerstein to explain the global expansion of capitalism. These scholars trace capitalism’s development from its genesis among trading families in Renaissance Europe to the present, arguing that nearly the entire world had become integrated into a single economic system. (Clayton, 1998, p. 480)

Meyer, 1986). Such an approach highlights similarities or convergence globally with respect to educational reform efforts. According to Inkeles & Sirowy (1984), there is a tendency for all national educational systems in the world to converge toward a common structure and set of practices. In the case of the more industrialized countries, change toward this common structure and practices is explained by the “‘imperatives’ built into the socio-technical systems they adopt which drive them to similar responses to common problems. This model, therefore, places great emphasis on the level of economic development of nations to account for movement towards common forms of social organization” (Inkeles & Sirowy, 1984, p. 139)

For the less developed industrialized nations a somewhat different explanation is offered. In this case, change in education is explained to result from “borrowing” structures and practices from the more developed nations (Ginsburg et al., 1991, p. 13). This is called “the imitation strategy”, which involves solving local problems in non-Western countries by applying Western or “modern” knowledge. This strategy was mainly practiced during the developmental decades of the 1950s and 1960s (Lee, 1986). Where such “borrowing” occurs, levels of development may be less relevant than integration in networks of influence through which ideas and social forms are diffused (Inkeles & Sirowy, 1984, p. 139). The point is that the core countries are major producers and disseminators of knowledge, while the peripheral countries to the central knowledge system are importing knowledge. Adams & Gottlieb (1993) note that “social sciences and educational theories and reforms are among the goods circulated by the world knowledge system” (p.98).

2.3.2 World System Level Conflict Perspective

In contrast to equilibrium perspectives approaches, conflict paradigm approaches stress that the world system is a capitalist system, which is stratified into “core,” “semi-peripheral,” and

“peripheral” countries (Ginsburg et al., 1991, p. 15).⁷ According to Kellner (2000, p. 300), “a wide and diverse range of social theorists are arguing that today’s world is organized by expanding globalization, which is strengthening the dominance of world capitalist economic system, supplanting the primacy of the nation-state by transnational corporations and organizations, and eroding local cultures and traditions through a global culture.” From this perspective, globalization represents the hegemony of capital over all other domains of life and constitutes an even higher level of capitalist domination than that described by Marx. In this regard, the concept of globalization can be disempowering, leading to cynicism and hopelessness, evoking a sense that inexorable market forces cannot be regulated and controlled by the state, or that the economy cannot be shaped and directed by the people, thus undermining democracy (Kellner, 2000, p. 307).

Scholars taking a conflict perspective focus attention on the efforts of core groups to manipulate education in periphery nations in order to disseminate ideologies and practices supportive of their interests (Clayton, 1998, p. 484). From this perspective, various type of international educational assistance projects mounted by multinational corporations, corporate foundations, bilateral and multilateral aid agencies and core-country universities can be seen as hegemonic ventures dedicated to the engineering of consent in periphery nations to a variety of inequitable and exploitative international structures and relationship (Clayton, 1998, p. 484, see Ginsburg, Wallace, & Miller, 1988, Ginsburg et al. 1991). In general, conflict perspectives of the world system or globalization argue that educational assistance provides a vehicle for the

⁷ Today, Japan, Australia, and most North American and Western European nations have core status, while periphery status is assigned to most nations of Africa and Asia. Semi-periphery states include the majority of Latin American nations, as well as the oil-producing states of Asia and Africa (Wallerstein, 1984, p. 14). However, unlike dependency theory, world-system theory portrays international power relations as constantly changing. For instance, Wallerstein in *The Politics of the World-Economy* (1984) argues that the United States, currently a dominant core nation, has already entered a period of decline such as the experienced by previous core powers. As a result, world system theorist do not assume, as do dependency theorists, that contemporary periphery nations are permanently locked in dependency relationship with contemporary core states. (Clayton, 1998, p. 480)

transmission of ideologies from core to periphery and, subsequently, for the “intellectual socialization” of periphery individuals. Samoff (1993, p. 186) explains:

As periphery students, teachers, administrators, and policy makers encounter core ideas through books and other curricular materials provided by core enterprises, through interactions with core teachers posted to periphery nations, through similar interactions as scholarship recipients at core universities, or through bureaucratic interface with core educational enterprises, their ways thinking undergo a fundamental change that incline to approach problems, specify relevant factors, and delimit solutions in terms of a particular understanding.

2.4 Profession, Professionalization, Deprofessionalization/Proletarianization, and Professionalism

The terms, ‘profession,’ ‘professionalization,’ and ‘professionalism,’ have been major parts of the discourses about reforming teaching, teachers, and teacher education around the world (ACDE, 1998; Carnegie Task Force, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; MOEHRD, 2001; NCTAF, 1996). In this section, I discuss different theoretical perspectives on the issues raised by these terms and how they apply to the occupation of teaching and the field of education.

2.4.1 Profession

What is a profession (*Chŏmunchik* in Korean)? Professions are of nineteenth and twentieth century origin. According to Esland (1980, p. 224), the rapid growth of professional occupations is a phenomenon of industrialization and the concomitant expansion of technological rationalization. Two of the major influences on the growth of profession in the advanced industrial societies have been, first, the rise of corporate capitalism in place of the entrepreneurial capitalism of the nineteenth century and, secondly, the emergence of the ideologies and institutions of liberal welfare policies which have been carried out by various twentieth-century governments. Both of these processes have had the effect of creating and enlarging the scope of two broad types of professional occupation: a) the industrial managerialist professions such as

accountancy, banking, engineering, advertising, surveying, architecture, and industrial psychology and b) the welfare professions such as social work, psychotherapy, and in some respect, teaching (Esland (1980, p. 225).

All of the professions are involved in the production and dissemination of knowledge, which ultimately structures the modes of thinking which prevail in a society (Esland, 1980, p. 215). Through the process professional workers have become the “Generalized Wise Men” of contemporary society (Mckinlay, 1973, p. 74). In Mills’ words, “as critics of morality, and technicians of power, as spokesman of God and creators of mass sensibility,’ the members of profession have acquired considerable control and influence over everyday consciousness (Mills, 1956, p.4). For instance, in England the growing educated and professional classes became a new type of aristocracy; in Germany a non-economic middle class based in the universities and in the civil services gained power as the educational system became the backbone of social stratification; and in the United States elites based on knowledge rose to prominence, higher education developed, and professionals helped link the educational system to the occupational order (Schudson, 1980, p. 215).

The sociological investigation of the professions from a functionalist perspective began in the 1930s with attempts to identify the defining characteristics or traits that distinguished professions from other occupations (Esland, 1980; Johnson, 1972, 1980; Runté, 1995). From a trait model or structural-functionalist approach, one of the most obvious characteristics of professions, in comparison with other occupations, is that they have a privileged status (Esland, 1980) and provide highly valued services based upon a complex body of knowledge. Moreover, autonomy on the job is taken as the cornerstone of professional working conditions since it is

through freedom from supervision and external controls that professionals are best able to apply their expertise (Densmore, 1987, p. 133).

While the precise traits identified vary among scholars (see Labaree, 1992; Larson, 1977; Lieberman, 1956; Ritti et al., 1974), there is substantial agreement that professions are characterized by the following general attributes: (1) a body of knowledge and techniques which practitioners apply in their exclusive occupational groups; (2) an extended period of training to master such knowledge and skills; (3) an orientation of service to clients; (4) a distinctive ethical code, which justifies the privilege of self-regulation granted by society; (5) high degree of autonomy and prestige; (6) a high level of remuneration; and (7) a system of having colleagues in control of selection, training, and advancement in the field (Darling-Hammond, 1990, pp. 25-50; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1995; p. 152; Dreeben, 1988; Esland, 1980; Ginsburg, 1996, pp. 133-134; Larson, 1977; Legatt, 1970).

Occupational groups, in turn, bid for this special status by claiming to possess these attributes (Doyle, 1990, pp. 7-8). These different occupations tend to become “real communities, whose members share a relatively permanent affiliation, an identity, personal commitment, specific interests, and general loyalties” (Larson, 1977, p. x). From this perspective, the claim to professional status rests on a simple bargain between the occupation and its clients: technical competence is exchanged for technical autonomy, practical knowledge for control over all aspect of practice, including ethical practice. The upwardly mobile occupational group must establish that it has mastery of a formal body of knowledge that is not accessible to the layperson and that gives it special competence in carrying out a particular form of work (Labaree, 1992). For example, for occupations such as teaching, social work, nursing and librarianship, the acquisition

of these attributes is a major element of their quest for status, internal control of work practice and higher financial reward (Esland, 1980).

However, the conditions of modern industrialization have led to the massive growth of what Aronowitz has called ‘the professional servant class’ (Aronowitz, 1973, p. 265). According to Esland, the nature of a profession has changed over time:

Compared with the independent practitioner of the last nineteenth century, most professional workers as now salaried employees within large organization. Even in the areas of training, curriculum, and validation some professions find that their regulations of entry and practice are determined by state departments rather than by their professional associations (although the associations are likely to be consulted). Thus, one of the paradoxes of the professions is that, although as a whole they constitute an ideologically powerful group, their members act frequently in the role of bureaucratic functionaries. (Esland, 1980, p. 223)

In much of the literature (Abbott, 1991; Darling-Hammond, 1995; Esland, 1980; Labaree, 1992; Pickle, 1990; Runté, 1995) authors employing/adopting a functionalist trait model simply took the established professions of medicine and law as their starting point and assumed that their characteristics accounted for their professional status. Their main concerns have been with the identification of criteria which existing professions are assumed to satisfy, rather than with the examination of them as products of professional ideologies. For example, in the 1960s, “there was a belief that almost any occupation could undergo professionalization if it reflected the generally-held values of progress, rationality, science, specialized expertise, and above all, the desire for money and status” (Runté, 1995, p. 6).

In contrast to functionalist trait model approaches, conflict theorists consider that there is no consensus on the definition of ‘a professional’ nor of ‘the profession’ (Densmore, 1987; Runté, 1995). In other words, “there is no single, truly explanatory trait or characteristic that can join together all occupations called professions beyond the actual fact of coming to be called profession” (Freidson, 1983, p. 32-33). According to Runté (1995), the traits introduced by the

functionalist above were never clearly defined, since one was never told precisely how much training was required, how esoteric the theoretical knowledge needed, how restrictive the certification obtained, and so on, before an occupation could be considered a true profession. Given the model's inability to precisely define relevant traits, their interaction, or their origins, trait models have been completely discredited.

2.4.2 Professionalization

The term professionalization (*Chōmunhwa* in Korean) cannot be detached from the term profession or professionalism. Professionalization refers to the process through which occupational a gainful activity moves from the status of an occupation to the status of a profession (Emerner & Cottone, 1989; Ginsburg, 1996). In practice, according to Ginsburg (1996, pp. 133-134), “professionalization involves acquiring the traits that functionalist theorist have asserted to differentiate between professions and other occupations.” That is, the process of acquiring involves education, client-protective credentialing, ethical codes, and similar guarantees of the professional-client relation. The key point of professionalization can be found in “how to be a profession.” According to Abbott (1991, p. 357), a variety of processes could produce a regular pattern of professional development under certain circumstances. For example, professions might imitate the structural moves of previously successful professions or occupation, or they might undertake structural moves as a means of competition against superordinate groups.

From a functionalist perspective, Wilensky (1964) analyzes the order of various events of professionalization: the founding of a training school, a university school, a local association, a national association, the passing of state-level licensing laws, and the establishment of ethics codes. In Wilensky's analysis, these six stages involve in the order of professionalization for

each profession. Johnson (1972), criticizing functionalist and trait theory approaches to the study of the professions, defines professionalization: “a historically specific process which some occupations have undergone at a particular time, rather than a process which certain occupation may always be expected to undergo because of their essential qualities” (Johnson, 1972, p. 45) .

2.4.3 Deprofessionalization/Proletarianization

The processes of deprofessionalization (*Talchömunhwa* in Korean) or proletarianization (*Rodongjahwa* in Korean) can be contrasted with that of professionalization (Filson, 1988; Ginsburg & Spatig, 1987, 1988; Ginsburg, 1987, 1996; Larson, 1980). This is kind of debate on the class position of nonmanual workers or what Larson (1980) calls “educated workers.”

Deprofessionalization, according to functionalist perspectives (Haug, 1975, Runté, 1995), happens as education levels rose among the general public, so doctors, lawyers, and other professionals began to lose their status as the only educated, literate members of the community. Also, highly sophisticated computer technology has been handling much of the routine workload for lawyers and other professionals since the mid-1980s. As the professions lose their monopoly over particular bodies of knowledge, they also lose the rationale for their special status as profession. In contrast, from a conflict perspective, deprofessionalization constitutes movement opposite to that of professionalization, through which workers’ remuneration, status, and power or autonomy are diminished relative to previous situation for this occupation and relative to other groups, including managers, employers, and state elites (Ginsburg, 1996). Haug (1975), for example, defines deprofessionalization as the “loss to professional occupations of their unique qualities, particularly their monopoly over knowledge, public belief in their service ethos, and expectations of work autonomy and authority over clients” (p. 197).

Proletarianization, from a Marxist perspective, refers to certain tendencies in work organization and work process under capitalism (Densmore, 1987). It is “the process whereby the worker is forced into a closer relationship with capital, which removes the skill (the conception and execution of work) and therefore the relative autonomy of the worker” (Ozga & Lawn, 1981, p. 124). Proletarianization is the complex historical process, which produces a working class, locking it into subordination to and conflict with a capitalist class. As a continuous process, proletarianization reproduce this working class in new and expended forms, which depend on the predominant structure of exploitation and on the configuration and outcomes of the class struggle at a given time (Larson, 1980, p. 134). Here, professionals are identified as credentialed, salaried workers, whereas the proletariat are wage earners who benefit less from their relations with those who control the means of production. In other words, proletariat are those workers who sell their labor for a wage and, by doing so, lack control over not only the investment in and the means of production, but also over the content and process of their work (Filson, 1988).

From a Marxist perspective, proletarianization involves the process by which the work of an occupational group is altered regarding: “1) separating the conception of work tasks from their execution; 2) standardizing and routinizing work tasks; 3) intensifying the demands of work; and 4) reducing the costs (salaries, benefits, training, etc.) of workers” (Ginsburg, 1996, p. 133). The process of proletarianization can be discussed in conjunction with the idea of deskilling by Littler (1982) from a conflict perspective:

The concept of deskilling refers to four processes: (i) the process whereby the shopfloor loses the right to design and plan; i.e., divorce of planning and doing; (ii) the fragmentation of work into meaningless segments; (iii) the redistribution of tasks amongst unskilled and semi-skilled labour, associated with labour cheapening; and (iv) the transformation of work organization from the craft system to modern Taylorized forms of labour control. (p. 25)

As C. Wright Mills observes:

Most professionals are now salaried employees; much professional work has become divided and standardized and fitted into the new hierarchical organizations of educated skill and service; intensive and narrow specialization has replaced self-cultivation and wide knowledge; assistants and sub-professionals performs routine ... tasks while successful professional men become more and more the managerial type. (Mills, 1951, p. 112)

The deprofessionalization and proletarianization process was accelerated in the 1970s and 1980s with the decline in the relative advantages that educated workers had experienced in comparison to the inflated advantages that had accrued to them in the booming 1950s and 1960s (Larson, 1980). According to Harris (1990), while proletarianization is associated with the work of manual laborers as blue collar workers, this does not necessarily mean that white-collar work is being converted into blue-collar work, but that working task and forms of work organization take on patterns found in blue-collar work (cited in Smyth et al., 2000, pp. 127-128). The point is that the new professional workers have become both agents of capitalist control and also the professionally trained servants of capitalism (see Esland, 1980, pp. 229-232).

2.4.4 Professionalism

The meaning of professionalism (*Chōmunsōng* in Korean) has changed over time (Desmore, 1987). From a structural-functionalist perspective, professionalism is “something which defines and articulates the quality and character of people’s action within that group” (Goodson & Hargreaves, 1996, p. 4). It can refer to some expertise, special skill or knowledge that is acquired by training, study, or practice.

However, according to conflict perspective, “professionalism is seen not as an ideal type, nor as an actual or idealized description of work conditions, but as an ideology that influences people’s practice” (Densmore, 1987, p. 134). As an ideology (Densmore, 1987; Friedson, 1970; Ginsburg, 1987, 1996; Johnson, 1972, 1980; Hughes, 1966), the concept of professionalism

distorts or only partially reflects social reality, serving to mobilize or immobilize individual and collective action in ways that support the interests of certain groups in society (Ginsburg, 1987, 1996). Larson (1977, p. xvii) explains how the ideology of professionalism was constructed and how it functions:

The model of the profession emerged during the ‘great transformation’ and was initially shaped by the historical matrix of competitive capitalism. Since then, the conditions of professional work have changed so that the predominant pattern is no longer that of the free practitioner in a market of services, but that of a salaried specialist in a large organization. The persistence of the term profession as a category of social practice suggests that the model constituted by the first movements of professionalization had become an ideology ... not only an image which consciously inspires collective or individual efforts, but a mystification which unconsciously ... obscures real social structures.

McKinlay (1973, p.77) elaborates on what he terms the ‘mythology of professionalism’ in discussing how “professionals” establish and maintain power over their clients:

the removal of certain activities from external observability and evaluation; a process by which professionals have become generalized wise men with an unwarranted mandate to challenge others; through the accordance of an unprecedented degree of trust based on ill-founded claims to altruism; and through the manufacture of artificial needs which render their services absolutely indispensable. Through such mechanisms it is suggested that professionals have been accorded almost dictatorial powers which appear to be cyclically re-employed to protect and even further enhance the power already vested in them.

Although within some versions of the ideology of professionalism the interests of employers, clients, the general public, and ‘professionals’ are characterized as identical or at least in harmony (Ginsburg, 1996, p. 137), this is not necessarily case, because “professional interests are often in conflict with the public interest” (Roth, 1974, p. 22) or the interests of other groups. The ideology of professionalism can serve the interest of economic and political elites both within a particular society and internationally (Ginsburg, 1996). With regard to economic elites, Johnson (1980) concludes: “The ideology of professionalism will be an effective strategy

only when its claims coincide with and draw on the dominant ideological processes of capital (p.359). With respect to state elites, Johnson (1982) explains: “The transitions to capitalism...was not marked by a separation of economic and political institutions but a historically unique articulation that involved the interrelated process of state formation and professionalization” (p.188). Finally, according to Johnson (1973), the ideology of professionalism was useful to some occupational groups in British colonies to the extent that their use of it served British imperialist goal. And the consolidation of the British Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century roughly coincided with the rise of professionalism in Britain (cited in Ginsburg, 1996, p. 136).

Ginsburg (1996) takes a critical position about occupational groups accepting the ideology of professionalism by pointing out how it contributes to power and how it establishes their own individual or group interests rather than communities. According to him, through the reliance on the ideology of professionalism occupational groups “have become harnessed to a much wider web of power and control in society, acting as ‘reality definers’ on important issues affecting society at large ” (Esland, 1980, p. 213) such that “symbiotic relations” have been established between at least some members of the professions and power groups in society (Klegon, 1978, p. 271). In this context, he concerns that appropriating in an unproblematic way the ideology of professionalism leads occupational groups to become “technicians of power” (Mills, 1956, p. 4) or “servants of power” (see Baritz, 1960, pp. 191-210) (Ginsburg, 1996, p.136). Also, as another example, Ginsburg (1996) argues that subscribing unproblematically to the ideology of professionalism may lead practitioners in the welfare or helping educators to define problems as residing within individuals or cultural groups rather than in the political, economic, and cultural systems at local, national, and global levels.

2.5 Teachers' Work and Status

Teachers can be described as caught between the directions of government and rigidities of bureaucracy, on the one hand, and the independence and varied needs of students and parents, on the other (Dreeben, 1970, p. 46). Thus, it is reasonable to say that the meaning and the orientation of the work and status of teachers has been deeply influenced by social, political, and economic changes (Apple, 1995, 2003; Ginsburg, 1987, 1996; Esteve, 2000; Smyth et al., 2000). Moreover, social attitudes towards teachers have changed according to the economic conditions in a given society. Not many years ago, teachers with university degrees enjoyed both a cultural and social status. Their knowledge and their work were widely recognized and respected in Europe (Esteve, 2000) and Korea (Park, 2003). Today, however, society tends to rank teachers' status in the United States in terms of earning potential and, especially in Korea, in terms of job security.

Here, I discuss teachers' work and status and how they can conceptualize in relation to different perspectives on profession, professionalization, and the ideology of professionalism.

2.5.1 Teaching as a Profession

As Hargreaves (1994) puts it, clearly, teaching is a job that entails of a set of tasks and human relationships that are structured in particular ways. For example, a school is a workplace for teachers – just like the hospital is for physicians/nurses, the office for a clerk, and the shop floor for a factory worker. The workplace is structured through resources and relationships which can make the job easier or more difficult, fruitful or futile, rewarding or dispiriting (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 13). Put simply, teachers are workers, teaching is work, and that work is organized and subject to workplace control (Dreeben, 1970; Seddon, 1990; Smyth et al., 2000, p .108).

The importance of thinking about teaching in this way is that it allows theoretical insights from the labor process discourse to be applied to the work of teaching in order that teachers' occupational lives can be located within a complex of influences that affect the macro and micro aspects of teachers' work (Ozga, 1988).

For some scholars, educators, and other people, the functionalist view of profession is held as an ideal-typical description of teachers' work (Darling-Hammond, 1985, 1990). So, the acquisition of the elements of traits suggested by structural functionalist perspective has been an urgent and major issue of the teaching occupation for status, internal control of its work practice and higher salaries (Avis, 1994; Esland, 1980; Gore & Morrison, 2000; Hoyle, 1982; Park, 2001; Pickle, 1990; Roh, 2003). In this position, educators have developed various rationales for teaching to be differentiated from other occupations by saying that "teaching is seen as becoming more complex and more skilled with teachers being involved more in leadership roles, partnership with colleagues, shared decision-making and providing consultancy to others in their own areas of expertise" (Hargreaves, 1994. p.14). Accordingly, educators assume that teachers possess pedagogical expertise (knowledge and skills) and significant autonomy in the classroom, even when the type of knowledge, degree of skill, or form of autonomy are disputed (Densmore, 1987, p. 133).

However, compared to the established professions of medicine and law, teaching is generally considered to fall short of being a profession, or at best is considered a semi-profession (Etzioni, 1969; Howsam, 1980; McDaniel, 1979). That is, the occupation of teaching resides in a limbo between craft and profession – having elements of each and (paradoxically, perhaps) momentum in both directions (Gore & Morrison, 2001; Labaree, 1995).

2.5.2 The Professionalization of Teaching

If we examine the historical record in various countries, we see that educators have experienced some degree of professionalization. In the case of Mexico (Torres, 1991, p. 138), the call for the professionalization of teachers has been justified as a means for upgrading teachers' qualification and enhancing self-esteem. After the liberal bourgeois revolutions in Mexico, educators achieved relatively high degrees of status and autonomy, at least in relation to local and church elites, although they did not really gain in terms of remuneration. This professionalization process occurred partly because of educators' own individual and collective efforts and because they served in the front-line for secular state elites in their continuing conflict with the Church (Ginsburg, 1996).

In Canada the late 1930s through the 1960s (Filson, 1988), in England after 1926 but particularly from the mid 1940s to the mid 1970s (Ginsburg, Wallace & Miller, 1988, Ginsburg, 1996, p. 135), and in the United States in the mid-1940s (Carlson, 1987; Ginsburg, 1996) educators experienced professionalization during times of economic expansion and were viewed by state elites as key players in defusing and deflecting the impact of radical movements which developed in previous years of economic and political crises (Ginsburg, 1996). Similarly, the initial years of the Allied Occupation in Japan (1945-1948) educators achieved greater power to organize and pursue economic goals, though not really accorded extensive curricular and pedagogical decision-making autonomy, because they were viewed as integral in the effort to suppress Japanese nationalism and militarism (Levine, 1969 cited in Ginsburg, 1996, p. 135).

Over the last two decades, in the case of the United States, teaching has increasingly met the criteria of a profession suggested by the functionalist perspective (Darling-Hammond, 1990;

Goodson & Hargreaves, 1996; Hargreaves, 1994, 2000; Holy, 1982; Pickle, 1990). In Korea, a perspective similar to that held in the U.S. has been introduced in academia, mainly representing the functionalist perspective that focuses on developing a variety of criteria in order to define teaching as a profession (Koo, 2002, pp. 69-70).

Hargreaves (2000) identifies four historical phases of the process of development of teacher professionalism in many countries: the pre-professional age, the age of the autonomous professional, the age of the collegial professional, and the fourth age –post professional or postmodern. In the pre-professional age dominant in many East Asian Countries, “teaching was seen as managerially demanding but technically simple, its principles and parameters were treated as unquestioned commonsense, one learned to be a teacher through practical apprenticeship, and one improved as a teacher by individual trial-and-error” (p.156). During the age of the autonomous professional the status and standing of teachers improved significantly in many countries, in part because teacher education became increasingly embedded within the universities reflecting a higher level and amount of knowledge (Labaree, 1992; Hargreaves, p. 158). The third phase of the collegial professional is “there are increasing efforts to build strong professional cultures of collaboration to develop common purpose, to cope with uncertainty and complexity, to respond effectively to rapid change and reform, to create a climate which values risk-taking and continuous improvement, to develop stronger senses of teacher efficacy, and to create ongoing professional learning cultures for teachers that replace patterns of staff development, which are individualized, episodic and weakly connected to the priorities of the school” (Hargreaves, 2000, p. 166). In the age of postmodern professionalism, suggests that “a positive new partnership [has been] created with groups and institutions beyond the school, and

teachers learning to work effectively, openly and authoritatively with those partner (Hargreaves 2000, p. 175).

2.5.3 The Deprofessionalization/Proletarianization of Teaching

In terms of deprofessionalization of teaching, teachers' work is portrayed as more routinized and deskilled and teachers are seen as having less autonomy (Collins, 1979, Ginsburg, 1996, Hargreaves, 1994), because of development such as an externally produced and imposed apparatus of behavioral objectives, in-class assessment, accountability instruments, and classroom management (Apple, 1995). In a variety of developing countries (Dove, 1986, 1995) and in the United States (Carlson, 1987) during the more general economic and political crises and the fiscal crisis of the state (from the 1970s at least through the 1980s) various forms of bureaucratic and technical controls were directed by state (and economic) elites at educators' work in areas of curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, and employment (Ginsburg, 1996). Korea is no exception. The government has issued detailed regulations in the scheduling and conducting of classes, and teachers has received a standardized and high level of training (Seth, 2002, p. 244). Often these efforts to undermine educators' professional autonomy were coupled with moves to intensify the range and pace of work and to reduce financial support for education. For example, "in the context of educational reform debates and struggles strategies were developed by economic and state elites in a variety of countries to all but remove teachers from effective participation in the politics of educational generally and even in the processes of determining teachers' salaries, benefits, and working conditions"(Ginsburg, 1996, p. 135).

Teachers have been deprofessionalized as the social space of schools has been reconstituted to produce a new work order ⁸ whereby the work of teaching has come under new forms of surveillance and control (Smyth et al., 2000, pp. 6-9). Teachers are depicted as being increasingly controlled by prescribed programs, mandated curricular and step-by-step methods of instruction (Apple, 1990, 1995). Moreover, it is claimed, “teachers’ work has become increasingly intensified, with teachers expected to respond to greater pressures and comply with multiple innovations under conditions, which are, at best stable and, at worst, deteriorating” (Hargreaves, 1994, p.118). Apple (1986), for instance, focuses on the intensification⁹ of teachers’ work in the growing dependence on an externally produced and imposed apparatus of behavioral objectives, in-class assessments and accountability instruments, and classroom management technologies. This, he says, has led to a proliferation of administrative and assessment tasks, a lengthening of the teachers’ working day, and elimination of opportunities for more creative and imaginative work. ¹⁰

⁸ Smyth (1995, pp.1-2) comprehensively introduces a number of trends emerging worldwide about how teaching is regarded. Tendencies include: intensifying the testing and the measurement of educational ‘outcomes’ through national and statewide testing; focusing on demonstrable, observable and performance aspects of teachers’ work; requiring teachers to be increasingly explicit about what it is they do; define competence in teaching according to static invariant standards derived largely from business and industry; requiring that teaching be reduced to some magical ‘bottom line’; rewarding teaching on the basis of ‘merit pay’ and ‘payment by result,’ according to the extent to which teachers are able to demonstrate achievement-oriented learning gains in students; demanding, under the guise of accountability, that teachers show that what they do enhances the skills of students and, in turn, reach up the level of international economic competitiveness; ranking, rating and appraising teachers and placing schools in ‘league tables’ that compare one against the other; marginalizing teachers because they are regarded as self-interested ‘producers’, and instead, favoring ‘consumers’, vaguely defined as parents and employers; treating teachers implicitly as if they cannot be trusted and are in need of surveillance through the use of ‘performance indicators.’

⁹ The concept of intensification is drawn from general theories of the labor process, as outlined by Larson (1980): “intensification ... represents one of the most tangible ways in which the work privileges of educated workers are eroded” ... [It] “represents a break, often sharp, with the leisurely direction that privileged non-manual workers expect: as it compels the reduction of time within the working day when no surplus is produced, intensification destroys the sociability on which association and community are founded. For workers whose labor activity is so often individual, the risk of isolation grows” (pp. 166-167).

¹⁰ For example, Lewis (2003) charges that NCLB in the United States threatens to “halt the development of truly significant improvement in teaching and learning” (p. 1) by focusing on testing and accountability the legislation emphasizes. Critics fear NCLB will force teachers to spend more time on test-prep and drill-and-kill exercises rather

The process of deprofessionalization attacks idea of the teachers as a profession as well having professionalism at its roots in terms of the service idea and the notion of autonomy. If those basic characteristics are destroyed, the use of professionalism as a controlling ideology by the state is weakened, and the supposed conflict between teachers and the state is more clearly seen (Ozga & Lawn, 1981, p. 147).

2.5.4 Professionalism in Teaching

In recent years governments, educators' organizations, and other groups have sought to improve the public image of the teaching occupation so as to attract more people into the occupation (see Hargreaves, 2000). Professionalism in teaching has been used as a defining concept for teaching and teacher behavior to be recognized and valued. The assumption is that the teaching occupation has consistently struggled to achieve professional status or has identified themselves as professionals (Darling-Hammond, 1990, p. 25). The statements is supported by a rationale that teachers' work has more significance than that of other workers, and that it deserves more autonomy, higher wages, and better working conditions than are available for others.

From a conflict perspective, Ozga and Lawn (1981) argue that in England the concept of professionalism is a conservative ideology promoted by state administrators for the specific purpose of co-opting teachers into repudiating class struggle and accepting bureaucratic domination. However, Ozga & Lawn (1981) note that the state may seek to disguise its essential relationship with the teachers by manipulating those aspects of the professional ideology which stress teacher autonomy, teachers may resist state intervention by making use of a defensive argument based on possession of professional expertise. The key point is that "the fact that both

than on authentic teaching and learning (Fusarelli, 2004). They argue that NCLB ignores the pedagogical knowledge and skills required in their teaching practice and leads to teachers' deprofessionalization.

the state and the teachers make use of the same term does not mean that they are essentially in harmony, the conflict is disguised and often the state uses its buffer sub-government to further conceal the true nature of the relationship.” (Ozga & Lawn, 1981, p. vii)

Also, the ideology of professionalism in teaching is produced and reproduced by individuals and groups who differ in their socioeconomic background (age, gender, race, and/or class) as well as occupational status (Ginsburg, 1988; Megahed, 2004). Thus, it involves contradictory aspects. For example, when a group of pre-service teachers in the United States were asked to identify their perceptions of professionalism, some of the interviewees’ conceptions associated with professionalism with high income and remuneration whereas others framed it with respect to a service ideal (Ginsburg, 1988). In Egypt, women teachers seem to be more likely than male counterparts to draw upon the service ideal element of professionalism (Megahed, 2004). So, the listing of attributes and the rating of occupations on a professionalism should be problematic not only because they have proved to be a theoretical dead-end, but also because they have deflected concern from the more crucial problems created by professionalization, such as the avoidance of accountability to the public, the manipulation of political power to promote monopoly control, and the restriction of services to create scarcities and increase costs (Roth, 1980, p. 18).

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This study involves a cross-national comparison of educational reform discourses with respect to teaching, teachers, and teacher education by employing both critical discourse analysis and interpretative text analysis. First, I analyze the main issues and concerns reflected in selected reform documents through a typical comparative research approach using both description and juxtaposition. Next, I analyze some versions of professionalism incorporated in educational reform discourses in the two countries. Finally, I investigate to what extent, if any, an influence relationship exists between the two countries.

For methodological tools, I primarily employ critical discourse analysis, which aims to develop ways of analyzing language, ideology, and power which are embedded in the workings of contemporary capitalist society (Fairclough, 1995). Also, I use interpretative text analysis (Diesing, 1991, pp. 104-145; Hodder, 2000, pp. 703-715), which is a method to examine the meaning of discourses with regard to not only what problems are identified and what solutions are suggested but also some commonalities and differences within documents between the two countries on various issues related to teaching, teachers, and teacher education. In this chapter, I sketch the major characteristics of discourse, critical discourse analysis, and interpretative text analysis, and then explain the process of data selection and data analysis.

3.2 Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis

3.2.1 The Meaning of Discourse

The notion of discourse is essentially fuzzy as is the case for such related concepts as ‘language’, ‘communication’, ‘interaction’, and society’ and ‘culture’ (van Dijk, 1997, p. 1). In

everyday language use and the dictionary, the term ‘discourse’ usually refers to a form of language use, public speeches or more generally to spoken language or ways of speaking (van Dijk, 1997, p. 1). However, discourse analysts try to go beyond such common-sense definitions. They want include some other essential components in the concept, namely *who* uses language, *how*, *why*, and *when* (van Dijk, 1997, p. 2).

According to Fairclough (1995, p. 131), ‘discourse’ is a category used by both social theorists and analysts (e.g., Foucault, 1972) and linguists (van Dijk, 1987). To linguists, discourse refers primarily to spoken or written language use, but Fairclough (1995, p. 131) extends its range to semiotic practice in other semiotic modalities such as photography and non-verbal communication, focusing it on as a form of social practice. In this regard, the term discourse is defined in the model as a limited range of possible statements promoting a limited range of meanings (Foucault, 1973, p. 117) or language use conceived as social practice (Foucault, 1972, p. 135). The meaning of the word *discourse* includes, “the general domain of all statements, sometimes an individualizable group of statements, and a regulated practice that accounts for a certain number of statements” (Foucault, 1973, p. 80). Nevertheless, these lexical resources are not fixed or static, even when they are codified in the official contexts of formal social institutions like families, schools, churches, workplace, mass media, government, political parties, and so on (Luke, 1995).

Within a Foucauldian approach, discourses are inextricably linked to *institutions* (the law, education, the family, etc.) and to the *discipline* that regularize and normalize the conduct of those who are brought within the ambit of those institutions – psychology, medicine, science, psychotherapy, pedagogy, and so on (MacLure, 2003, p. 176). So, discourses not only circumscribe what it is possible to say, know, and do, but also establish what kind of person one

is entitled/obligated to 'be' (Kress, 1985; MacLure, 2003, p. 176). To large extent, each discourse is tied to ways of knowing, believing, and categorizing the world and modes of action (Gee, 1999). However, discourse is not a transparent medium for the interaction between human minds and the world; it is, rather, a major factor to be taken into account, simultaneously shaping and shaped by that interaction (Gottlieb, 1991, p. 319). Fairclough & Wodak (1997, p. 258-259) describe discourse as social practice and emphasize that a dialectical relationship exist between a particular discursive events and the situation(s), institutions (s), and social structure(s) which frame it. A dialectical relationship is a two-way relationship: the discursive event is shaped by situations, institutions, and social structures, but it also shapes them.

In relation to this study educational reform can be viewed as a discursive event. For example, analysts have identified discourse of school effectiveness (Morely & Rassool, 1999), of empowerment (Bates, 1998), of partnership (Croizer, 1998), of accountability (Poulson, 1996), and of professionalism and professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education (Ginsburg, 1987, 1996; Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989; Labaree, 1992a, 1992b, 1995). Some researchers have argued that educational discourse, in recent times, has been invaded or 'colonized' by alien discourses (MacLure, 2003, p.179) – for instance, by the discourse of neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism (see Apple, 2004, Conway et al, 2002; Shin, 2003) - or by management and business, resulting in the 'marketization' of educational discourse (Fairclough, 1992). Garman & Holland (1995) focus on the metaphorical and heavily freighted language deployed by commissions in their reports, and suggest how language [discourse] is used to frame issues and shape public perception. To them, discourse is cast by the interpretive response of readers that interact with the text of educational reform documents.

3.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Sociological and political analyses of discourse are being undertaken in a wide range of areas in the social science (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). Here, it is necessary to distinguish discourse analysis from text analysis, called content analysis, which focuses more on observable aspects of discourse – mostly words - than in the meaning of discourse in terms of societal structure or social groups (van Dijk, 1997, p. 9). Theoretically, van Dijk (1997) formulates some general principals shared by many contemporary approaches to discourses, emphasizing discourse studies are about talk and text in context:

Discourse studies should deal both with the properties of text and talk and with what is usually called the context, that is, the other characteristics of the social situation or the communicative event that may systematically influence text or talk (p.2).

In arguing for a multi-disciplinary approach to discourse analysis, Fraser (1991, p. 98) contends that a critical theory of discourse can help us (1) understand how people's social identities are fashioned and altered over time; (2) understand how, under conditions of inequality, social groups are formed and unformed; (3) illuminate how the cultural hegemony of dominant groups is secured and contested; and (4) shed light on the prospects for social change and political practice. Similarly, Fairclough (1995) argues that critical discourse analysis aims:

To systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationship between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (pp. 132-133).

With regard to social policy studies, in particular, Edelman (1988) argues that the real power in politics resides in the process whereby problems are constructed and articulated, since

it is through language that we experience politics. Thus, the analytical emphasis in policy analysis including reform policy documents is on how problems are discursively represented because these contain an explicit or implicit diagnosis of the “problems” and how the problems should be addressed (Marston, 2002, p. 84). In education, discourse-based studies has contributed to shifting our view from a perspective on text or discourse as constructed artifact explicable by reference to essential characteristics of its producers and productive context to the study of how text are constructive of social formation, communities, and individual social identities (Luke, 1995, p. 9). This approach was influenced by Michel Foucault (1972), who states that discourses “systematically form the objects about which they speak, shaping grids and hierarchies for the institutional categorization and treatment of people” (p. 49).

An empirical interest in the consequence of how knowledge and language is used is partly a product of the increasing currency of the social constructionist perspective within the social sciences (Hastings, 1998, p. 191). Social constructionism directly challenges the foundations of the dominant positivist tradition that emphasizes rational and evidence - based approaches to policy making. Unlike positivists, social constructionists do not accept social facts as permanently ‘accomplished’; the emphasis here is on contesting, rather than objectifying social phenomena (Jacobs & Manzi, 2000, p. 36).

The aim of critical discourse analysis is to challenge the concept of ‘objectivity’, particularly as it is used in bureaucratic or economic discourses to create and maintain inequalities and hegemonic constructions of educational reform and is to provide an alternative interpretation of policy and practice. In this way, a central task of the contemporary approach to critical discourse analysis would be to see how broader formations of discourse and power are manifest in text or discourse in use including reform documents (Luke, 1995, p. 11).

Critical discourse analysis emphasizes the social and institutional dimensions of discourse, and attempts to relate these to textual fabric of everyday life (MacLure, 2003, p. 179; see also Fairclough, 1992, 1995; Luke, 1995; van Dijk, 1995, 1997). In Luke's words, "such an analysis attempts to establish how textual constructions of knowledge have varying and unequal material effects, and how these constructions that come to 'count' in institutional contexts are manifestations of large political investments and interests"(Luke, 1995, p. 12). As Kress (1990) states, critical discourse analysis brings an overtly political agendas to the study of texts, adding that practitioners of critical discourse analysis reject the scientific neutrality and the non-judgemental, descriptive stance of traditional linguistic analysis.

Those scholars engaged in critical discourse analysis make their social and political position explicit; they take sides, and actively participate in order to uncover, demystify or otherwise challenge dominance with their discourse analyses (van Dijk, 1997, p. 22). That is, critical discourse analysis is primarily concerned with how power, ideology, identity, and social relations are negotiated, legitimated, and contested towards political ends (Apple, 1996). So, analyzing texts [discourses] is done in order to understand the link between text and society. It means that "[a]ll texts are located in key social institutions. Human subjects use texts to make sense of their world and to construct social actions and relations required in the labor of everyday life. At the same time, texts position and construct individuals, making available various meanings, ideas, and versions of the world" (Luke, 1995, p. 13). According to van Dijk (1997, p. 277), these connections between socio-cultural processes and properties of texts are rather complex, and are best seen as indirect or mediated rather than direct.

3.2.2 Analytical Framework of Critical Discourse Analysis and Interpretative Text Analysis

Fairclough (1995 pp. 133-135) suggests a three-dimensional framework of analysis for exploring linkages between discourse, ideology, and power. According to him, each discursive event has three dimensions or facets: it is a spoken or written language *text*, it is an instance of *discourse practice* involving the production and interpretation of text, and it is a piece of *socio-cultural practice*. Textual analysis (micro) is concerned with description about the form and meaning of the text, discourse practice (meso) focuses on the discursive production and interpretation of the text as opposed to social-institutional aspects, and socio-cultural practice (macro) operates at the level of broader social analysis (Marston, 2002, p. 85). The analysis of the discursive event as social practice may refer to different levels of social organization – the context of situation, the institutional context, and the wider socio-cultural context (Fairclough, 1995, p. 134). At this macro-level, systems of discourse are closely associated with ideology, hegemony and the legitimation of power (van Dijk, 1997a, p. 9; 1997b, p. 7).

According to Fairclough (1995, p. 133), “text can be regarded as interweaving ‘ideational’, ‘interpersonal’, and ‘textual’ meanings. Their domains are respectively the representation and signification of the world and experience, the constitution (establishment, reproduction, negotiation) of identities of participants and social and personal relationship between them.”

Interpretative text analysis is a method to examine not only what problems are identified and what remedies are suggested but also to examine some commonalities and differences within documents and between countries on various issues of teaching, teachers, and teacher education. The main goal of interpretative text analysis is to clarify the meaning of a text, which is similar to that of discourse analysis if I treated a text as a discourse (see pp.49-51) (Diesing, 1991, pp.

104-145; Hodder, 2000, pp. 703-715). Here, text includes various forms of written documents such as reform documents issued by governmental and non-governmental organizations. In analysis, I use the so called hermeneutic circle, which means I am systematically moving quickly back and forth between the selected data and interpretation throughout the study. Therefore, by means of interpretative text analysis, I examine not only what each document says with regard to problems identified and solutions suggested, but also how it uses and/or constructs the notion of profession, professionalization, and professionalism.

3.3 Selection of Documents

Data sources for the study include original documents focusing on educational reform such commission reports, proposals, legislation, and documents issued by governmental and nongovernmental organizations at national level in the United States and Korea. In order to identify possible documents that dealt with teaching, teachers, and teacher education reform in relation to a professionalism and professionalization agenda, a systematic literature review was conducted for the years 1980 through 2002 using the following sources on the Pitt Digital Library database: *Eric (Education Abstract: Via EBSCO)* and *Digital Dissertation (ProQuest Digital Dissertation)*. In addition, related journals¹¹ were reviewed by the researcher. Criteria for selection of an article or paper to identify possible documents were: 1) the reform documents related to teaching, teachers, and teacher education in the United States and Korea and 2) the reform documents were issued by government agencies, nongovernmental, philanthropic foundations, educational organizations, and/or assorted prestigious committees and commissions

¹¹ These journals are: American Educational Research Journal, British Journal of Educational Studies, Comparative Education Review, Delta Kappa Gamma, Educational Foundation, Educational Policy, Educational Researcher, Educational Review, Harvard Educational Review, Journal of Education for Teaching, Teaching and Teacher Education, Teachers College Record.

at national level since the 1980s. From this review of the literature, I found 24 reform reports and/or proposals dealing with the reform of teaching, teachers, and teacher education in the United States (see Appendixes A for a complete list). In Korea, the selection of documents were not complicated, because each administration has issued its own proposal and/or report to deal with various issues on education, including teaching, teachers, and teacher education.

I selected the specific reform documents (see Table 1) from the larger list reviewed for this study based upon three criteria: a) the documents' focus on the issues/concerns related to teaching, teachers, and teacher education, b) the institutions or organizations responsible for developing or issuing document, and c) 'when' the document was issued in each country.¹²

In the United States, due to its decentralized and privatized system of governance, there are lots of different proposals, reports, and documents issued from at states or federal levels, teachers' unions, and philanthropic or private foundations.¹³ Considering its variety of reform proposals and reports across states and institutions in the United States, special attention was given to documents that represent national level so the US government and national level organizations, including teachers' unions and philanthropic foundations, were considered to be eligible for this study (e.g., the American Federation of Teachers (AFT),¹⁴ Carnegie Task Force, Holmes Group, National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), National

¹² The reason to include "when" is to identify the influence relationship between the two countries on the issues and concerns, and some versions of professionalism they presented. So, attention was paid to distribute the time period of the selected documents as possible as and tried to select documents having more attention from academia unless they have differences in content across documents.

¹³ Philanthropic foundations such as the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation have played critical roles in identifying how the education of various professions in the United States should be structured. For example, major reports such as *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum, 1986), *Action for Excellence* (Task Force on Education and the Economy, 1983) were issued by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* was issued by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) in September 1996. The Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York funded the work of this commission in 1994. (Gallagher & Bailey, 2002, p. 12)

¹⁴ In order to analyze the position of AFT and NEA on the issue of teacher professionalism, AFT president Albert Shanker's speech (1985) and NEA president Bob Chase's speech (1997) and the document issued by AFT in 2000 were referenced.

Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), and the National Education Association (NEA),¹⁵ The U.S. Department of Education[DOE]).

I selected the following documents because they have received widespread attention and their continuous influence discussions and actions in the United States (see Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Ginsberg & Plank, 1995, pp. 7-9; Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989; Sadvonik et al., 2002; Sikula, 1990, pp. 72-82) and in Korea (see Ahn et al, 1998; Kim, 1998, pp. 81-122; Roh, 2003; Shin, 2002). For example, in the United States, *Nation at Risk* by NCEE (1983) was selected, because the report triggered public debate about education excellence and teacher competence, and has been cited in most subsequent reports. The Holmes Group reports (1986, 1990, 1995) were selected not only because their attention and their ongoing influence, but because they were important ones of the US education and teacher education reform reports during the last two decades to be initiated and carried out from within the educational profession (see Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989). *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (1996) in the United States was selected because it was aimed at redirecting American schooling and teacher education. It was known as a provocative report, one that presents not only a criticism of the current state of education in the United States, but also a proposal for change (see Bullough Jr, 1998). The *No Child Left Behind Act* (2002) was selected because it affects all areas of K-12 education and is the most sweeping federal education legislation in decades (AFT, 2003; Fusarelli, 2004). Other reform documents selected, such as DOE (1999), AFT (2000), were all related to teacher education reform identifying problems and suggestions.

¹⁵ In the case of NEA, three vigorously debated proposals shaped the association's stance on professionalism: the earliest was about *Teacher Education* (1982), the second on *the Direction of School Improvement* (1987), and the most recent, on *Peer Assistance and Review* (1997). For the study, a position paper on teacher professionalism by Bob Chase, President of NEA (1997) were selected to review.

Other documents (e.g., *Making the Grade*, 1983; *Action for Excellence*, 1983; *Educating Americans for the 21st Century*, 1983; *Educational Reform*, 1983; and *Staffing the Nation's School*, 1984) were not selected for analysis in this study, because they were issued in the same year with the selected documents and because they had limited focus on the reform of teaching, teachers, and teacher education. The document *A Call for Change in Teacher Education* (1985) was not selected, because the problems and remedies identified overlap with selected documents such as *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) and *A Nation Prepared* (1986). Other documents issued in the 1990s, including *Higher Education Amendments of 1992*, *Goals 2000: Educate America Act 1994*, and *To Touch the Future* (1999) were not included, because they were legislations reflecting the reform reports of the 1980s and paid attention to issues already suggested in the earlier report documents. *Doing What Matter Most* (1997) issued by NCTAF (1997) was not selected, because it basically repeated ideas included in NCTAF's first report *What Matters Most* (1996). *Higher Education's Challenge* (2001) and *Investing in Teaching* (2001) were not selected, because they proposed similar remedies to those suggested in other selected reports.

In Korean documents, it was not complicated to select the documents, because Korea has remained highly centralized and uniform in standard, content, and method of education and each administration has issued its own comprehensive educational reform reports covering all sections of education in the country since the 1980s. The following documents were selected: *Education Reform for a New Education* (1995) issued by PCER, *Comprehensive Measure* (2001) issued by MOEHRD,¹⁶ other documents were selected in considering the nature of organization issuing the

¹⁶ The MOEHRD has issued detailed regulation in the scheduling and conducting of classes, and teachers has received a standardized and high level of training. Considering this centralized culture of education system, materials and documents issued by MOEHRD showed no big differences for main themes. For example, *A Five Year Plan for Education Development* issued by MOE (1999) was excluded from the selection because it had little different from the document issued in 2001 with respect to teaching and teacher education reform. According to Roh (2003, p. 31), under the administration of Kim Young Sam the government released 27 reform policies and under the Kim Dae Jung's Administration 55 teacher reform policies were suggested.

documents and their contents on teaching, teachers, and teacher education. They were selected, because they all were issued by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, which has considered an advisory organization to the president, determining the basic direction for education and forming the national consensus on the long-term educational development since 1987. Also, I selected the following documents issued by the KTU: *Declaration of Education Democratization* (1986), *Declaration of Korean Teachers' Union* (1989), and *Educational Policy Proposal for the 16th Presidential Election* (2002).

Primary sources of educational reform documents and materials in the United States were all available on-line and in different libraries and research centers. Documents and materials in Korea were collected with the assistance of fellow researchers working for the Presidential Commission for Education Innovation (2003 to 2004) and Korean Education Development Institute during March 2004 through January 2005. Also, secondary data (i.e., newspapers, journal articles, books, technical reports from universities and research institutes) were available through the library system of University of Pittsburgh and the cooperation of the researchers in Korea and the Internet search.

Table 1 Key Documents Selected for Primary Sources

U.S.A			Korea		
Author	Year	Title	Author	Year	Title
NCEE	1983	Nation at Risk	SCNSM (국보위)	1980	July 30 Education Reform
Holmes Group	1986	Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group	YMCA (KTU)	1986	The Declaration of Education Democratization
Carnegie Task Force	1986	A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21 st Century	PCER	1987	Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform
Holmes Group	1990	Tomorrow's School	KTU	1989	Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union (Chunkyojo)
Holmes Group	1995	Tomorrow's Schools of Education	PACER	1992	Basic Framework of Education Development
NCTAF	1996	What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future	PCER	1995	Education Reform for A New Education System Leading Toward a Globalization and Information Era
DOE	1999	A Talented, Dedicated, and Well-prepared Teacher in Every Classroom	PCNEC	2000	Reform Directions and Tasks for the 21 st Korean Education Reform
AFT	2000	Building a Profession	MOEHRD	2001	Comprehensive Measure to Develop a Teaching Profession
PL 107-110	2002	No Child Left Behind Act of 2001	KTU	2002	Educational Policy Proposal for the 16 th Presidential Election

3.4 Data Analysis

In employing primarily critical discourse analysis and interpretative text analysis as methodological tools, I treated the selected reform documents (data) as texts in which U.S. and Korean educational reform discourses of teaching, teachers, and teacher education manifest themselves. First, I introduced the background of each reform documents, including the rationale for writing the documents, the main actors to write the reports as well as the social and political context of the reform. Next, I analyzed each document for instances of “problems” and “remedies.”

For more detailed analysis of the texts, I employed a microscopic examination approach, similar to that used for analyzing interview data. Strauss and Corbin (1998, pp. 51-71) refer to this technique as ‘open coding.’ Open coding involves close examination of text, ‘line-by-line’ analysis as well as ‘word-by- word’, ‘sentence-by-sentence’, or ‘paragraph-by-paragraph.’ For example, major categories used to code the issue of professionalism in teaching, teachers, and professionalization of teaching and teacher education included the nature of teaching and teacher education, the ways of describing teachers, power and autonomy, teachers’ status, educational length, remuneration, in-service training, certification/licensing, working condition.

In order to present findings, the descriptive method by Hantrais & Mangen (1996) was used. For comparison, I employed a juxtaposition approach, in which the two countries’ and different documents’ problems identified and solutions suggested were placed side by side, so that the similarities and differences between the countries and different documents could be clearly identified and analyzed.

Similarities in documents and time ordering of publication found across countries were considered to identify possible influences. Attention was also paid to references to and quotes from other countries' documents as well as to common phrasings even if they are not explicit referencing or quoting.

4. THE U.S. CASE OF REFORMING TEACHING, TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I first introduce an outline of the selected reform documents issued by national level organizations, including governmental and nongovernmental organizations, in the United States since the 1980s, in order to illuminate both the background and the aims of the reform documents. Here, the selected reform documents, appearing in order of their publication year, are examined for the following: who are main actors speaking through these documents, how do they define societal and educational problems, and what remedies do they suggest. I, then, compare the problems identified and the remedies suggested across documents with regard to teaching, teachers, and teacher education. Finally, I analyze how the selected reform documents and/or proposals draw, implicitly or explicitly, on some versions of the ideology of professionalism, either in framing the problems identified about or in proposing the remedies for teaching, teachers, and teacher education.

4.2 The Documents

The documents discussed in this section are as follows: *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (the Holmes Group, 1986), *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986), *Tomorrow's School* (the Holmes Group, 1990), *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996), *A Talented, Dedicated, and Well-Prepared Teacher in*

Every Classroom: Information Kit (the Department of Education, 1999), *Building A Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction* (the American Federation of Teachers, 2000), and *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (Public Law 107-110).

A Nation at Risk

(National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983)

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) appointed by the Ronald Reagan administration issued its report entitled *A Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform* in 1983. Members of the NCEE consisted of variety of people, including three university presidents; the president of a community college; research scientists and university professors, including a Nobel Laureate; school board members; school principals; the 1981-1982 National Teacher of the Year; parent activists; a former state commissioner of education; and the governor of Minnesota. In accordance with the secretary of education's instruction, which directs the Commission to examine the quality of education in the United States, the Report contains practical recommendations for educational improvement, which aims to "generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality" (p. 6). Among the Commission's works, assessing the quality of teaching and learning in public and private schools, colleges, and universities was a priority assignment. As the title of the Report implies, it is "chock-full of strong language and disturbing findings on the state of education in the United States" (Coeyman, 2003, p. 1).

The release of *A Nation at Risk* brought to the public's attention the need for reform in American schools. The Report raised concerns about slipshod preparation of teachers, teacher shortages in key fields, and the inability to attract academically able students to teaching.

Arguing that [o]ur once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world” (p. 5), the Report claimed that shortcomings in the public school system were impairing the nation’s economic competitiveness in the global economy, adding that “the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people.” (p. 5). The Report recommended a return to basics such as reading and math in order to boost U.S. competitiveness in the international economy.

The Report’s authors used the military language of combat to give power to its argument: “If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might have viewed it as an act of war” (p. 5). Referring to the 1950s, when the National Defense Education Act aligned education policy with the cold war objective of defeating the Soviet Union (Spring, 1998, p. 6), the report contended, “We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament” (p. 5). The Commission concluded that declines in educational performance are in large part of the result of disturbing inadequacies in the way the educational process itself is often conducted.

Problems identified: *A Nation at Risk* (1983) found deficits in four important aspect of the educational process: content, expectations, time, and teaching. And as a result of the problem in teaching, schools were failing to provide students with adequate levels of academic preparation (pp. 18-23). Regarding teaching, teachers, and teacher education, the Commission identified four problems: not enough academically capable students were being attracted to

teaching; teacher preparation programs needed substantial improvement; the professional working life of teachers was on the whole unacceptable; and a serious shortage of teachers existed in key fields (pp. 22-23).

Addressing the low quality of applicants in the field, the Commission offered evidence that “[t]oo many teachers are being drawn from the bottom quarter of graduating high school and college students” (p. 22). About teacher preparation programs, the Commission criticized the current curriculum, weighted heavily with courses in educational methods at the expense of courses in subjects to be taught (p. 22). The Report noted that a “survey of 1,350 institutions training teachers indicated that 41 percent of the time of elementary school teacher candidates is spent in education courses, which reduces the amount of time available for subject matter courses” (p. 22). Regarding the working life of teachers, the Report found that “the average salary after 12 years of teaching is only \$17,000 per year, and many teachers [have] to supplement their income with part-time and summer employment. In addition, individual teachers have little influence in such critical professional decisions as, for example, textbook selection” (pp. 22-23). The Report found its final problem in the severe shortages of teachers in certain fields, stating that “[h]alf of the newly employed mathematics, science, and English teachers are not qualified to teach these subjects; fewer than one-third of U.S. high schools offer physics taught by qualified teachers” (p. 23).

Remedies suggested: The Commission proposed seven recommendations intended to improve both the quality and the status of teaching (pp. 30-31), encompassing improvement in the preparation of teachers or making teaching a more rewarding and respected “profession.”

First, regarding higher teacher standards, the Commission recommended that persons preparing to teach should be required to demonstrate an aptitude for teaching, and to demonstrate

competence in an academic discipline. The Commission also concluded that colleges and universities offering teacher preparation programs be evaluated by how well their graduates meet these criteria (p. 30).

Second, in order to make teaching a more “rewarding profession,” the Commission suggested introducing a more rigorous teacher evaluation system along with raising salaries. “Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated” (p. 30).

Third, the Commission focused on the issue of the differentiated staffing, calling for career ladders for teachers in order to distinguish between the beginning instructor, the experienced teacher, and the master teacher, was suggested. (p. 31)

Finally, to improve teacher education programs and their relevance to teaching practice, the Commission suggested involving master teachers in designing teacher preparation programs and in supervising teachers during their probationary years (p. 31).

Tomorrow’s Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group

(Holmes Group, 1986)

In 1986, the Holmes Group¹⁷ issued its first report, *Tomorrow’s Teachers*, which set forth its vision of good teaching, analyzed the obstacles to attaining it, and recommended an agenda of actions. The Holmes Group was “a consortium of education deans and chief academic officers

¹⁷ The Holmes Group pressed its reform agenda within colleges of education from 1986 through 1996. Its original plan was to reform teacher education by concentrating on the research universities at the top of the academic pecking order. The Holmes Group proposed a number of costly and ambitious reforms designed to transform teaching into a full “profession,” but the goal of eliminating bachelor’s degree programs in education proved controversial enough to stand out from the rest (see Newman, 1997, pp. 73-76)

from the major research universities in each of the fifty states” (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 3). When *Tomorrow’s Teachers* was prepared, the Group consisted of 48 members, but its membership grew thereafter, to 100 by 1988 (Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989, p. 12) and to about 250 institutions (or about one fifth of all institutions that prepare and screen educators) in 1995, when it issued its third report, *Tomorrow’s School of Education* (Holmes Group, 1995, p. 2).

The aim of the Holmes Group (1986), as expressed in the Report, is to accomplish “nothing less than the transformation of teaching from an occupation into a genuine profession” (p. ix), with the university considered to be the key to such a transformation. Therefore, the reform of teacher education and the reform of the teaching profession constitute the twin goals of the consortium (p. ix). The Report described shared goals, understanding, and action commitments that have guided the refinement and gradual implementation phase of the consortium and portrays university education schools as the prime epistemological authority in an otherwise uncertain world of teaching and learning.

With an assumption that “teachers are the butt of most criticism, yet singled out as the one best hope for reform” (p. 3), the Report argued that “teaching must be improved, but plans for improving teaching also must be improved” (p. 3). The Report introduced the rationale for its reform of teacher education as follows:

American students’ performance will not improve much if the quality of teaching is not much improved. And teaching will not improve much without dramatic improvements in teacher education. (p. 3)

The Report found the realities of teaching, teachers, and teacher education facing the United States to be ones of mutual impairment, which contributed to developing an agenda for improving the profession.

Teacher education long has been intellectually weak; this further eroded the prestige of an already poorly esteemed profession, and it encouraged many inadequately prepared

people to enter teaching. But teaching long has been an underpaid and overworked occupation, making it difficult for universities to recruit good students to teacher education or to take it as seriously as they have taken education for more prestigious professions. (p. 6)

Problems identified: The Report identified the failings of past reform efforts and the shortcomings of the present situation by referencing “naïve views of teaching (p. 27),” “flat career patterns” (p. 31), “pseudo-credentialism” (p. 43), and “lack of demonstration sites” (p. 56). According to the Report, “popular and excessively simple conceptions of teaching (p. 27)” are to blame for the nation’s troubles with student learning in schools. The Report criticized that too many teachers employed a transmission model of teaching, involving “presenting” or “passing on” a substantive body of knowledge, or “presenting and keeping order,” or “planning, presenting, and keeping order” (p. 27). The Holmes Groups rejected a simple lesson delivery fashion that makes teaching something any intelligent person can do, by noting “this belief can ignore professional knowledge” (p. 28).

The Report also questioned the nature of “institutions unfit for teacher professionals” (p. 31), arguing that the traditions of recruitment, norms of preparation, and conditions of work in schools have severely hindered efforts to improve the quality of teaching. The Report found that these norms and traditions contributed to a flat career pattern, condemned as teaching’s careerlessness, where ambition and accomplishment went unrewarded both in terms of expanded responsibilities and autonomy, and in higher salaries (pp. 31-32).

Describing the pitfalls of “pseudo-credentialism” (p. 43) and “blind credentialism”(p. 45), the Report criticized that teachers are paid according to the number of graduate credits earned beyond their bachelor’s degree, regardless of whether additional education improved their teaching. For example, “state-imposed continuing certification requirements routinely benefit

teachers and teacher educators financially, with little regard to the substance of the advanced credentials invested in or awarded” (p. 43).

The Holmes Group found the criticisms outlined in *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983) valid, confirming the NCEE’s analysis of weakness in undergraduate programs, such as a lack of curricular coherence and the failure of university teacher education faculties to assume corporate responsibility for the entire undergraduate program (p. 47). The Report pointed out problems of inadequate academic pedagogical studies and too brief a period of student teaching, adding “lack of demonstration sites for prospective teachers” (p. 56).

Remedies suggested: Recognizing the fact that “the problems of teacher education mirror society’s failure to treat teaching as a profession”(p. 60), the ultimate goal of the Holmes Group was not just to improve teacher education but also to construct “a genuine profession of teaching” (p. 62). To make teaching into a “profession,” the Report identified the need for changes in five major goals.

First, to make the education of teachers intellectually sound, the Holmes Group argued that teaching should be grounded on a strong core of knowledge, because teaching is about the development and transmission of knowledge (p. 63). With this in mind, the Report suggested “[phasing out] the undergraduate education major in member institutions and [developing] in its place a graduate professional program in teacher education” (p. 63).

Second, to recognize differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment among teachers, the Holmes Group suggested that a differentiated structure of the occupation of teaching be developed, consisting of three levels:

The Career Professional Teacher, who would be capable of assuming responsibility not only within the classroom but also at the school level; the Professional Teacher, who would be prepared as a fully autonomous professional in the classroom; and the

Instructor, who would be prepared to deliver instruction under the supervision of a Career Professional Teacher. (p. 65)

Third, to create relevant and defensible standards of entry into the profession of teaching, the Holmes Group recommended developing and administering a series of Professional Teacher Examinations on which to base decisions of entry to the profession. And, considering the limitations of standardized testing in predicting the future performance of teachers, the Holmes Group recommended that students be required to demonstrate mastery of important knowledge and skills through multiple evaluations across multiple domains of competence:

Students admitted to teacher education will be required to demonstrate basic mastery of writing and speaking; prior to a clinical internship, students will be expected to pass an examination demonstrating their mastery of the subject they will teach, their skill in lesson planning, and their instructional delivery; and during their work in classrooms, prospective teachers will be required to observe and evaluate a variety teaching styles, including their own, and to present evidence of analytic skill in this area as part of their professional portfolio for advancement. (pp. 65-66)

Finally, to connect schools of education with elementary and secondary schools, the Holmes Group suggested establishing Professional Development Schools (PDSs). According to the Report, these PDSs, which would be analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, will create working partnerships among university faculty, practicing teachers, and administrators and would be designed around the systematic improvement of practice (p. 66).

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century

(Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986)

In 1986, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* was issued by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (CTFTP) under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The authors included governors, leaders of both major teachers'

unions (American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association), chief state school officials, a leading teacher educator, a state legislator, people deeply committed to quality education for minorities and the poor, business executives, and a superintendent (p. 6). The Report called for sweeping changes in education policy, arguing that “America’s ability to compete in world market is eroding” (p. 2) and “Many [American children] are dropping out – not just out of school but out of productive society” (p. 2). In order to make the nation more fully competitive in industry and in commerce, but also to enhance social justice and progress, the Report argued for higher educational standards for those going into teaching. The Report also called for insuring that such a profession of well-educated teachers would be able to assume new powers and responsibilities in redesigning schools for the future.

The Report was the first of a series of policy recommendations on American education to be produced in fulfillment of the objectives of Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. Originally, the Forum, a program of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, was interested in exploring the link between economic growth and the education of the people (p. 6). For this reason, the report depended heavily on a business perspective that education exists to serve the economy. The Task Force insisted that education is the foundation of economic growth, equal opportunity, and a shared national vision and affirmed that the “teaching profession” is the best hope for establishing new standards of excellence as the hallmark of American education (p. 7). In other words, the Report stressed the need to raise standards for teachers and the importance of the link between effective instruction and social efficiency – goals that are descended directly from the emphasis on excellence that shaped educational discourse in the early 1980s (Labaree, 1992, p. 129).

In this Report, the Task Force showed how the changing nature of the world economy requires far higher standards than any before, and it laid out a strategy for transforming teaching and the structure of schools. The main notion underpinning the Report is an imperative for a new understanding of the education standards necessary for creating the kind of high-wage work force that can compete in a global economy (p. 11). Recognizing the degree of inadequacy in the rhetoric of the recent education reform movement, with its focus on repairing the educational system based on mass production, which emphasized the development of the routinized skills necessary for routinized work (p. 15), the Task Force stated that the education system should be rebuilt to match the drastic changes needed in the U.S. economy and be supported by the most advanced technologies available (p. 13). In addition, recognizing the fact that pay and conditions of work are elements essential to solving the problems identified in the document, the Report offered alternatives to attracting the most capable college graduates to teaching. In a nutshell, the Report argued that improving both the status and the positions of the teaching occupation is absolutely dependent upon improving the conditions of work.

Problems identified: The Task Force identified three major factors that will impact America's future: a steep increase in demand for teachers; a declining supply of well-educated applicants; and a desperate need for minority teachers (pp. 26-32). According to the Report, unless teaching as a career changed the gap between teacher supply and demand would grow. By conservative estimates, for example, the Report anticipated a steep increase in the demand for teachers, so that between 1986 and 1992, 1.3 million new teachers would need to be hired. Also, the declining supply of well-educated applicants, another challenge identified by the Task Force, shows that the academic performance of those students contemplating teaching careers continued to lag behind that of the average college-bound student by a substantial margin (p. 29). Almost

half of the students enrolling in teacher education came from non-academic high schools programs, from general and vocational programs not intended to prepare students for college (p. 32). In addition, there was a particularly need for minority teachers, because of the growing numbers of disadvantaged students from low-income families, non-English speaking backgrounds, and single-parent households, all of whom need teachers with a much more sophisticated and complete understanding of their subject material (p. 32).

The Report (p. 36) exclaims that the conditions under which teachers work have become increasingly intolerable:

Teaching in the United States, like nursing, is a feminized occupation. It took its current form in the 1930s and 1940s, when women were expected to subordinate their career aspirations to their childrearing responsibilities and their salary expectations to the man's role as breadwinner. Their work roles and the conditions under which many of them work more nearly resemble those of semiskilled workers on the assembly line rather than those of professional. ... It is hardly surprising in these circumstances that teachers' salaries rank with other feminized occupations at the bottom of all occupations requiring a college degree. (p. 36)

Furthermore, teachers' conditions of work in the United States suffer because bureaucratic rule rules made by others govern teacher behavior at every turn:

Teachers are treated as if they have no expertise worth having. The text and the scope and sequence of the curriculum define in detail what they are supposed to teach. Decisions made by curriculum supervisors, teacher training experts, outside consultants and authors of teachers' guides determine how a teacher is to teach. Teachers who choose to work together as professional colleagues must constantly fight the natural tendencies of a system based on very different principles. And an endless array of policies succeeds in constraining the exercise of the teacher's independent judgment on almost every matter of moment. ... This is not the world of schools, not the world that teachers live in. Teachers spend between 10 percent and 50 percent of their time on non-instructional duties – everything from recording test scores to monitoring the halls, from doing lunchroom and playground duty to running the ditto machine. They are constantly running out of supplies, forced to use outdated texts, make do with inadequate materials. Skilled support help is rarely available, nor the time to do the job right. (pp 39-40)

Remedies suggested: In order to deal with the major problems identified, the Task Force set as a goal the creation of a: “system in which school districts can offer the pay, autonomy and career opportunities necessary to attract highly qualified people to teaching. In return, teachers would agree to higher standards for themselves and real accountability for student performance” (p. 55). Among the eight recommendations, the following four remedies specifically addresses the structure of teaching career and the education of teachers, while the remaining remedies were intended to transform the environment of teaching.

To restructure the teaching force, the Report proposed introducing a new category of Lead Teachers with a proven ability to provide active leadership in school redesign and in helping their colleagues uphold high standards of learning and teaching (p. 55). The Report proposed establishing a differentiated staffing pattern (pp. 100-102), a four-level teaching force that consists of licensed teachers, certified teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers. *Licensed teachers*, at the lowest level, have state licenses and are preparing for national certification. *Certified teachers*, the majority of the teaching force, have passed evaluations developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)¹⁸, an organization the Carnegie Corporation helped establish in 1987. *Advanced teachers* have passed even more rigorous evaluations, and *Lead teachers*, elected by teachers from among the advanced level teachers, serve as “instructional leaders” in their schools, that is, they may serve as mentors for beginning teachers and intervenors/helpers for experienced teachers in trouble. Expertise, responsibility, and compensation increase as teachers move up the ladder.

¹⁸ The NBPTS had the powerful financial and political support of the Carnegie Corporation. The NBPTS, a majority of whose members are classroom teachers, was chartered in 1987 to establish high and rigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do, to certify teachers who meet those standards, and to advance related education reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in America. The board is issuing national teaching certificates that eventually may help teachers move up the rungs of a national career ladder. National certification for teacher is voluntary, much like national board certification for physicians, but the Carnegie Forum believes national certificates will become so prestigious teachers will seek them and states will recognize them. (Newman, 1997, p. 58)

The Task Force also suggested that each teacher hold a bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching (p. 55). The Task Force argued that undergraduate years should be devoted wholly to a broad liberal arts education and a thorough grounding in the subjects to be taught. Thus the Report recommended that "the states and higher education institutions should abolish the bachelor's degree in education" (p. 73).

Closely tied to that, the Task Force also recommended developing a new professional curriculum that would lead to a Master in Teaching degree, based on a systematic knowledge of teaching that included internships and residencies in the schools (p. 55). Recognizing the fact that "teachers need a command of the subjects they teach, a sound grasp of the techniques of teaching those subjects, information about research on teaching, and an understanding of children's growth and development and of their different needs and learning styles" (p. 71), the Task Force argued for "significant investment in research, curriculum, and clinical practice" (p. 71). For graduate program, the Task Force insisted on a strong association with higher education to develop a systematic understanding of practice.

Finally, assuming that a better than average level of intellectual ability is desired in the teaching force, the Task Force proposed that such conditions be recruited by offering salaries, benefits, and working conditions competitive with those of other professions, such as accountants. With the facts that "teachers' starting salaries are at the low end of the spectrum for college graduates and the prospects for salary growth do not compare with other occupations" (p. 98), and that "seniority and the accumulation of graduate credits determine the outcome of current compensation system" (p. 98), the Task Force suggested "creating a set of positive incentives for excellence" (p. 99), connecting teachers' quality to their compensation, which reflect market forces. According to the Report, a restructured salary system should be

determined by the following dimensions: job function based on teacher's level of responsibility, level of certification, seniority, and productivities in terms of improving student performance (p. 101).

Tomorrow's School

(Holmes Group, 1990)

Four years after its first report, with funding from the Ford Foundation, the Holmes Group released a second report, *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990). The ideas and recommendations in the 1990 report were written by the writing group of four professors working for Michigan State University and a communication specialist in the Holmes Group. Based on notes from all seminars among leading school and university faculty members from across the nation, the Report was drafted and critiqued by a committee of the Holmes Group Executive Board and by the Tomorrow's Schools Steering Committee. Finally, the Report was reviewed and endorsed by representative of Holmes Group member institutions as their annual meeting January 27, 1990 (pp. viii-ix).

In general, the 1990 report reiterated and elaborated on the ideas suggested in the first report, including creating more intellectually sound teacher education programs; connecting universities and schools; making better use of differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment among teachers; creating higher standards for entry into the teaching occupation; and leveraging better working conditions for teachers. The second report promoted a variety of reform efforts called for in the first report, including a move toward graduate-level programs for preparing teachers and the formation of professional development schools (Labaree, 1995, pp, 166-167). The 1990 report also called for education schools to form "professional development schools" in

close collaboration with local school systems. “The idea of PDSs – a new kind of educational institution that will be a partnership between public schools and universities – reflects our [Holmes Group] fundamental commitment to teacher education” (p. vii). In *Tomorrow’s Schools*, the PDSs became an almost mystical scene of collaboration, one where the emphasis was placed on equality between the partners: “We believe these bonds between universities and schools should be a partnership among peers” (p. vii).

Serving as background for the Report, the Holmes Group described public concerns about the relationship between schools and the broader society, introducing three stakeholder perspectives of public education (pp. 3-4). For example, corporate leaders were said to be worried about the quality of schooling, whether the school can educate young people to succeed in jobs that will require a high level of collaborative decision making and understanding of complex processes. Intellectuals were described as being concerned with the erosion of citizen participation in basic democratic processes. And parents were characterized as being worried about whether schools give their children a fair chance to learn what they need to get ahead and be happy. These concerns were identified in relation to social, economic, and cultural conditions and reflected society’s demands on public schools (p.4). Therefore, the focus of the Report is on the task of building PDSs, and it presented a rationale of “placing the education schools in a democratic role, with education professors and schoolteachers working side by side to restructure the way schools organize and carry out instruction” (Labaree, 1995, p. 174).

Problems identified: The authors of the Report recognized that there were things wrong with the way, in which universities educated teachers, which looked flat and monotonous. According to the Report (1990, p. vii) “schools and colleges of education cannot continue to emulate disciplinary departments in universities, largely ignoring the field of practice.” The

report insisted that a school of education must shape a separate identity as a professional school with strong roots in reflective practice and strong bonds to the public school.

Remedies suggested: The main idea of the second report by Holmes Group was to lay out principles to guide the design of a professional development schools (PDS), which serves as a “school for the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession” (p. 1). The Report suggested some principles as to how a PDS should be organized (p. 7). As partnerships between schools and universities, PDSs would be part of the reinvention of public schooling and higher education, designed to focus on professional preparation for novices and veteran teachers, school-based research melding both theory and practice, and the improvement of teaching (pp. 4-6; pp. 85-88). In so doing, the aim of PDSs were to focus on creating learning communities for students as well as for teachers, administrators, and teacher educators and ensuring that all students are taught in ways that lead to deep understanding (p.11).

The Holmes Group stated that professional development will indeed improve education, but they also asserted that the goal of such improvement is to prepare students for active citizenship in a democratic society, goal that can be accomplished only through the collaboration of professors and teachers (p. 7).

Tomorrow's Schools of Education

(Holmes Group, 1995)

In 1995, the Holmes Group issued its third report, entitled *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*, which calls for the reconstruction of both teacher education and teacher work roles in order to produce a quality teaching force for American schools (p. 2). As the title of the 1995

report suggests, it was intended to give it full attention to the problems and prospects of education schools, building on the previous reports to provide an authoritative analysis of what is wrong with these institutions today and what restructuring will be required in order to correct these problems (Labaree, 1995, p. 167).

According to the Report (1995, p. vii), since the publication of *Tomorrow's School* (1990), the Holmes Group has had its own struggles with the implications of its founding goals and principles about the nation's teachers and schools. This third report scrutinized its analysis of how tomorrow's teachers and schools affect the design and operation of university-based colleges and schools of education.¹⁹ The 1995 report challenged the 250 institutions in its membership to raise their standards of quality and to make important changes in their curriculum, focusing on the learning needs of school students, faculty who are working in public schools as on university campuses, location of much of faculty's work on professional development schools, and in the student body reflecting diversity (pp. 2-3).

This report included the following goals for future schools of education, a vision the Holmes Group calls "a crusade in quest of exemplary professional practice"(p. 12): make education schools accountable to the profession and the public; make research, development, and high-quality learning in real schools a primary mission of education schools; connect professional schools of education with professionals directly responsible for elementary and secondary education at local, state, regional, and national levels to coalesce around higher standards; prepare educators for various roles in schools, roles that call for teamwork and a common understanding of learner-centered education; make education schools better places for

¹⁹ The university, as the base for research-oriented education schools, becomes the problem rather than the solution for teachers and schools. The classic attributes of a university – theory-driven research, graduate education, academic autonomy- are now seen as detrimental to the mission laid out for the ideal education school, which is expected to be centered relentlessly on applied knowledge, teacher preparation, and problems of practice. (Labaree, 1995, p. 172)

professional study and learning; correct loss of focus and program proliferation to focus on developing educators who work with young people; assist state policymakers in promoting rigorous standards for educators, including licensure, hiring, certification, and professional development (pp. 12-15).

The Report made it clear that proposals suggested for solving the education school problem are not to be taken as just set of suggestions among many in an open national discourse about the role of these institutions. Instead, the plans laid out in this report for tomorrow's schools of education are presented as the one and only chance for turning around an institution in crisis. The Report stressed that if current schools of educations are unwilling to adopt these proposals, they should quit or be driven out of business.²⁰ "Institutions preparing educators should either adopt reforms that link their educational contributions closely with improved schooling for America's young ... or surrender their franchise" (p. 6).

Problems identified: The Report discussed common problems American elementary and secondary schools face as part of its rationale for changing schools of education. According to the Report, educational problems facing American society include "American students compare unfavorably with peers in other countries. ... [and] only limited numbers of low-skilled jobs are available for students who leave high schools because of failure, boredom, or economic need" (p. 5).

In the first part of the Report, the authors make clear that problems lie in the basic character and standard model of operation in today's university-based education schools (p.5):

²⁰ When the Report was being prepared, schools in the 1990s were under pressure to change from a number of directions, and schools of education had to adapt to these changes or risk being made irrelevant. Transformations in the American economy exerted pressure on schools to prepare students for a changing array of postindustrial jobs over the course of a career, putting a premium on lifelong learning and information-processing skills. The evolving class and ethnic divisions within American society have increased both the complexity of teaching and the urgency of providing adequate preparation for students to function in a multicultural environment. (Labaree, 1995, p. 167)

“Too many education schools maintain low standards for the public school in which their students carry out apprenticeships. They often place students in schools where the conditions of work are almost identical to those encountered generations ago” (p. 7). It is in fact the university connection that is at the root of this problem, which means that the Holmes Group institutions themselves bear most of the blame.

According to the Report, the primary failing of education schools is that “in their rush to emulate colleagues in the arts and sciences, many faculty members of education schools lose sight of their responsibilities and opportunities as part of a professional schools” (p. 13). In addition, the Report criticized the education school professors who have focused on graduate studies, programs for non-teaching professionals, and theory-driven research with the mind of “the generally negative attitude in higher education toward matters relating to elementary and secondary education” (p. 88). The Report claims that this kind of behavior has left education schools only remotely connected to educational practitioners and the core problems of practice that constitute the heart of American elementary and secondary education (p. 11).

Remedies suggested: The remedies to these problems calls for a radical transformation of the form and function of today’s university-based schools of education. For one thing, they must carve off peripheral activities and concentrate their efforts on what should be their central mission: concentrating on teacher preparation at the expense of other programs. According to the Report, a primary goal of tomorrow’s schools of education should be “to center our work on professional knowledge and skills for educators who serve children and youth” (p. 15). It goes on to explain:

We will sharpen our focus and concentrate our programs so that we offer studies more closely aligned with the learning needs of children and youth in a democratic society. ... Education schools trying to be all things to all people fail everyone. Our priority will

be on program quality for those working to improve learning for children and youth. (p. 15)

Another part of the solution called for education schools to become grounded in the problems of school practice by reorganizing themselves around professional developmental schools. Initially proposed in the first report and promoted forcefully in the second, PDSs are elementary and secondary schools that are collaboratively constructed by personnel from education schools and K-12 school systems. As defined by the Holmes Group, these institutions were supposed to serve a complex array of functions: as laboratories of exemplary practice, experiments in restructuring educational roles, models of ongoing professional development, venues for research into problems of practice, and sites for preparing pre-service teachers. For example, in PDS, “a student of professional education benefits from a setting in which he or she may observe, be guided by, and participate in discussions with a cross-section of excellent practitioners” (p. 80). PDS’s are also institutions where educators engage in improvement-oriented inquiry, “acquiring and exercising the habit of reflecting, questioning, and trying out and evaluating ways of teaching by one’s self and with colleagues...[as well as] systematic research and development aimed at generating and applying new knowledge by members of both the school and university faculty associated with the PDS” (pp.81-82). The idea is that the PDS should become the center around which all other activities in tomorrow’s schools of education should revolve: teaching, research, and service will all become concentrated there (pp. 79-86).

What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future

(National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996)

The report of the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF, 1996), entitled *What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future*, offered a blueprint for

recruiting, preparing, supporting, and rewarding excellent educators in all of America's schools. The Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York funded the work of this Commission for two years from 1994 to 1996. The NCTAF is a panel consisting of twenty-six members, including, the president of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the president of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, several prominent business leaders, three university presidents, three governors a congresswoman, the presidents of the two largest national teacher unions (AFT and NEA), and three classroom teachers.

Following two years of intensive study and debate, according to Darling-Hammond (2000, p. 28), Executive Director of the NCTAF, the Commission concluded that recent reforms like new curriculum standards, tests, and accountability schemes are unlikely to succeed without a major investment in teachers. The intention of the Report was to redirect American schooling and teacher education: "What is required is a great national crusade united behind the proposition that competent teaching is a new student right" (NCTAF, 1996, p. 57). It is a provocative report, one that presents not only a criticism of the current state of education in the United States, but also a proposal for change (Bullough Jr et al., 1998), which tried to standardize teacher education. The Report differed from other reform statements in its emphasis on teachers and teacher learning as the center piece of educational reform.

The Commission started from three simple premises by arguing that the proposals are systematic in scope: (1) what teachers know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn; (2) recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is the central strategy for improving our schools; and (3) school reform cannot succeed unless it focuses on creating the conditions in which teachers can teach and teach well.

Problems identified: The Commission’s report identified seven unresolved issues that present formidable barriers to enacting the agenda the public says it wants. These barriers define the dimensions of the challenge facing American schools and teachers. First, the Report found a problem in ‘low expectations for student performance,’ arguing that “[t]hroughout this century, little academic achievement has been expected of most students, who were presumed to be preparing for low-skilled jobs” (p. 24).

Second, the Commission pointed out that the quality of teachers is low because standards for teachers were not being forced (p. 27). The Report criticized that “many teachers do not receive the kind of preparation they need and few standards are in force that distinguishes those who know how to teach successfully from those who do not” (p. 27).

Third, the Commission argued that the ways in which teachers prepare for their work are still very much unchanged from two or three decades ago:

Most teacher education programs taught theory separately from application. Teachers were taught to teach in lecture halls from texts and teachers who frequently had not themselves ever practiced what they were teaching. Students’ courses on subject matter were disconnected from their courses on teaching methods, which were in turn disconnected from their courses on learning and development. They often encountered entirely different ideas in their students teaching, which made up a tiny taste of practice added on, without connections, to the end of their coursework. (p. 31)

Forth, the Commission questioned the current recruitment system that “passively receives those who come to [school of education] rather than aggressively recruiting those who should apply; then they treat promising candidates with abandon, losing many along the way” (p. 34).

Fifth, the Commission focused its attention on the “[i]nadequate induction for beginning teachers” (p.39), noting that turnover in the first few years is particularly high because new teachers are typically given the most challenging teaching assignments. In addition, they are

often placed in the most disadvantaged schools and assigned the most difficult students to teach, with the greatest number of class preparations.

Finally, the Commission identified that “most U.S. school districts invest little in ongoing professional development for experienced teachers and spend much of these limited resources on unproductive practice” (p. 40), meaning that there is a gap between support or rewards for knowledge and skill and what teachers want to study and practice.

Remedies suggested: NCTAF (1996) proposed a sweeping plan to improve the quality of teaching, shifting control of accreditation and certification from local school boards and state education agencies to private education organizations. The Commission’s remedies do not specify the curriculum of teacher training programs or the content of licensing examinations. Rather, their reform agenda is essentially one of empowering education professionals to set standards for how teachers will be trained, tested, hired, and promoted (Ballou & Podgursky, 1997, pp. 5-6). The Commission offered these five major recommendations: get serious about standards for students and teachers (p. 69); establish professional standards boards in every state (p. 69); insist on accreditation for all schools of education (p.70); close inadequate schools of education (p. 70); license teachers based on demonstrated performance, including knowledge tests in subject matter, teaching, and teaching skills (p.7 2); use National Board standards as the benchmark for accomplished teaching (p. 72).

The Report argued that “standards²¹ for teaching are the linchpin for transforming current systems of preparation, licensing, certification, and ongoing development so they better support

²¹ Standards are meant to provide the common metric to assess quality. The standards-based reform movement began in the mid-1980s in response to a continued perceived deterioration in schools’ and students’ performances and the failure of previous reform efforts to improve these performances (National Commission for Excellence in Education, 1983; for more detail, see Delendshere & Petrosky, 2003, pp. 2-5). The recent recommendations of the National Educational Goals Panel (2000) serve to highlight the importance of standards. The Panel, an independent agency of state and national lawmakers and members of the administration, suggested aligning all three elements of teacher development- teacher education program, teacher licensing, and professional development- to standards

student learning” (p. 67), and thus the Commission recommended that standards be developed by three different organizations: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE),²² the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC),²³ and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).²⁴

The second recommendation was to reinvent teacher preparation and professional development programs by specifying standards for both students and teachers (p. 76-77). For this to occur, the Commission suggested several changes, such as, organizing teacher education and professional development programs around standards for students and teachers (p. 76); developing extended, graduate-level teacher preparation programs that provide a yearlong internship in a professional development school (p. 77); establishing and funding mentoring programs for beginning teachers, along with evaluation of teaching skills (p. 80); creating stable, high-quality sources of professional development (p. 82).

The third Commission recommendation addressed correcting the policies and practices for teachers recruiting and placing qualified teachers in classrooms. Ways to accomplish that includes “increasing the ability of low-wealth districts to pay for qualified teachers” (p. 88) and “eliminating barriers to teacher mobility” (p. 90).

(Conway, 2002, p. 101), regardless of whether standard-based reform is a desirable starting point or not. Delandshere & Petrosky (2003) warn against standards-based reform of teacher education by criticizing “standards, as they are written, replace teachers’ intellectual work, and focus their efforts on executing other’s ideas” (p.12)

²² The new standards of NCATE, most recently revised in 1995, reflect the evolution of a much stronger knowledge base for teaching and require schools of education to demonstrate how they are incorporating new knowledge about the effective teaching of subject matter, various approach to learning, and student diversity in their preparation of teachers. (NCTAF, 1996, p. 68)

²³ INTASC is a consortium of more 30 states and professional organizations. The standards developed by INTASC outline how teachers should demonstrate their knowledge of subject matter, child development and learning, classroom communication and management, planning, instruction, and assessment, and the ability to work well with parent and colleagues as a basis for gaining a license to teach. INTASC’s licensing standards are the basis for tests of subject matter and teaching knowledge for an initial license and for a performance assessment that examines teaching skills during the first year or two of supervised teaching. (NCTAF, 1996, p. 68)

²⁴ For experienced teachers, the standards for accomplished practice developed by NBPTS provide guidance for ongoing professional development. Teachers that undertake the National Board’s challenging performance assessments can receive certification of accomplished practice that recognizes the high levels of expertise they have developed. (NCTAF, 1996, p. 68)

Finally, the Commission recommended encouraging and rewarding teacher knowledge and skill; developing a career continuum for teaching linked to assessments and compensation systems that reward knowledge and skill (p. 94); removing incompetent teachers (p. 98); and setting goals and enacting incentives for National Board Certification in every state and district, aiming to certify 105,000 teachers in this decade, one for every schools in the United States (p. 100).

A Talented, Dedicated, and Well-Prepared Teacher in Every Classroom: Information Kit,
(Department of Education, 1999)

In 1999, the U.S. Department of Education issued a document entitled *A Talented, Dedicated, and Well Prepared Teacher in Every Classroom: Information Kit* (DOE, 1999). Making the assumption that “[n]o success can come from efforts to increase student achievement without caring and competent teachers (p. 2),” the Report observed that “the nation’s goals for student learning depend on good teaching in all our schools” (p. 2). By referencing various studies showing evidence that good teaching makes a difference in student achievement, the Report emphasized “teachers’ ability, experience, and education are clearly associated with increases in student achievement” (p. 3).

Problems identified: In describing the current problems of teaching in the United States, the Report relied heavily on information contained in the 1996 NCTAF report. The U.S. Department of Education (DOE, 1999) called attention to serious problems in how teachers are recruited, prepared, licensed, and supported and listed the five major barriers to successful educational reform that relate directly to the quality of teaching.

First, the Report pointed out that the United States has no comprehensive federal strategy for attracting into teaching the kinds of individuals desired, referring to the current strategy as “painfully slipshod teacher recruitment and hiring practices” (p. 4). The Report also specified several types of shortages: shortages of qualified teachers in high-poverty communities, shortages of teachers in certain subject areas and specialties, shortages of teachers in certain regions, and shortages of teachers of color.

Second, the Report cited “seriously flawed teacher preparation,” observing that teacher education programs were too focused on theory at the expense of classroom practice (pp. 5-6).

Third, the DOE noted “unenforced standards for teachers,” arguing that entry into teaching is based on low standards, based upon examinations designed to weed out the weakest candidates rather than to select the strongest ones (p. 6).

Forth, the DOE cited “inadequate support for beginning teachers” (p. 8), adding that new teachers in America are given the toughest assignments – the classes that no one else wants to teach and the extracurricular activities that other teachers do not want to supervise (p. 8).

Finally, the DOE noted a “lack of professional development and rewards for knowledge and skills” (p. 8), where professional development remains largely short-term, non-collaborative, and unrelated to teachers’ needs (pp. 8-9).

Remedies suggested: The Report reemphasized the challenges presented to educators, states, and school districts by Richard W. Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education, dividing them into sections: a) the higher education community level and b) states and school districts (p. 12). In general, recommendations for the higher education community emphasized the need for a shared responsibility between higher education institutions, their schools of education, and individual teacher preparation programs. For example, in order to ensure that teachers have solid

knowledge content, the Report recommended developing stronger links between colleges of arts and science and colleges of education. In addition, the Report promoted stronger links between institutions of higher education and local schools in order to facilitate future teachers developing the skills they need.

In the case of states and school districts, the Report advocated more rigorous standards for controlling the quality of teachers and more supportive working conditions for teacher, including: higher teacher salaries, pay based on teachers' knowledge and skills, a demanding but flexible certification process, policies encouraging portability of teaching credentials and providing credits for years of experience, and better pensions, teaching assignments based on fields in which teachers are trained, long-term induction or mentoring programs to help new teachers, professional development programs designed to provide new knowledge and skills, and improved hiring practices (p. 12).

Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction,
(American Federation of Teachers, 2000)

In 2000, the AFT issued its report, entitled *Building A Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction*, developed by a task force, created in 1998 and composed of K-12 and higher education leaders, to examine issues related to improving teacher education.²⁵ The

²⁵ Today, both the AFT and NEA (National Education Association) are unions whose major goals are increasing the economic security of public school teachers and improving their working conditions. Both organizations pursue these goals by looking after teachers' interest in the political area and, in most states, by holding teachers collective bargaining sessions with school boards. Both are also professional associations that take stands on a variety of issues affecting students, teachers, and public education in general, issues ranging from the curriculum to teacher education to the federal budget (Newman, 1997, pp. 105-109). In both and 2000, about 79 percent of public school teachers belonged to a teacher union. Of the two national unions, the NEA is the larger, with 2.7 million members, including preschool and postsecondary employees. The AFT predominantly operates in urban school districts and has about one million members, including teachers, non-teaching school personnel, healthcare workers, and state and municipal employees. While all public school teachers belong to a union, most private and charter school teachers do not. Unionization and collective bargaining are mainly associated with higher teacher salaries, benefits, working

AFT task force focused on three interrelated issues relevant to teacher education: entry/exit standards (including licensure) for teacher candidates, the clinical experience (including induction of new teachers), and the curriculum, in regard to both subject matter and pedagogy (AFT, 2000, p. 15). The task force reviewed literature on teacher preparation, surveyed teacher education programs, and analyzed existing state policies. Their report presented the findings from that research and formulated a set of recommendations designed to strengthen pre-service teacher licensure and entry into the profession.

The Task Force asserted that “a) the way to improve teacher preparation is to develop policies that strengthen teaching as a true profession with all the classical attributes of a profession” (p. 14) and b) the “best way to bring an adequate supply of well-trained teachers into the classroom is not by avoiding collegiate teacher education, but rather by strengthening it – by bringing more professional control, higher quality, greater resources, and much more coherence to the way higher education screens and prepares teacher candidates today” (pp.14-15). The Task Force also strongly argued that excellent teaching requires a high degree of professionalism, as do law, medicine, or any other complex public service (p. 33).

Problems identified: The Report identified five major problems concerning teacher education programs in colleges and universities across the nation.

conditions, and job security, likely enhancing both the attraction and retention of teachers (the US Department of Education, 2004, pp. 20-21). With respect to the issue of teacher professionalism, the AFT and the NEA say that they are trying to make public school teaching a true “profession.” For example, NEA president Bob Chase announced “The New Unionism” at the National Press Club in a February 1997 speech titled, “It’s Not Your Mother’s NEA.” Chase vowed to create a new union that would build partnership with administrators, work to enhance school quality, and help incompetent teachers improve – or remove them from the classroom, saying “NEA’s role is to cultivate teacher professionalism” (Chase, 1998, p. 20). In fact, more than a decade before, in an April 1985, AFT president Albert Shanker delivered a speech, emphasizing “a union of professionals” and upheld the highest professional standards for teaching occupation (Kerchner, Koppich, & Weeres, 1998, p. 21). Considering the history of the AFT, the AFT’s position toward teacher professionalism in the latest report is not a new one.

First, the Report focused on the difficulty in recruiting the ablest students into teaching, caused mainly by low pay, poor working conditions, and a lack of respect for the profession, as well as the low esteem in which teacher education courses are held at many universities.

Second, the Report criticized the inadequate standards for entering and exiting teacher education programs.

Third, the AFT Task Force bemoaned the underinvestment in teacher education by the university.

Forth, the Report found little consensus about what should comprise the pedagogy curriculum, a problem that was compounded because within a four-year program there was not enough time to include the proper balance of coursework in liberal arts, pedagogy and a major in an academic discipline.

Finally, the Report noted the problems with clinical experiences such as standards resulting in haphazard recruitment and training of supervising personnel as well as inadequate collaboration among the professionals concerning program goals, student oversight, and assessment. Clinical experiences are often too brief and do not require students to take sufficient responsibility for instruction as well (AFT, 2000, p. 6).

Remedies suggested: The AFT formulates a set of remedies for “reshaping” teacher preparation (AFT, 2000, pp. 33-37). These remedies were based on the belief that the best answer to high-quality teaching is “professionalism”: high-quality professional training, high standards for entry into the profession, a strong induction program for beginning teachers, competitive pay, administrative support and continuous opportunities for professional growth (p. 41).

First, the Report first stressed the need for core liberal arts courses prior to admission to teacher education, observing that core courses would provide broader coverage and a sound foundation in a range of subjects and information relevant to K-12 curriculum standards.

Second, in order to raise entry standards, the Report recommended that a 2.75 (phased up to 3.0) grade point average at the end of the sophomore year be required for admission to a teacher education program. The Report also recommended a national entry test, through which students demonstrated college-level proficiency in the core subject areas of mathematics, science, English language arts, and history/geography-social studies.

Third, the Report proposed that all future teachers major in academic subject (as well as take course in other liberal arts disciplines and in pedagogical subjects) in order to understand its content and thereby be better able to help their students meet K-12 education standards.

Fourth, the Report suggested developing a core curriculum in pedagogy. This curriculum should be based on the best research on how students learn and on effective content-specific teaching methods.

Fifth, the Report emphasized clinical experiences, which build on successful models of involving cooperating teachers, clinical supervisors and education faculty.

Sixth, the AFT Task Force recommended instituting a rigorous exit/licensure test, which assessed teaching candidates' knowledge and skills related to both teaching content subject matter and pedagogical subjects.

Seven, the Report argued that teacher preparation should be organized, at a minimum, as a five-year process, which would enable the students to receive an intensive clinical training internship, conducted in close collaboration with the public schools.

Finally, the Report recommended that induction programs be developed for all beginning teachers in order to guide, support, and evaluate beginning teachers.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

(Public Law 107-110)

On January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB, Public Law 107-110). Enacted with strong bipartisan support, *NCLB* represents a significant shift in the federal education policy away from the federal government being primarily a source of funding for low-income students to being a major force in shaping the goals and outcomes of education (Fusarelli, 2004, p. 71). *NCLB* embodies a very ambitious set of goals for improving public schools and increasing academic achievement among all students.

The publicly identified intent of *NCLB* legislation is to close achievement gaps between students who are of different genders, ethnic minority groups, (dis)abilities, economic classes, or levels of English proficiency. To accomplish this, *NCLB* addresses four principles: a) accountability for students' academic achievement, b) local control of federal education dollars, c) parental involvement; and d) the implementation of scientifically-proved programs and teaching methods (NCLB, 2001). The Act is enormous, not only in the fact it has 670 pages, but also in the expanded role it envisions for the national government's Department of Education (Hardy, 2002). It is said to represent the most comprehensive federal intervention into public schools since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (Fusarelli, 2004, p. 72). In addition, the Act focuses on the preparation, training, and recruitment of high quality teachers for every classroom in the United States.

According to Fusarelli (2004), the Act establishes a comprehensive framework of standards, testing, and accountability absent in previous federal legislation, and, in the process, it removes some discretion from local education authorities in determining what the goals and outcomes of education should be. “National report cards” will in effect be issued to each school and district in the United States. Schools and school districts demonstrating “success” will be rewarded with greater funding, whereas “failing” schools and districts will be punished through withdrawal of federal funds, pressure for privatization, and public school choice. All students in Grades 3 through 8 will be tested in reading and math, with testing in science added by 2005 and students must demonstrate “proficiency” in 12 years (by 2013-2014).

Problems identified: According to President Bush’s executive summary, the reform was necessary because nearly 70 percent of inner city fourth graders were unable to read at a basic level on national reading tests; U.S. high school seniors trail students in Cyprus and South Africa on international math tests; and nearly a third of U.S. college freshman find they must take remedial courses before they are even able to begin regular college-level courses. The academic achievement gap between students from rich and poor families and between majority and minority group students is not only wide, but, in some cases, is growing wider (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Remedies suggested: There is a section of the Act that addresses the problems identified and demands major improvements in the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals. According to the Act, by 2005-06: 1) all teachers must be fully qualified; 2) paraprofessionals must finish two years of college or demonstrate knowledge by passing a rigorous test; and 3) highly qualified teachers must hold a bachelor’s degree, be fully licensed in the subject he or she is teaching, and demonstrate competence in the subjects being taught (NCLB, Sec. 1119).

4.3 Comparisons of Documents

This section summarizes the similarities and differences evidenced in the various documents with respect to the problems identified and the remedies proposed. To facilitate the comparisons, I categorized the following types of problems: a) in pre-service teacher education programs (quality of applicants, curriculum, clinical experience), b) in teacher certification and licensing, c) in teacher's status and remuneration, and d) in in-service professional development. With respect to proposed remedies I categorized the following: a) increasing the length of pre-service teacher education programs, b) enhancing the status of teachers, c) increasing teachers' salaries, d) enhancing teachers' autonomy and power, and f) improving the condition of teachers' work.

4.3.1 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the Documents

As can be seen in Table 2, which displays major problems identified, in general, the problems largely relate to issues of pre-service teacher education, certification, teacher status and remuneration, and in-service training. Particularly, the issue of pre-service teacher education has been paid a lot attention among all the documents, with few differing expressions and points compared to other issues. Regardless of the ways in which problems are defined under a theme, Table 2 shows that detailed problems vary from a declining supply of well educated applicants to teaching occupation itself (*Nation At Risk*, 1983; *A Nation Prepared*, 1986; *Building a Profession*, 2000) to unbalanced curriculum construction and management in teacher education institutes (*National At Risk*, 1983; *Tomorrow's School of Education*, 1995; *What Matters Most*, 1996; *A Talented, Dedicated and Well Prepared in Every Classroom*, 1999; *Building a Profession*, 2000).

With regard to pre-service teacher education, a few documents speak clearly of the lack of quality of institutions responsible for pre-service teacher education. In particular, the lack of capable individuals to schools of education is considered to be a problem. *A Nation at Risk* (1983), for example, points out that, at that time, education students were receiving lower scores than those in nearly all other majors, and that these scores had been declining steadily throughout the 1970s, so that the teaching occupation needed to attract more academically accomplished individuals. In *A Nation Prepared* (1986), the issue is discussed in greater detail, indicating that almost half of the students enrolling in teacher education programs come from non-academic high school programs, that is from general or vocational programs not intended to prepare students for college. *Building a Profession* (2000), released nearly two decades later, raises the same problem of recruiting the ablest students, asserting that those in the teaching occupation still operated under low pay, poor working conditions, and a lack of respect by the general public for the occupation as well as in a situation where teacher education courses are often held in low esteem. As can be seen, the issue has been remained one of the major problems to be addressed in the documents since the 1980s. It seems no big progress in attracting able students to the teaching occupations has been made so far.

With respect to the issue of teacher education programs, almost all documents raises questions that varied from curriculum construction and management to lack of standards for teachers and lack of clinical experiences for prospective teachers. For example, *A Nation at Risk* (1983, pp. 22-23) calls attention to the problem of teacher quality. In the Report, too many teachers are accused of having poor academic records and receiving low scores on cognitive ability test. In addition, teacher education programs are criticized because large numbers of students did not know enough about the subject they were teaching, without clarification. And, a

heavy dependence on education courses, rather than subject matter courses, is pointed out in the Report. In *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), the Holmes Group criticizes weaknesses in the undergraduate programs, such as a lack of curricular coherence and the failure of university teacher education faculties to take corporate responsibility for the entire undergraduate program. Inadequate academic pedagogical studies and short periods of student teaching experience were also mentioned. In *Tomorrow's School* (1990), the Holmes Group focuses mainly on the problem that universities have educating teachers. The main point raised by the Holmes Groups is that schools and colleges of education didn't establish their own identity in educating prospective teachers; they merely emulated disciplinary departments in universities, largely ignoring the field of practice. In *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995) the Holmes Group, as the title of the report implies, focuses its attention on restructuring university-based schools of education. The problems identified by the Holmes Group overlap with their previous report, but this 1995 Report is more detailed in explaining those problems. The 1995 Report criticizes that many education schools faculty members had focused on graduate studies, programs for non-teaching professionals, and theory-driven research rather than on teaching teachers how to teach. In *What Matters Most* (1996), low standards for admission to teacher education program is identified as a problem for the low quality of teachers, which resulted from unenforced standards for teachers. This issue is mentioned in brief in the earlier documents at *A Nation at Risk* (1983). In addition, *What Matters Most* (1996) identifies theory oriented teacher education programs and disconnection between students' courses and their courses in teaching methods as problems, and the problems are also criticized in a similar way in *A Talented, Dedicated, and Well Prepared In Every Classroom* (1999). In *Building a Profession* (2000), the issue of teacher education programs is identified as having: problems in terms of inadequate standards for both entering and

existing teacher education programs; little consensus about what should comprise the pedagogy curriculum; and the limitations of a four-year program.

On the other hand, regarding the issue of clinical experience of prospective teachers, in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), a brief period of student teaching and lack of demonstration sites are criticized. Along with inadequate academic pedagogical studies and lack of place to demonstrate student knowledge learned in schools of education, the short period of student teaching experience is blamed for not ensuring competent classroom instruction. In *Building a Profession* (2000), the issues are raised in a little differently. For example, there is lack of standards for the clinical program and the program also does not require students to take sufficient responsibility for instruction. As can be seen by the comparison, the ways of framing the problems shows very similar patterns across the documents, particularly emphasizing the lack of standards for entering and existing teacher education program, despite differences in some terms and expressions.

The issue of certification and licensing seemed to be given less attention as a problem compared to other issues. For example, in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) the Holmes Group criticizes the current certification system as 'pseudo-credentialism' by referencing state-imposed continuing certification does not reflect teachers' improvement in their teaching. *What Matters Most* (1996) and the DOE document (1999) identify the low quality of teachers as a problem. Both documents find this problem to be a result of standards for teachers not being enforced at teacher education institutions.

Regarding teachers' status and remuneration, only one document, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), raises questions about the image of teaching by pointing out that teaching was regarded as popular and an excessively simple conception of an occupation. For example, the Holmes

Group (1986) describes the one-way of teaching as a problem, that is, the presenting or passing on of a substantive body of knowledge or presenting and keeping order. The delivery of lessons in a simple fashion is also criticized, because this make teaching into something any intelligent person could do with relatively little training. In addition, a flat career pattern in the teaching occupation is blamed for teachers' carelessness, where ambition and accomplishment are not rewarded in terms of expanded responsibilities, autonomy, or higher salaries. In *A Nation Prepared* (1986b), the teaching occupation is described as both a feminized and semiskilled job, which are all considered to lower teachers' status. On the issue of remuneration, *A Nation at Risk* (1983), *A Nation Prepared* (1986b) among several documents, raise a question of low teachers' salaries. While *A Nation at Risk* (1983) directly indicates that many teachers are required to supplement their income with part-time and summer employment, *A Nation Prepared* (1986b) points out teachers' salaries ranked at the bottom of all occupations requiring a college degree. However, remuneration is not mentioned as a problem in subsequent documents in that way. Also, in *A Nation at Risk* (1983) draw attention to teachers' discretion by observing that "individual teachers have little influence in such critical professional decisions as, for example, text book selection" (p.23). However, no other documents mention teacher autonomy.

Finally, in the case of teacher in-service training as part of professional development programs, *What Matters Most* (1996) criticizes the issue by first dividing it two parts: inadequate induction for beginning teachers, and little invest in professional development programs. And then the issue reappears in *A Talented, Dedicated and Well Presented in Every Classroom* (1999). Regarding the inadequate induction for beginning teachers, the main problem is found to be a high turnover rate in a teachers' first few years of teaching, and this because new teachers are typically given the most challenging teaching assignments with neither proper preparation or

support. In addition, according to *What Matters Most* (1996), most U.S. school districts invest in little, if any, ongoing professional development for experienced teachers, and neither is there a proper support or reward mechanism for acquisition of knowledge and skills of what teachers want to study and practice.

The differences to frame the problems identified in these documents, however, are not obvious with the exception of the *No Child Left Behind Act* (2002), in considering major problems that have similarly categorized the same issues. This is because NCLB do not focus on the issues of teaching and teacher education in framing problems, but rather directs its attention to issues closely related to remedies suggested for teaching and teacher education. The issue of teacher shortage is also given attention in the documents released in the 1980s, but is no longer mentioned in the documents of the 1990s. Both *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and *A Nation Prepared* (1986) raises the issue of teacher shortage. In the case of *A Nation at Risk* (1983), the problem is addressed in a way that positioned the nation as facing severe shortages in certain subjects, such as mathematics, science, and foreign languages. In *A Nation Prepared* (1986), a growing gap between teacher supply and demand in the coming years is dealt with.

Table 2 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the U.S. Documents

Problems Documents	Problems			
	Pre-Service Teacher Education	Certification and Licensing	Teacher's Status and Remuneration	In-service Professional Development
Nation at Risk (1983)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Not enough academically able students · Heavily depending on education courses in teacher preparation · Severe shortages in certain fields 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No discretion in choosing text book · Low teachers' salaries 	
Tomorrow's Teachers (1986)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Simple concept of teaching · Weakness in an undergraduate program (inadequate academic pedagogical studies/ too brief a period of student teaching, lack of demonstration sites) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Pseudo-credentialism/ blind credentialism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A flat career pattern of the teaching occupation 	
A Nation Prepared (1986)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Teacher shortage · A declining supply of well-educated applicants · A need for minority teachers 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A need for minority teachers · A feminized occupation · A semiskilled job · Lack of autonomy · Too many non-instructional duties · Low teachers' salaries 	
Tomorrow's School (1990)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Flawed teacher education in universities, emulating disciplinary departments and ignoring field experience 			
Tomorrows' School of Education (1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Focused on graduate studies · Programs for non-teaching professionals · Theory-driven research 			

Problems Documents	Problems			
	Pre-Service Teacher Education	Certification and Licensing	Teacher's Status and Remuneration	In-service Professional Development
What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future (1996)	· Major flaws in teacher preparation	· Low quality of teachers resulting from unenforced standards		· Inadequate induction for beginning teachers · Little investment in professional development programs
A Talented, Dedicated, and Well Prepared in Every Classroom (1999)	· Seriously flawed teacher preparation, focusing on theory	· Unenforced standards for teachers		· Inadequate support for beginning teachers · Lack of professional development and rewards for knowledge and skills
Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction (2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Difficulty in recruiting the ablest students caused by: low pay; poor working conditions; a lack of respect for the profession; the low esteem at universities. · Inadequate standards for entry/exit in teacher education · Poor coordination between teacher education and liberal arts faculty · Little consensus on pedagogy curriculum · Limitation of a four-year program · Lack of standards for clinical programs 			
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (2002)				

4.3.2 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed in the Documents

The remedies proposed in the selected reform documents can be discussed around the similar themes as can be seen in Table 3. The suggested remedies seem to be more specific in covering the notion of teacher professionalism and professionalization, because the remedies were suggested both to solve the problems identified and to provide ideas for direction in how to achieve the goal of “professionalization.” In the case of framing the remedies, nearly all documents focused primarily on how to strengthen teacher education programs by extending education periods and by requiring higher standards for entry and exit, and how to enhance the status of teaching along with proving strategies of remuneration increase and conditions of teachers’ work.

With regard to the issue of increasing the required education as well as improving pre-service teacher education, *Tomorrow’s Teachers* (1986), *A Nation Prepared* (1986), *What Matters Most* (1996), and *Building a Profession* (2000) strongly suggests to both abolish undergraduate education majors and develop a graduate professional program or take a five-year view of teacher education programs. Particularly, this view of expanding the education period, according to *Tomorrow’s Teachers* (1986), is recommended in order to construct a “genuine profession of teaching.” In both *Tomorrow’s Teachers* (1986) and *A Nation Prepared* (1986), the Holmes Groups and the Task Force, recognizing that a strong core knowledge is required to make the education of teachers intellectually sound, proposes to phase out the bachelor’s degree in education. In *A Nation Prepared* (1986), a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education is suggested, along with a bachelors’ degree in arts and science as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching. In addition, a Master in Teaching degree, based on the

systemic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residences in the schools, is suggested. This idea is developed into extended, graduate-level teacher preparation programs that would provide a yearlong internship in *What Matters Most* (1996) as well as in *Building a Profession* (2000). Both argue for taking a five-year view of teacher education programs that would enable students to take part in an intensive clinical training internship. Unlike the documents stressing lengthy education, including the Master degree in teaching and a five-year program, *NCLB* (2002) emphasizes the need for highly qualified teachers holding a bachelor's degree, which constitutes a slightly different way in which to define the concept of qualified teachers.

Other remedies for quality teacher education programs addresses strengthening “standards” for teacher preparation and hiring. This remedy appears in *A Nation at Risk* (1983), *Tomorrows’ Teachers* (1986), and *What Matters Most* (1996). In *A Nation at Risk* (1983), the standard is focused on how to evaluate students’ aptitude for teaching and level of competence in an academic discipline because of the deep concern of not having capable students entering teacher education programs. *Tomorrow Teachers* (1986) come up with another idea, suggesting a series of the Professional Teacher Examination as well as multiple evaluations in order to overcome the limitations of standardized testing. In *What Matters Most*, the idea of standard is emphasized more as a “linchpin for transforming current systems of preparation, licensing, certification, and ongoing development” (p.67) and is proposed to set standards for how teachers will be trained, tested, hired, and promoted by three separate organizations such as NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS.

On the issue of teacher in-service training in order to strengthen teachers’ knowledge and skills, the Holmes Group series report, *Tomorrow’s Teachers* (1986), *Tomorrow’s School*

(1990), and *Tomorrow's School Education* (1995) proposes establishing Professional Development Schools (PDSs). Proposed initially in the first report and promoted forcefully in the second, the idea of PDSs, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, is to create working partnerships among university faculty, teachers, and administrators. Put in more detail, PDSs aim to focus on creating learning communities for students as well as for teachers, administrators, and teacher educators to ensure that all students are taught how to apply complex knowledge in practice settings (1990, p.11). As defined by Holmes, PDSs are supposed to serve a complex array of functions, such as laboratories of exemplary practice, experiments in restructuring educational roles, models of ongoing professional development, venues for research into problems of practice, and sites for preparing pre-service teachers. PDSs have been placed at the center of teacher training from the standpoint of the Holmes Group, at most. Also, mentoring beginning teachers has been a strategy to improve the quality of teacher in-service training.

With regard to the issue of enhancing the status of teaching, a few documents attempt to differentiate the flat teaching career into three or four career ladders. It seems that a more hierarchical structure to the teaching occupation, to reformers, would have the public think of the teaching as a more competitive and preferred occupation parallel to other professions. There seems to be an assumption that differentiating staffing patterns would eventually increase the image of the teaching occupation and enhance teaching status in the public view. For example, in *Nation at Risk* (1983), career ladders for teachers that distinguish among the beginning instructor, the experienced teachers, and the master teacher were recommended, with master teachers designing teacher preparation programs and supervising teachers during their probationary years. In *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), in the name of recognizing differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment among teachers, a three-tier system of teacher licensing in

order to create incentives for “a constructive professionalism” (p.9) is one of several key ideas for improving the profession suggested in the report (pp.8-14): the career professional teacher, the professional teacher, and the instructor. In *A Nation Prepared* (1986), the idea of differentiating the teaching force is articulated into a four-level teaching force consisting of licensed teachers, certified teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers. The report argues that the quality of public education can only improve if school teaching is transformed into a full-fledged profession. In “the pursuit of excellence” through education, according to the Carnegie report, “the key to success lies in creating a profession equal to the task – a profession of well educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools for the future” (p.2). The documents released in the 1990s do not discuss the issue of a career ladder in differentiating the teaching force.

On the issue of increasing teacher salary, four of the nine documents suggest the necessity of increasing teachers’ salaries based upon connecting teaching quality with compensation. In *A Nation at Risk* (1983), the recommendations for salary, promotion, tenure, and retention emphasizes the idea of a competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based system by implementing an effective evaluation that includes peer review, so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated (p.30). In *A Nation Prepared* (1986), a set of positive incentives for excellence is recommended. According to the document, reflecting market forces, for example, the incentive system should be based on various dimension of job function, such as teachers’ responsibility, level of certification, seniority, and productivity in improving student performance (pp.98-101). In *What Matters Most* (1996), compensation systems are recommended as a way to link assessments in order to develop a career continuum for teaching. Here, the systems, incentives for demonstrated

knowledge, skill, and expertise, are regarded as a function of moving the mission of the school forward. Demonstrated knowledge and skill refer to at least three types: successful completion of performance assessments for a full continuing license; licensing in more than one subject area; and advanced certification (pp.94-98). *A Talented, Dedicated, and Well Prepared in Every Classroom* (1999) has similar suggestion to *What Matters Most* (1996) regarding remuneration. As can be seen from the remedies discussed above, the whole idea of increasing teachers' salaries seems to be based upon motivating teachers to compete with each other to get a greater reward and upon making the teaching occupation a more market based system.

With regard to the issue of teachers' autonomy and working conditions, the selected reform documents little mention remedies for the problem identified. There might be two reasons for not exploring the related remedies. First, the issue of teachers' autonomy or working conditions might be determined by teachers' collective bargaining sessions with school boards, since the U.S. education system is very much decentralized. Perhaps this is why the national level reform documents selected seemed not to speak directly to the issues related. Second, the standard based accountability system for student academic achievement might overshadow the issue of teachers' autonomy or working conditions, since teachers in the U.S. have been forced to achieve the goal set by school districts, states, and federal government.

A major difference among documents is found between *NCLB* (2002) and all the other documents regarding the issue of qualified teachers as a profession. While *NCLB* defines a qualified teacher as holding a bachelor's degree, the other documents insisted continually on the necessity of extending the period of education, for example, to the level of graduate professional schools of education or to a five-year view program. This suggestion begins with *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and is evident across the comparisons. In addition, the other documents

(*Tomorrow's Teachers*, 1986; *A Nation Prepared*, 1986; *What Matters Most*, 1996; and *Building a Profession*, 2000) clarifies the concept or notion of the profession of teaching based on general attributes of professionalism, while *NCLB* (2002) do not attempt to clarify the notion of professionalism.

Table 3 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed in the U.S. Documents

Remedies	Remedies				
	Increasing the Length of Pre-service Teacher Education (Restructuring Pre-service Teacher Education and in-service training)	Enhancing the Status of Teachers	Increasing Teachers' Salaries	Enhancing Teachers' Autonomy and Power	Improving the Condition of Teachers' Work
Documents					
Nation at Risk (1983)	· Raising standards for teacher preparation and hiring	· Developing a career ladder · Introducing the Master teacher	· Increasing salaries		
Tomorrow's Teachers (1986)	· Constructing a genuine profession of teaching · Teaching for a strong core of knowledge: Phasing out the undergraduate education major and developing a graduate professional program · Creating standards of entry into teaching (professional teacher examinations)	· A differentiated structure of teacher licensing (the career professional/ the professional / the instructor)			
A Nation Prepared (1986)	· Abolishing the bachelor's degree in education · Developing a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education · Introducing a Master's Degree in Teaching	· Introducing a four-level teaching force (the licensed/the certified/ the advanced/ the lead	· Creating a salary system based upon connecting teacher quality to compensation		
Tomorrow's School (1990)	· Developing a Professional Development School				
Tomorrows' School of Education (1995)	· Focusing on professional knowledge and skills for educators who serve children and young · Reorganizing schools of education around professional development schools				

Documents	Remedies				
	Increasing the Length of Pre-service Teacher Education (Restructuring Pre-service Teacher Education and in-service training)	Enhancing the Status of Teachers	Increasing Teachers' Salaries	Enhancing Teachers' Autonomy and Power	Improving the Condition of Teachers' Work
What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future (1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Establishing higher standards for teachers: NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS · Establishing professional standards board in every state · Insisting on accreditation for all schools of education · Closing inadequate schools of education · Licensing teachers based on performance · Using national board standards 				
A Talented, Dedicated, and Well Prepared in Every Classroom (1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Developing stronger links between colleges of arts and science and schools of education · Developing stronger links between schools of education and local schools 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Raising teacher salaries and pay teachers for knowledge and skills 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Developing long-term induction programs
Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction (2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Requiring core liberal arts courses · Instituting higher entry criteria · Instituting a national entry test · Requiring an academic major · Developing a core curriculum in pedagogy · Strengthening the clinical experience · Instituting a rigorous exit/licensure test · Taking a five-year view 				
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Qualifying teachers holding a bachelor' degree 				

4.3.3 Analyzing Some Versions of the Ideology of Professionalism

What versions of the ideology of professionalism are incorporated into the selected documents? A common theme of professionalism for the study can be analyzed by identifying some basic elements that are implicitly and/or explicitly incorporated into the selected reform documents. As discussed in the conceptual issue, general attributes for claiming a professional model include: 1) a body of knowledge and techniques that practitioners apply to their exclusive occupational groups; 2) an extended period of training in order to master such knowledge and skills; 3) enhancing teaching status; 4) a high level of remuneration; 5) a system of having colleagues in control of selection; and 6) a high degree of autonomy and prestige. These characteristics represent a trait model of professionalism or the structural-functional model of professionalism, which are considered to be the most obvious characteristics of a profession in the current capitalist society. Therefore, analyzing some version of the ideology of professionalism that might be incorporated into the selected reform documents can be accomplished by examining how the attributes are justified in the documents selected.

With regard to a body of knowledge and techniques exclusive to the teaching occupation, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), *A Nation Prepared* (1986), *Tomorrow's School of Education* (1995), *What Matters Most* (1996), and *Building a Profession* (2000) all recognize the limitations facing the teaching occupation and proposed developing knowledge and skills unique to teaching. In *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), the Holmes Group reject the concept of teaching as a simple lesson delivery fashion, calling it a naïve view of teaching, and suggested transforming it into a genuine profession by recognizing differences in teachers' knowledge, skills, education, certification, and work experience. The Report argues that "teaching should be

grounded on a strong core knowledge because teaching is about the development and transmission of knowledge” (p.63). In *A Nation Prepared* (1986), a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education is suggested, emphasizing systematic knowledge of teaching and internships and residencies in schools. The document argues that teachers need a command of the subject they teach, a sound grasp of the techniques of teaching those subjects, information about research on teaching, and an understanding of children’s growth and development and of their different needs and learning styles (p.71). In *Tomorrow’s School of Education* (1995), professional knowledge and skills are stressed as the first priorities in improving education for children and youth.

Moreover, *What Matters Most* (1996) suggests standard-setting tasks for knowledge and skills of teaching, proposing evaluation by three private professional organizations.²⁶ The Commission believes that both the standards and the evaluation have to become powerful tool for the profession:

Their [NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS] standards and assessments examine and insist upon the attributes of effective teachers; subject matter expertise coupled with an understanding of how children learn and develop; skill in using a range of teaching strategies and technologies; sensitivity and effectiveness in working with students from diverse backgrounds; the ability to work well with parents and other teachers; and assessment expertise capable of discerning how well children are doing, what they are learning, and what needs to be done next to move them along. The standards reflects a teaching role in which the teacher is an instructional leader who orchestrates learning experiences in response to curriculum goals and students needs and who coaches students to high levels of independent performance. (p.68)

In *Building a Profession* (2000), a rigorous exit/licensure test is proposed in order to examine subject matter and pedagogy. These findings from the documents are clearly matched

²⁶ Sykes & Plastrik (1993, pp.15-17) clarify how the professional model is constructed in the teaching occupation. According to them, the model concentrates on three sets of standards, for initial licensure of teachers: for their advanced certification, and for approval of the programs and accreditation of the institutions that prepare teachers (p.15).

with the idea that claims for the professional model rest on conceptions of the knowledge underlying practice that may be represented in curriculum, licensure, and on characteristics of the professional schools (Sykes & Plastrik, 1993, p.17).

On the issue of an extended period of training to master such knowledge and skills, four of the nine documents emphasizes the necessity of extending the education period, mainly in the form of a graduate professional program or at least in taking a five-year view of teacher program. For example, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), the Holmes Groups portrays schools of education in universities as the prime epistemological authority that can make teacher education more rigorous and intellectually sound. With this in mind, the Group suggests developing a graduate professional program in teacher education (p.63). *A Nation Prepared* (1986) suggests a more detailed strategy for expanding the education period for the teaching occupation, that is, acquiring a bachelor's degree in the arts and science as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching, which lead to a Master of Arts in teaching degree (p.55). In *What Matters Most* (1996), an extended, graduate-level teacher preparation program is proposed by specifying standards for students and teachers. In fact, the development of extended programs²⁷ that add a year (and occasionally two) of graduate level preparation beyond the traditional four-year undergraduate degree has been adopted through the efforts of the Holmes Group of education deans (p.78). In *Building a Profession* (2000), the same logic of extending the education period, taking a five-year view, is stressed, while *NCLB* (2002) holds to the idea of qualified teachers as having a bachelor's degree, making it different from all the other documents mentioned previously. Overall, the prevailing assumption in the selected reform documents, with respect to

²⁷ Extended programs allow beginning teachers to complete a bachelor's degree in their subject and acquire a firmer grounding in teaching skills, including the knowledge of learning and students' special needs. Some are five-year models that allow an extended program of post-baccalaureate preparation for undergraduates interested in teaching. Others are one- to two- year graduate programs serving either recent graduates or mid-career recruits (NCTAF, 1996, p.78).

the lengthy period of education, is that four-year teacher education programs are not sufficient to produce well-trained, well qualified teachers both for their subjects and for their teaching skills, including the knowledge of learning and students' special needs. The assumption justifies additional training, supervised residences, and certification examination through extended programs.

With regard to the issue of enhancing teaching status, a few documents (*Nation at Risk*, 1983; *Tomorrow's Teachers*, 1986; *A Nation Prepared*, 1986) attempt to differentiate the flat teaching career into three or four career ladders. Creating a more hierarchical structure to the teaching occupation is to have the public think of the teaching as a more competitive and preferred occupation parallel to other professions. Behind this an assumption differentiating staffing patterns would eventually increase the image of the teaching occupation and enhance teaching status in the public view.

On the issue of a high level of remuneration for the professional model, given the problems in attracting and retaining talented and qualified individuals in teaching caused by generally low salaries, differential pay schemes are suggested in order to reward better teachers. For example, merit pay in *Nation at Risk* (1983), a career ladder in *What Matters Most* (1996), and incentive pay systems in *A Nation Prepared* (1986) and *What Matters Most* (1996) are all good examples that demonstrated an effort to pursue the professional model, without clarification. Only, in *A Nation Prepared* (1986, p.100), do the Task Force propose a hypothetical teacher salary scale in an average American community by employing a restructuring of salary scale.

With respect to the issue of a system of having colleagues in control of selection, training, and advancement in teaching, professional standards settings are emphasized across

documents, from *Nation at Risk* (1983) to *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) to *What Matters Most* (1996), and *Building a Profession* (2000). These standards setting are articulated and developed most effectively in *What Matters Most* (1996) by introducing the role of three different organizations (NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS) that can be eligible to fulfill the needs of the professional model (for more detail, see the sections on *A Nation Prepared* and *What Matters Most*).

Overall, the selected reform documents include, implicitly and/or explicitly, the basic elements presenting a rationale for teacher “professionalism.” Some documents, for example, *Tomorrow's Teachers*, 1986; *A Nation Prepared*, 1986; *What Matters' Most*, 1996; and *Building a Profession*, 2000 explicitly express the rationale for teaching as a “profession.” The other documents, including those mentioned above, define the problems and specify proposed reforms, employing the basic attributes integral to the notion of profession, professionalization, and professionalism. In sum, all documents selected for the study have some elements that at least partially meet the categories or attributes for claiming the professional model, but all documents selected do not much attend to the issues of high degree of autonomy and power, which is considered to be very necessary in fulfilling the notion of professionalism. Only *Nation at Risk* (1983, p.23) raises the question of individual teachers having little influence in making such professional decisions as textbook selection. Considering the fact that these categories make the assumptions that society and school or student achievement can be improved by implementing such changes, such a view is explicitly consistent with a structural functionalist perspective of education reform.

5. THE KOREAN CASE OF REFORMING TEACHING, TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATION

5.1 Introduction

In this section, I first introduce the selected reform documents issued at the national level in Korea since the 1980s in order to illuminate both the background and aims of the reform documents. Unlike the U.S. reform documents discussed in the previous chapter, which have various sources ranging from government organizations to teacher unions to private foundations at a national level, the selected Korean documents are limited to those issued by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform,²⁸ the Ministry of Education,²⁹ and the Teachers' Union.³⁰

²⁸ The Presidential Commission on Education Reform (PCER) is considered an advisory organ to the President, aiming at determining the basic direction for education and constructing the national consensus on future educational plans. The PCER, organized under Chun Doo Hwan's Fifth Republic (1980-1988), has changed slightly its title under each administration since it began its activity (1985-1987) as an advisory organ to the President, but its aim remains the same. Under the administration of Roh Ta Woo (1988-1993), who succeeded Chun, its title changed to The Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Policy (PACER); the administration of Kim Young Sam (1993-1998) renamed it the Presidential Commission for Education Reform. Under the administration of Kim Dae Jung (1998-2003), it was entitled the Presidential Commission for New Education Community (PCNEC).

²⁹ In 2001 the Korean government restructured its body by changing the Ministry of Education (MOE) into the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (MOEHRD) and placing it under the post of the Deputy Prime Minister simultaneously (Kim & Han, 2002, p. 3), although for this study I use the original source of either MOE or MOEHRD according to materials I cite.

³⁰ In Korea three teachers' organizations, the Korean Federation of Teachers' Association (KFTA), the Korea Teachers' and Workers' Union (KTU), and the Korean Union of Teaching and Educational Workers (KUTE), represent the voice and interests of teachers and educators. The KFTA (*Gyochong*), historically a government-sponsored body, was established in 1947 essentially as a school principal group in order to carry out government policy. As a historical organization for teachers, the KFTA is regarded as one of the largest professional groups in Korea. Any educational employees in Korea can join the KFTA and the KFTA membership is calculated at 45% of all teachers from kindergarten to university level as of April 2004 (KFTA, 2004). In July 1999, the KTU (*Chonkyojo*) was formally recognized as a trade union, following the enactment of legislation passed in January 1999 that allowed teachers to form trade unions. This act broke the long held policy of prohibiting civil servants to form trade unions (Synott, 2001, p. 130). The KFTA has as much legal approval to negotiate wages, working conditions and teachers' welfare as the KTU has, but the KFTA considers themselves as the organization more concerned with the issues of enhancing teacher professionalism, curricula, and the professionalization of educational administration. The two groups strongly opposed to each other. When the KTU fought for its legal position as a trade union, the KFTA was strongly against the idea of constructing a teachers' union and rejected conceptually classifying teachers as workers (KFTA, 1998; Synott, 2001). With respect to the notion of teacher professionalism, while the KFTA has not issued any particular proposals or documents to clarify its position except emphasizing words such as "enhancing teacher professionalism" for collective bargaining (KFTA, 1998, p.10), the KTU released some documents directly related to the notion of teacher professionalism (KTU, 1997, 2002). For this reason, this

The Commission reports selected are more like comprehensive proposals for education, which have been taken up by the government for policy making. Because the scope and range of the documents by the Presidential Commissions are occasionally more extensive than the documents in the U.S. cases, I have limited the focus of my analysis to the themes concerning teaching, teachers, and teacher education.

First, I discuss in chronological order the selected documents with respect to who participated in developing them, from what perspective(s) do they conceptualize societal and educational problems, what major issues or problems do they identify related to teaching, teachers, and teacher education, and what remedies do they suggest. I then compare the problems identified and the remedies suggested across the documents. Finally, I analyze how, if at all, the documents draw implicitly or explicitly on some version(s) of the ideology of professionalism in framing the problems about and in proposing the remedies for teaching and teacher education.

5.2 The Documents

The documents discussed in this section are as follows: *July 30 Educational Reform* (the Special Committee for National Security Measure, 1980), *the Declaration of Education Democratization* (the YMCA Teachers' Association, 1986), *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1987), *The Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union* (Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union, 1989), *Basic Framework of Education Development* (Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Policy, 1992), *Education Reform for a New Education System Leading Toward a Globalization and Information Era* (Presidential Commission for Educational

study only discusses documents from the KTU. The KTU has been recognized as one of major factors in influencing the shaping of Korea's teacher policy since it received its regal position (Kim & Han, 2001, p. 4).

Reform, 1995), *Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21st Century Korean Education* (Presidential Commission for New Education Community, 2000), *Comprehensive Measure to Develop a Teaching Profession* (Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, 2001), and *Educational Policy Proposal for the 16th Presidential Election* (Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union, 2002).

July 30 Educational Reform,

(Special Committee for National Security Measures (SCNCM), 1980)

The early 1980s in Korea was a period of significant changes in social, political, and educational arenas. The assassination of President Park by his security chief, Kim Che Kyu, on 26 October 1979, brought hope to many Koreans and non-Koreans for democratic reform in politics and education. During the next five or six months, a time known Seoul Spring, the political atmosphere in Korea improved measurably and Koreans met all over the country to discuss a new constitution (for a description of more historical approaches, see Cumings, 1997, pp. 367-382; Lee, 1997, pp. 200-201). However, by May 1980 Chun Doo Hwan consolidated his position as head of a military power. Faced with student demonstrations, workers strikes, and calls by opposition candidates for free elections, the administration, led by Chun, declared martial law on 17 May and formed a junta committee, known as the Special Committee for National Security Measures (SCNSM), to implement dictatorial measures (Kim, 1998, p.85). The SCNSM announced the *July 30 Education Reform*, named for the date on which it was announced, but referred to publicly as the *Measures for Normalizing Education and Solving*

Overheated Tutoring.³¹ Therefore, the SCNSM created a significant role in educational reform in the early 1980s (Kim, 1998, p.86).

Having forcibly seized power, Chun never gained the trust of the people. Chun's main interest was in controlling people in the context of social turmoil, turning people's political interest to other paths, and establishing his own military regime as soon as possible (Kim, 1998, p.87). Chun's educational reform was designed primarily to win support for this government from the people, and MOE, KEDI, and other government officials made a sweeping educational reform, responding to the request by the Committee, called the *July 30 Educational Reform*.

Recognizing the serious social issue of private tutoring for university entrance examination, the *July 30 Education Reform* contains key proposals: a) it banned private tutoring and b) it abolished both the state-sponsored preliminary test and the Final Selection Test, replacing them with a new College Entrance Achievement exam (MOE, 1983, pp. 30-33).

Problems identified: The main problems identified by the *July 30 Education Reform* report includes overheated private tutoring and an abnormal phenomenon of education caused by the tutoring. According to the report (MOE, 1983, p.30), private tutoring, seen as necessary for students gaining admission to universities has caused a deterioration in the high school education system; caused class differences in educational attainment because some can afford the tutoring and other parents can not; forced students to focus on rote learning for university exams, so they do not have the time to develop as a whole person; relegated teachers to the role of transmitter of knowledge. The Report also noted that tutoring is the result of a variety of factors both inside and outside the school system: limited access to higher education; a flawed university entrance examination system; a school system not synchronized with its aims; little investment in

³¹ Overheated private tutoring, a direct translation of the Korean phrase (*kwayol kwaoe*), refers to an incredible excess in tutoring that goes in the country.

education; lack of opportunity to work, and wage differences between degreed and non-degreed people; misguided educational views about children's education.

Remedies suggested: Remedies suggested by the special committee were largely divided into two parts, educational policy and social policy. The remedies were proposed in a brief way without further clarification. For educational policy, main remedies includes: abolishing the final selection of the university entrance examination and introducing a Home School Record System (*naesin*); decreasing the number of subjects in grade schools; introducing a new quota system for college entrance called "admission over quota, graduate by quota";³² making all day teaching available at universities; increasing the total number of university admissions; increasing the admission quota for the Air and Correspondence University; introducing education broadcasting; and extending the two-year elementary teachers' college to four years.

The agenda regarding teaching and teacher education is found in the final sentence of the final measure among seven recommendations. It included "the extension of ... the two-year elementary school teachers college to four-year colleges granting bachelor's degrees by 1984" (MOE, 1983, pp. 32-33) and "the improvement of the educators' welfare system by increasing educators' payment and extending research grants for educators" (MOE, 1983, p.33). Although not directly related to the key "problems" of exams and private tutoring, the proposal for lengthening the period for pre-service education for elementary school teachers was included because of a demand by the educators, involved in producing the reform report. In particular,

³² The SCNCM found the source of overheated private tutoring (excessive extra curricular study) to be from an imbalance between the supply and the demand of higher education and they expected to solve the problem by increasing the university quota system (Kim, 1999, p. 95). This new quota system mainly aimed at extending opportunities for higher education, while controlling for quality by keeping the same number of graduates. According to this system, colleges could admit students up to 30 percent over their quota, but they could graduate only their allotted quota. This system meant that colleges had to flunk out a substantial number of students by their senior year (see Kim, 1998, pp. 96-97).

Jung Tae Soo, (later) Deputy Minister of Education and editor-in-chief for the report *Korea Education Reform in the 1980s*,³³ published in 1983, emphasized the necessity of the extending the length of teachers colleges programs (Kim, 1998, p. 93). The rationale for this change in pre-service elementary teacher education was recounted by a document issued in 1983 by the MOE:

[T]he previous two-year colleges for elementary school teachers not only have a sizeable burden of course work, but also have a very limited period in which to learn professional knowledge and teaching skills to be a teacher. Considering that the low morale, pride, and responsibility of elementary teachers and the emerging importance of pre-school education and kindergarten education, and both the skepticism of self-realization of elementary teachers as human beings and the low respect toward elementary education by graduates of two-year colleges, the extension to a four-year teacher college was determined. (MOE, 1983, p. 113)

Social policy remedies included: abolishing a degree limit not necessary in increasing opportunities to work; hiring people for government organizations and state-run industries based on a quota of different levels of education (high school diploma, university degree, etc.); strengthening the relationship between industry and universities.

The Declaration of Education Democratization

(YMCA Teachers' Association, 1986)

On 10 May 1986, the YMCA Teachers' Associations³⁴ organized meetings on the first Teachers' Day in Seoul, Pusan, Gwangju, and Choonchun, involving eight hundred teachers and

³³ This is the selection of documents on education reform released in the early 1980s by MOE. The original document of *July 30 Education Reform* is located in the selection.

³⁴ In 1981, a group of mainly young teachers formed the YMCA Teachers' Association. They sought radical educational reform allowing for greater teacher autonomy, greater decentralization of the educational system, an end to the practice of mobilizing students and teachers for pro-government rallies, and an end to military drills and spiritual education, all of which they linked to political reform (Seth, 2002, p. 228). After a period of local mobilization in the 1980s, the formation of a national movement was announced at a conference, and the so-called YMCA Declaration of 1986, which expressed a range of teachers' grievances, set out a determination to press for reforms. In May 1989, the movement declared itself a Union-*Chunkyojo*- the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers Union- drawing heavy repression from the government which resulted in the imprisonment of several leaders, including the president for a year, dismissal of some 1,700 teachers, hunger strikes, protests by teachers and students in schools, student suicides, mass rallies, and intense public debate and conflict over the issue (Synott, 2001, p.132).

expelled former teachers. As a result of these meeting the Association issued a *Declaration of Educational Democratization (Kyoyuk Minjuhwa Sŏnŏn)*, which was disseminated around the nation; mass rallies were held and different member associations issued their own declarations (KTU, 1990, p. 49).³⁵ The declaration by the Korean YMCA Secondary Education Teachers' Association was important because it spelled out the basic goals of the so-called "democratic education movement" and significantly influenced the course of Korean education during the next decade.

With the belief that democratizing education is inseparable from the process of democratizing society, the declaration criticizes the current non-democratic education system that failed to provide students with critical thinking and problem solving abilities. One thing that made it different from the governmental perspective is the way in which the unionized teachers defined the term 'educational reform.' The document identified teachers, students, and parents as major actors in education and, thus, educational reform. According to the declaration, educational reform without their involvement would be regarded only as a technical and partial treatment, not as a real reform (KTU, 1990, p. 51).

Problems identified: Two-thirds of the Declaration was devoted to revealing various problems with the Korean education system (KTU, 1990, p. 51). First, the Declaration argued that teachers' autonomy and creativity were restricted in the current education system, because it was controlled by political power elites to serve their interest, it was characterized by a bureaucratic form of educational administration, and it was a non-democratic system. According to the document, teachers were degraded as being the lowest class, because they performed their duty under extremely controlled conditions (bureaucracy) and were forced to sacrifice

³⁵ The KTU published in 1990 the *Korea Education Movement White Paper 1978-1990* to celebrate its first anniversary of organizing the union. The book is a white paper that includes various materials related to the education movement in Korea from the end of the 1970s to the early 1990s.

unconditionally their position under the name of ‘clergyman (*sungjikja*)’.³⁶ Therefore, the Declaration pointed out that teachers’ autonomy and creativity for real education were excluded.

Second, the Declaration criticized students’ situation, saying that students, who should enjoy their life at school by both seeking the truth and strengthening their bodies and minds in order to become healthy, humanistic members of the community, were suffering from continuous high stakes examination. Also, the Declaration criticized the current school system, indoctrinating a biased and fixed value to students, failed to teach students to become democratic citizens of high quality, with high values.

Third, the Declaration referred to parents as one of the victims of the current education system, saying that the education system reinforced the competitiveness of examination and tutoring, thereby parents, without being aware of the educational problems caused by a social structure full of contradictions and a flawed education system, were reducing the quality of their lives and those of their children (KTU, 1990, p. 51).

Remedies suggested: As the title of the document implies, the Declaration called for an end to the top-down administration of education, hoping that parents, teachers, students, and the public would direct the education system to meet the needs and desires of society. In particular, the Declaration called for protecting the basic rights of teachers as well as other citizens, stating that “teachers’ rights should not be interfered with”³⁷ and that “government interference and repression of ... [independent teachers’] organizations should be prohibited” (KTU, 1990, p. 52).

³⁶ The term “clergyman” is a widely used translation of the Korean term “*sungjikja*” and has been used by governmental documents rather than teacher union’s documents. The term means “man whose life is devoted to religious service.” Over a long and relatively stable history of educational practice from the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, a broadly accepted understanding of teachers’ positions in the social order developed in such a way that *sungjikja* was the term used to identify the teacher role. The unionized teachers regard their classification as a form of clergy to be a practice of government that excluded teachers from active and democratic participation in school decision-making, curriculum formulation, and professional development. They argued that the maintenance of the “clergy” role promoted non-critical, rote-learning classroom pedagogy that characterized Korean school education (see Synott, 2001, p. 134)

³⁷ For example, the Declaration called for protecting teachers from arbitrary dismissal, transfer, or demotion.

Additionally, the Declaration called for insuring the political neutrality of education as guaranteed in the Korean constitution; the independent of educational administration; implementing educational decentralization; the elimination of miscellaneous business unnecessary to education;³⁸ and an end of supplementary classes (*poch'ung suöp*)³⁹ and night learning (*simya haksuöp*) for examination preparation (KTU, 1990, p. 52).

Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform

(Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1987)

The Presidential Commission on Education Reform, established in 1985 under the Chun Doo Hwan regime, issued its final report, entitled *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform*, in December 1987. The Commission was headed by the Minister of Education and included members representing various social organizations, ranging from the director of KEDI to the CEO of a major company. However, the majority of the members were educators, including university presidents, university professors. In particular, specialists who wrote the final report were composed mainly of KEDI researchers and university professors specializing in education.

The Commission's report's proposals for 10 policy reforms were derived from 42 reform tasks through plenary sessions, conferences, and public forum, organized in the 1985-87.

³⁸ Behind the claim there was a strong demand for the MOE not to mobilize students and teachers for pro-government rallies. The practice of student mobilization was long hated by parents and teachers. The student mobilizations came to a complete end in 1993. Also, teachers' responsibility for collecting various fees including tuition, supplementary class fees, and special reference materials' fee etc., was a target for elimination in order for teachers to focus on education. Teachers felt a very big burden to collect those fees directly from students.

³⁹ *Pochung suop* is a kind of supplementary class taking place from middle school through high school to prepare students for examinations-for high school entrance examination and university entrance examination. These classes usually began after regular classes are over and parents had to pay for the classes. No exceptions were allowed for the classes. Even though the unionized teachers wanted to end the classes, many parents wanted opportunities for their children to study for the entrance exams, and they placed pressure on the provincial and municipal boards not to abolish the classes (Kim, 1993)

Problems identified: The first problem identified by the Commission was examination-oriented education. According to the Report (pp.41-42), schooling in Korea was primarily oriented students planning to attend prestigious universities, so that all educational activities were focused on preparing students for entrance examinations. Thus, schools' emphasized rote-memory -oriented lessons, for example, with middle and high schools were focused only on finding "correct" answers to questions that would appear on examinations, without exploring or using their individual interests and talents.

The second problem area noted by the Commission was that both teachers and students were limited to following the same curricular content and using the same teaching methods. As a result of the excessively high student-to-teacher ratio, heavy teaching loads,⁴⁰ irrelevant curricula and textbooks, invalid evaluations, and poorly prepared teachers (pp.43-44), instruction did not address all students' interests and academic abilities and is geared to middle-level students. Therefore, the excellent students usually lost interest in learning, and the low level students left school having made little progress.

The Commission drew brief attention to problems regarding teaching and teacher education:

There are many problems with teacher preparation, recruitment, training, working conditions, welfare, and treatment. for example, non-professional curricula in the teacher preparation system; the contradiction between licensing and recruiting; superficial on-the-job training; a rigid administrative system; and the lack of welfare. (p. 275)

⁴⁰ The Commission cited that in 1986 the average primary, lower secondary, and high school class size was 37.9, 38.4, and 31.1, respectively. In the case of teaching hours per week, the Commission reported that most elementary (grades 5 and 6), lower secondary, and high school teachers taught 30, 22+, and 19+ hours per week, respectively, with this load being even heavier when counting extra classes, such as complementary classes and night self-learning, along with miscellaneous clerical chores, not directly related to lessons and student supervision (PCER, pp. 44-46).

These problems, according to the Commission, not only lowered the effectiveness of the school system, they also weakened teachers' "professionalism," diminished the social credibility of the teaching occupation, and reduce teachers' morale.

Remedies suggested: The remedies related to teaching and teacher education were mentioned in the section of "attracting excellent educators" (p. 61, pp. 272-292).⁴¹ First, in the case of teacher preparation and licensing, the Commission, aiming at strengthening teachers' "professionalism" and upgrading the social credibility of the teaching position, suggested having high standard selection system and differentiated teachers' licensure according to the level of the schools. The Report proposed lengthening the period of preparation for kindergarten teachers from two to three years in junior colleges and four-years in universities. The Commission also recommended that colleges of education a) begin licensing elementary teachers specializing in certain subjects as well as continue to offer the multi-subject license and b) differentiate preparation programs for middle school and high school teachers. Also, to attract qualified teacher candidates, the report proposed a scholarship program, obligating recipients to serve in schools, so that all candidates in both public and private teacher training institutes would be eligible to participate.

Second, the Commission recommended that a redefinition of the goals of the college of education:

In order to prepare the teacher as a whole person, armed with a lucid education philosophy and a national consciousness, it is necessary for teacher training institutes to strengthen the way in which teachers are educated to become good ones and to *deepen their professionalism* by mastering subject matter teaching methods and guidance counseling methods. (p. 278)

⁴¹ The definition of the term educators (*kyowon*) in Korean, according to the law of elementary and secondary education, refers to principals, vice principals, and teachers teaching students in grade schools (K-12) (The Compilation of Education Laws, 2000, p. 14), and the term for the study refers only to teachers.

In addition to curricular changes implied in this statement, the Commission suggested that a) all teacher candidates must live in a dormitory or boarding house at least one year in order to improve their character and personality (p. 279) and all higher education institutions preparing teachers must establish attached schools (kindergarten, elementary, middle, and high schools), where teacher candidates could practice their teaching methods and apply the knowledge acquired in their college courses.

Third, the Commission recommended an in-service training system that would increase teacher “professionalism.” In order to accomplish this in the short term in-service training programs should be divided into three categories: training in schools; regular in-service training; and in-service training for a certificate. In the longer term in-service training programs should be organized so that teachers earn credits from universities toward attaining higher degrees (p. 283).

Fourth, regarding teacher recruitment and promotion, the Report suggested establishing career ladder and licensure systems,⁴² which are assumed to enhance teacher “professionalism.” This would involve inductions programs, for example, internships for novice or recently licensed teachers as well as creating the role of master teachers, who would serve as mentors for interns and other less experienced/expert teachers (p. 286).

To improve the socio-economic status of teachers, and thus enhance the status of teaching and attract more qualified teacher candidates, the Commission offered two suggestions: a)

⁴² According to the current qualification system (The Compilation Committee of Education Laws, 2000, p. 14, pp .20-21), the hierarchical structure of teacher status consists of grade 2 teacher, grade 1 teacher, vice principal, and principal, which is rather simple compared with other occupations. Of course, there are other non-curricular teachers, such as associate teachers, counselors, librarians, nursing teachers, and practical skills teachers. Graduates completing teacher training courses in universities are given grade 2 teacher certificate with no examination authorization procedure. Grade 2 teachers who work for three years are entitled to apply for the grade 1 teacher certificate by taking a required in-service training course. Grade 2 teachers with six years of experience teaching and grade 1 teachers with three years of experience are eligible to acquire vice principal certificate through a qualification training course. In order to get the principal certificate, candidates must have a vice principal’s certificate and three years of experience as the vice principal along with the training course. However, the report suggested that ten years experience and a training course for teachers be required for all vice principals candidates (PCER, 1987, p. 286).

improving teachers' salaries and fringe benefits making them equivalent to other professions and b) enacting a law called "*Act for Attracting Qualified Teachers*," which is aimed at improving teachers' social-economic status, guaranteeing job security, and increasing the credibility of the teaching occupation in the public eye (pp. 290-291).

The Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union (Korean Teachers and Educational Workers Union, 1989)

On 28 May 1989, at Yonsei University two hundred teachers held a meeting declaring themselves the Korean Teachers and Education Workers' Union (*Chonkyojo*). Despite Roh Tae Woo government's coercive measure, including arresting teachers who were in charge of organizing the union and threatening and conciliating teachers who were in favor of the union (KTU, 1990, p. 346),⁴³ the union set up over 160 branches at 15 regional associations throughout the country and attracted fifteen thousand members within two months (KTU, 1990, p. 360). Many teachers became affiliated without actually becoming members, participating in various meetings or joining associated clubs, so that about 12 percent of all the country's educators were linked to the union in some way (Seth, 2002, p. 229). The Declaration by the KTU indicated how it planned to achieve its organizational goals of becoming a legitimized trade union in accord with their fundamental democratic rights: able to perform three basic principles: a) the right of teachers to form their own organization to represent their interests to employers (the right of free association); b) the right of the teachers' organization to negotiate with employers on behalf of its members (the right of collective bargaining); c) the right of the teachers'

⁴³ By the early 1990s a whole battery of state surveillance and repression was directed against the unionized teachers. Those who had been dismissed from their teaching position, some 1,700, became the activist core of the movement, and they and other supporters of teacher unionization became militantly anti-government, especially against President Roh Tae Woo and his education ministry.

organization to call for and co-ordinate activities by member teachers in support of their negotiating position (the right of collective action) (Synott, 2001, p. 142). The union waged a ten-year struggle with successive governments to get legal status as a trade union, which was granted in July 1999. The goal of organizing the teachers' union, according to the Declaration (KTU, 1990, p. 348), was to democratize the nation, clean up a legacy of decades of military dictatorships, and educate future generations who would contribute to reunifying the divided nation in the near future.

According to Synott (2001, p. 135), the teacher union movement sought to replace the notion of teachers' identity as the clergy or public servants of the society with one that defined teachers as practitioners of "Real Education (*Chamkyoku*), which was a progressive, democratic educational philosophy centered on teachers as empowered educators. In rejecting their being labeled as the clergy, the unionized teachers identified themselves as workers. The assertion of their identity as workers confirmed the governments' fears – that teachers who were supporting unionization were "communist," who would subvert the nation's welfare.

Problems identified: In its Declaration, the KTU defined the current Korean education system as one full of contradictions and identifies serious problems facing Korean education and society as follows (KTU, 1990, p. 348). The unionized teachers argued that the current education system failed to educate students who deserve a true education, stating that the military dictatorship infringed upon teachers' autonomy and undermined the political neutrality of educational system by forcing teachers to serve as propaganda agents for those in power. With respect to the status of teachers, the unionized teachers questioned who dare to label Korean teachers as true teachers, since false education, forced by the military dictatorship, degraded the authority of teachers and relegated them to the bottom of society.

Regarding the nature of schooling in Korea and the Korean students themselves, the unionized teachers found that the Korean education, focusing on university entrance examination, lost its identity and role for its nation and history, because teachers were prevented from educating students to become citizens who could contribute to the welfare of the community with self-reliance; teachers instead were forced to teach them to become selfish. Therefore, the unionized teachers criticized that students trapped in super examination competition failed to find their own way and were instead wandering like lost sheep. In addition, parents' attitudes, influenced by success-oriented education, were criticized for considering their children only within a narrow family self-centeredness.

Remedies suggested: The major goal of the KTU was the democratization of Korean society, which could only be achieved by democratizing schooling, that is, organizing the educational system so that teachers would serve as a model of workers and citizens in a democratic society. In contrast, in the current education system, according to the Declaration (KTU, 1990, p.348), teachers were not able to exercise any influence over policies and practice, to speak out in support of democratization, or to teach students about democracy.

Under the heading of achieving educators' autonomy, the union argued two things (KTU, 1990, p.350): a) the system of government-approved and government-issued textbooks should be reformed so that teachers and parents should play an active role in the curriculum decision-making process and b) the bureaucratic system of educational administration should be transformed by empowering school-level teachers' meetings to make decisions for school activities and by introducing a system in which school principals are elected for a fixed term.

Under the heading of improving teachers' welfare, the KTU (1990, p. 351) recommended: a) increasing teachers' salaries by readjusting the salary system; b) abolishing

supplementary benefits between teachers' grade; c) lengthening baby care leave, d) paying a nursery allowance, e) establishing day care centers; f) reinstating the allowance for teaching subject matters; g) providing a big increase of allowance for class-room teachers; and h) providing commuting buses for educators.

Basic Framework of Education Development

(Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Policy, 1992)

In 1992, the Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Reform under the Roh Tae Woo administration issued its report entitled *Basic Framework of Education Development*. The Commission wrote this report to update and extend the first report issued, in 1991. The Commission was composed of many of the same members who participated in the previous 1987 Commission, and also included specialists who were in charge of writing the report. The Commission was chaired by a former prime minister, and its primary members represented various sectors, including politics, business, culture, art, science, technology, law, mass media, and education. The diverse background of members was necessary, according to the report (p. 13), to develop a more comprehensive approach to educational reform than would be the case if only education specialists were involved.

The Commission stated its objective as follows:

The commission recognizes that both [conducting] an in depth reviewing of current educational issues and a constructing of a basic framework to raise educational productivity and efficiency are urgent tasks for Korean education. This report ... previews the 21st century world and future Korean society and establishes a Korean profile required as an educational goal for the coming society. Finally, the report suggests total strategies, including directions to guide educational policy, a system that realizes the educational goal, and a whole support system to make them possible. (PCER, 1992, p. 7)

Viewing education from a comprehensive perspective, in which family, school, and society are closely connected, the Commission argued that education should not be viewed primarily as a means for individual success, employment, admission to a higher level of schooling, or even economic development alone (pp. 7-8).

Problems identified: The Commission organized its presentation of problems regarding teaching, teachers, and teacher education in four parts (p. 48): a condition of the teaching occupation; the decreasing teachers' welfare; the weakening of teachers' professionalism; school manager's behavior. First, under the subheading of "a condition of the teaching occupation," the Commission identified teachers' work overloaded and their low morale as major problems caused by too heavy a workload for teaching, an irrational teacher personnel system, infringing upon teachers' rights to teach, and uncertainty of teachers' positions at private schools.

Second, the report identified the decreasing socio-economic status of teachers as another problem. In particular, compared to other occupations, such as public servants and private sector employees, the salary scale for teachers remained low.

Third, the issue of the weakening of teacher "professionalism" was raised. The Commission pointed out three elements working against enhanced teacher professionalism: a) an overlap in the in-service training provided by teacher education institutions and training institutions;⁴⁴ b) irrelevance of the in-service training provided in such institutions; and c) a lack of lab facilities, time, and funds to support individual teachers' research activities.

Finally, The Commission accused school managers of behaving in an authoritarian manner that prevented more democratic decision-making processes in schools. The Commission found different concepts of the status of teachers (i.e., public servants versus workers), which

⁴⁴ The Commission criticized the programs offered in teacher training centers for the in-service training, since the programs were not updated for teachers and so repeated the same contents teachers were taught while they were in their school of education and included no advanced teaching method.

created conflicts among teachers, the public, and the government after KTU was organized, from those authoritarian leadership.

Remedies suggested: Remedies suggested in the report are found in the chapter entitled “Establishing Professionalism among Teachers” (pp. 155-173). With an idea that teachers are main actors in determining the quality of education, the Commission suggested four strategies for increasing teachers’ professionalism: a) establishing a perspective of the teaching occupation and rights to teach; b) attracting, preparing, and inducting qualified teachers; and c) reforming the licensure system; and d) reforming teacher in-service training.

First, the Commission argued for viewing teaching as a “profession” similar to that of the clergy and not as workers.⁴⁵ According to the Commission (p. 156),

[T]eachers should be proud of themselves as a profession, not as a mere messenger for knowledge, in terms of educating properly for each person. ... The feeling of being proud as a professional would be attained through continuous self training, in order to respond to evolving knowledge in a rapidly changing society, along with a high degree of ethics. ... Teachers educate students who are immature, and the ultimate goal of education aims at having students mature and develop in desirable ways. Therefore, teachers obviously differ from workers working for companies in which their ultimate goal is producing goods and making profits. Therefore, it is valid to view the teaching occupation as a profession [similar to the] ... the clergy, since the teaching occupation is an occupation emphasizing its public responsibility and is in complete charge of students’ maturing and development. (PCER, 1992, p. 156-57)

The Commission stressed teachers’ right to teach in considering them as a profession, acknowledging that teachers’ activities should be protected in terms of their essential rights, including the right to develop and select proper curricular content and teaching methods, the autonomy to manage the class, the right to review and evaluate student achievement and

⁴⁵ The reason the report tried to define the teaching occupation as a profession is found in its description of the current situation facing Korean society. The report recognized that the teaching society faced various conflicts in the way of democratization. According to its perception, if these conflicts continue in the teaching society, Korean education might fall down and regress, seriously damaging students seeking education. Therefore, this conflict should be resolved as soon as possible. (PCER, 1992, p. 156)

behavior and the right to inform students and parents and seek their cooperation. The Commission recommended that teacher policies should focus on building a condition where teachers themselves, first of all, could recognize the importance of employing the right of teachers and feeling secure and proud as professionals (p. 158).

The second remedy included selecting and preparing qualified teachers, all of which are directly related to reforming teacher education institutions. As for selection, the Commission proposed several new ideas: a) developing an evaluation tool to examine applicants' aptitude for the teaching occupation, which avoids the current selection based only on academic test scores; b) employing an interview to supplement academic score based selection; c) considering an admission system based upon the recommendation of high school principals; d) having admission periods for teacher education institutions that differ from those of general colleges and universities; e) expanding the number of scholarships for teacher candidates (pp. 160-161). In addition, the Commission recommended: hiring professors majoring in specific subject matter for teacher education institutes; strengthening general education and teacher education requirements; and establishing an accrediting system for teacher education institutions (pp. 162-163).⁴⁶

The third recommendation focused on reforming teacher qualifications and personnel systems (pp. 165-168). The Commission suggested introducing an "examination of eligibility of qualification," with more objective criteria, to be used in determining teachers' positions on a "new career ladder": second-class teachers, first-class teachers, advanced teachers, and lead

⁴⁶ An accrediting system for teacher education institutes refers to a system that aims at evaluating comprehensively the aim, content, professors' activities, and education environment for students and professors of the institutes and determining their function, role, and scale for the institutes to be affordable. Moreover, it offers information necessary for the institutes to improve and develop themselves. (PCER, 1992, p. 163)

teachers.⁴⁷ This new system, according to the Report, is aimed at encouraging classroom teachers to remain their classroom and to take pride in their teaching, rather than viewing their career only in terms of promotion into administrative positions, such as vice principal or principal. The Commission also proposed the “introduction of a one year internship” as a means to evaluate the qualification and eligibility of teacher candidates and to compensate for a lack in training practice during course work at colleges of education. The period of the internship would be included in the teaching career, and interns would be trained to teach classes, prepare materials for teaching, and observe other classes.

As for the welfare, the Commission proposed that “ in order to achieve teachers’ professionalism ... it is necessary to establish salary and allowances regulations and separate from the regulations for general public servants and to reexamine the current teacher salary system” (p. 167). Reducing heavy teaching loads for teachers and substantially decreasing time spent on non-teaching task were also suggested.

Finally, the Commission suggested that teachers’ in-service training courses should be diversified and systematized (pp. 170-173). The Commission recommended four levels of the training course: a) basic courses (focused on developing clear professional consciousness and teaching method); b) settling courses (concerned with increasing teachers’ instructional techniques and research abilities; c) developing courses (focused on developing leadership skills that contribute to working for communities as education specialist; and d) intensive courses (concerned with promoting professional leadership skills)

⁴⁷ The first-class teachers who have ten years teaching experience would be eligible for advanced teacher status, and advanced teachers who have ten years teaching experience would be eligible for lead teacher status.

Education Reform for a New Education System Leading Toward a Globalization and Information Era

(Presidential Commission for Educational Reform, 1995)

The Presidential Commission for Educational Reform under the President Kim Young Sam's administration issued on 31 May 1995 a report entitled *Education Reform for a New Education System Leading Toward Globalization⁴⁸ and the Information Era*. This document, often called *the May 31 Education Reform Initiative*, because it was released on that day, is considered to be the most significant policy document in Korea's educational history by educational policy makers, researchers, and practitioners (Kim, 2003) and was evaluated by OECD inspectors as an ambitious and inclusive reform effort (Lee, 2000).

The reform commission consisted of 25 committee members, including ten university professors, two university presidents, a senior researcher of KDEI, one former principal of a vocational high school, an elementary school vice principal, two business CEOs, one newspaper editor, one presidential advisor on policy making, the president of the National Parents' Association, and the president of the National Private Institute Association.⁴⁹ This reform commission also convened its own professional committee, which includes five university professors, one dean of a graduate school of education, the president of a professional college, and one elementary school teacher.

⁴⁸ The meaning of the term, globalization (*segvehwa*), in this document, is not spelled out, but one may assume that it signaled an interest in making Korea's educational system similar in content and method to those of other developed democracies (Seth, 2002, p.233).

⁴⁹ Note that no teacher representing any of the teachers' associations was included among the 25 commission members. The Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers Union (KTU- *Chunkyojo*) was still being treated as an illegal organization by the government, but there were also no representatives from the Korean Federation of Teachers' Associations (KFTA), which was recognized and often collaborated with the government. It is also interesting to note that almost half of the 25 committee members and all professional committee members earned their doctoral degrees in the United States and were working for universities or research institutes in Korea (Shin, 1998, p.178).

The education reform proposed in 1995 differs somewhat from previous reform efforts in framing the issues and presenting a rationale for proposed changes. The reform did have a clear direction in which to lead education in Korea – preparing Koreans to function effectively in a globalized and information-based world – and included practical strategies for achieving this goal, at least, from the government’s standpoint with nine action plans.⁵⁰ The Commission offered “a new vision of information and global society that would lead education reform, and was differentiated from the so-called modern, industrial society” (p. 4). Assuming that “Korea would become more competitive in the global market place,” the Commission suggested that “education should be a key platform in developing intellectual capacities such as creative thinking and learning and become a source for the development of the nation” (pp. 4-5) and emphasized developing competent teachers:

Whether education can be successful or not mainly depends on teachers, who are considered as main actors in the education arena. Therefore, the first priority is to develop competent teachers, to induct them into the schools, then to construct working conditions for them in which they can dedicate themselves to teaching with complete responsibility. (PCER, 1995, p.37)

Problems identified: The Commission defined educational problems and their causes, dividing them five categories (p. 6). First, the Commission identified “examination hell” as the main problem facing Korean society and education. They found its causes in the education fever of Korea where people were eager to educate their children for higher education, and in the very restricted regulations for running such higher education institutions, including the establishment of higher institutions, the size of enrollment, and establishing departments. The second

⁵⁰ The nine action plans include: building an open learning society; diversification and specialization of universities; constructing school communities for self controlled elementary and secondary schools; instituting a curriculum that develops the character and creativity of learners; improving college entrance examinations; operating elementary and secondary schools that respect the diverse individuality of learners; establishing an accredited support system for education supplies; nurturing decent and competent teachers; securing 5 percent of the GNP for the education budget. (PCER, 1995)

problem identified by the Commission was “excessive private tutoring”, which reached 6 percent of the GNP in 1994. The Commission found its causes in current schooling that never satisfied different educational needs or desires of students and parents. The lack of investment in public education was also mentioned as part of the problem, by evidencing the pupil to teacher ratio. For example, the average Korean elementary school class in 1993 had 31 students, in contrast to 20 students per teacher in Malaysia, 21 students in Japan, 16 students in France, and 27 students in Hong Kong. The third problem defined by the Commission was over preparation by students. The current education system, which favored education suppliers’ position and would not consider students’ needs, was criticized. There were also too many subjects for students. High school students in Korea were required to study 25 subjects, compared to 11 subjects in Japan and 14 subjects in the United States. Finally, a low quality of education was blamed. The Commission identified that 13- year- old Korean students ranked Group A for international science achievement, but 18 year- old students fell into Group C. Moreover, the Commission criticized a school system where almost every student progress and graduate without any evaluation system.

Major problems for teaching, teachers, and teacher education addressed in the reform document of *the 1995 Commission Report* had three parts. In general, the report identified the problems from the Korean teaching occupation, which was not attractive and closed atmosphere and from teachers’ welfare that did nothing with teaches’ passion and ability (p.57). In detail, first the low reputation of teacher education institutes finds to be a problem, since the teaching occupation in Korea considered as having a low status. Other reason included teacher preparation curriculum lacking professionalism, which made it harder to attract and prepare excellent candidates. The other one was about teacher recruiting system, which was known as a

closed system compared to other occupations, so it was blamed not to induce good candidates into the teaching occupation.

The second problem identified by the Commission was about teacher in-service training programs, which had been operating merely as a means to provide upper certification, the training curriculum actually lacking relevance to teaching activities. Teacher training had fallen into a kind of passing ritual, a superficial one that could not contribute to developing teacher capabilities. The Commission used this example: “under the current system, a teacher having participated in a first-class certification training program within 5 to 10 years since being appointed, does not have to take any additional training until he or she retires, if that teacher does not wish to” (p. 57).

Finally, the Commission pointed out the current personnel system, including promotion, which, according to the report (pp. 57-58), ran by seniority rather than teacher productivity, so that the teaching occupation in Korea seemed not to get excited. The current salary system, unilaterally determined “the same salary for the same career with the same class with no incentives,” was also criticized.

Remedies suggested: Two types of remedies were suggested to address the problems: a) “[e]nsuring competent teachers by reforming teacher education and teacher in-service training” and b) “[e]stablishing promotion and a differentiated salary system based on competence” (pp. 58-61).

To supply the field with excellent teachers armed with professional knowledge and flexibility to teach, the Commission suggested improving the curriculum of teacher education institutions, and developing minor for elementary teachers teaching their own subjects and for middle school teachers teaching elective subjects. The Commission also recommended reducing

the class size in elementary and secondary schools. Moreover, the Commission suggested reforming the teacher recruitment system⁵¹ in order to ensure that teachers with excellent teaching skills were selected. To improve teachers' "professionalism," the Commission recommended the development of a teacher self-training system that would focus on developing individual teacher competence. For that to occur, the Commission suggested acknowledging training results earned from graduate schools and social education institutes for general training courses and taking those courses into promotion and salary determination.

The Commission recommended setting up a merit pay system for promotion and salary determinations, and proposed granting overtime allowance for teachers who taught more hours than assigned by law. Other recommendations included enabling teachers to focus on their essential tasks, teaching and research, for example, by introducing part-time teacher, volunteer, and assistant teachers to do some of the non-instructional tasks. Moreover, the Commission recommended implementing a pilot, self-regulated working hours system for teachers to establish an efficient work environment at schools, where teachers can arrange their own working hours unless their teaching schedule or student guidance activities conflict with their time desired.

Reform Directions and Tasks for 21st Century Korean Education

(Presidential Commission for New Education Community, 2000)

Kim Dae Jung (1998-2003) appointed what he called the Presidential Commission for New Education Community (PCNEC), which issued in 2000 its report entitled *Reform Directions and Tasks for 21st Century Korean Education*. The PCNEC was a panel consisting of

⁵¹ The current selection of middle school teachers consists of four parts: education (30), specialization (70), writing (25), and interview (25), so that the results of the selection depend on an examination composed of multiple choice questions (PCER, 1996, p. 59).

twenty-six members, including thirteen university professors, eleven staff of national education research institutes, and two Ministry of Education officials. To obtain views of a broad range of educators and community members, the PCNEC appointed five hundred education policy reporters and it appointed one hundred twenty education specialists, called field-reform supporters, in order for them to give advice to local educational authorities, schools, and local educational bodies. Moreover, the PCNEC offered technical support to organize local education communities of citizens, and held various meetings and seminars to share information and experiences.⁵²

The PCNEC defined the current society as knowledge based society, where:

[V]arious fragments of information are not only resources themselves, but are also to be used for their commercial value. Moreover, our lives becomes largely dependent on productivity and social value generated from a knowledge-based society when the society produces, uses, exchanges, expands, and reconstructs more organized and advanced knowledge (pp.10-11).

Problem identified: Recognizing the fact that Korean education was facing a quality issue in public education, the PCNEC identified its basic problem from a centralized bureaucratic system that controlled the entire public education system (p. 24). With regard to teaching, teachers, and teacher education, the PCNEC offered the review of reform policies suggested by previous and current administrations under the subtitle of “Increasing Teacher Professionalism.” By examining the content of policies related to teacher professionalism and the process of whether they have been implemented or not, the PCNEC identifies two problems (pp. 85-86).

⁵² According to the Report, the PCNEC had a few positions for educational reform similar to those of the PCER (1995) of the previous administration, but the PCNEC differed somewhat in its function. While the PCER (1995) aimed at setting agendas for educational reform and tasks to implement, the PCNEC accepted the directions and tasks set by the previous government and continually tried to implement the reform tasks. For educational reform, that means, “Kungmin administration (Kim Dae Jung government) basically succeeded to the directions and tasks set by Munmin administration (Kim Young Sam government) and kept implementing the reform policies consistently (pp.3-4).

First, according to the Report, the project to increase teacher “professionalism” proved somewhat unproductive when considering the whole structure of educational reform. The PCNEC diagnosed “teacher policies and teacher reform so far have failed in a larger perspective” (p. 86).

Second, the PCNEC criticized that teacher policies were shaped primarily by outside influences without negotiation inside the education community. The document cited two examples: reducing the retirement age in 1998 and legalizing the KTU (p. 86).

Remedies suggested: The PCNEC suggested establishing local educational communities centered on schools, expecting their own voices of self determination to increase as they grew, in order to exclude a unilateral culture and minimize the development of marginalized groups (p. 24). Three remedies with regard to the problems were suggested in the report (pp. 86-87).

First, the Commission suggested drawing on a consensus outside and inside the education community by reconsidering and reorganizing the basic propositions of teaching and teacher reform, accusing that many tasks tended to lose their essential intention of reform in the midst of conflict among interests groups.

Second, the PCNEC suggested that reform inside the education community should be proceeded with the appeal that “teachers are the main actors for teacher reform” (p. 86).

Finally, the PCNEC recommended creating an environment where each school unit could operate independently including introducing a “self-financing private school system” as well as expanding the policy that permits public schools to manage themselves (p. 87).

Comprehensive Measure to Develop a Teaching Profession

(Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, [MOEHRD] 2001)

In 2001 the MOEHRD of the Kim Dae Jung administration issued a Comprehensive Measure to Develop a Teaching Profession. This policy document was written by a panel and chaired by the Deputy Minister of Education. The panel consisted of 19 members including three people representing teachers' associations, a principal, six educational staff members, four education specialists, and five people representing civic organizations and parents' associations. To receive a range of review from the public and specialists, the MOEHRD and KEDI held various hearings and conducted surveys. This document was developed after an extensive policy review, was informed by the results of a pilot program initiated on 24 December 1999, and was formulated with input from various interest groups, including teachers' associations and parent associations (Park, 200, pp.9-10).

Problems identified: The *Comprehensive Measure* discussed two sets of problems: low teacher morale and limited teacher "professionalism". As for teacher morale, the problems identified by the *Comprehensive Measure* varied from issues of teacher alienation and the feeling of being victimized to over-sized classes to the issue of poor teacher welfare (pp.6-14). First, it was noted that some students and parents challenge teachers' rights to teach so that teachers felt alienated. The document also acknowledged that teachers sometimes felt victimized, as if they were the target of the reform policies in the past. According to the document, teachers' authority was also decreasing in that conflicts related to corporal punishment by teachers tended to be resolved by intervening external organizations, not by teachers themselves.

Second, the *Comprehensive Measure* pointed out various problems regarding teachers' working conditions: a) being burdened with heavy workloads and oversized classes because of a shortage of teachers; b) having to devote time to non-instructional activities (including lots of paper work, distributing textbooks, and collecting fees); c) working in schools without rooms for research, rest, and dressing for teachers; and d) having a restricted working schedule (from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays and 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. weekends).

Third, the *Comprehensive Measure* discussed poor treatment of classroom teachers and of teachers with administrative assignments, indicating that teachers deserve more compensation for workload and that teachers' salaries were far less than salaries of employees at large private companies.

Fourth, the *Comprehensive Measure* noted that because teacher participation in policy making was limited and their voices were hardly reflected in policies, such policies tended to have little relevance to the field. The current regulations regarding research projects were also criticized, because they limited primary and secondary school teachers' roles to that of co-researchers rather than primary investigators.

Finally, the *Comprehensive Measure* pointed out the absence of a mechanism connecting retired teachers, parents, and local citizens who were willing to volunteer for schools, so that voluntary activities at local and school levels did not work well.

With respect to teacher "professionalism," problems identified in the *Comprehensive Measure* were related mainly to how to educate excellent teacher candidates, how to strengthen teachers' in-service training, and how to expand the opportunities of social experiences for teachers. First, the document pointed out that the current curriculum of teacher education institutions did not correspond well to a knowledge-based and information-based society and that

students in schools of education had a limited choice in elective courses because of rigid curriculum policies. In addition, the document pointed out the lack of variety in faculty members' backgrounds with few faculty members specializing in subject-instruction methods, resulting in limitations on how much prospective teachers could learn about ways to teach a subject.

Second, in the case of teachers' in-service training, the *Comprehensive Measure* identified beginning teachers who did not have systemic training before and after being appointed had trouble with student guidance and teaching. Also, training and research leave, both without-pay, were criticized, because the limitation of research without pay caused obstacles to supporting the various needs or desires of teachers to respond actively to a rapidly changing environment. The document criticized the current regulations for teacher in-service training because that restricted teachers from taking part in in-service training at domestic institutions, thereby limiting opportunities to study abroad to earn degrees and making it difficult for teachers to understand and learn the education systems and teaching methods of other advanced countries. The documents identified that there was also a lack of government support for voluntary in service training and research activities at school sites.

Third, the *Comprehensive Measure* identified curricular problems in the schools.⁵³ In the case of primary schools, emphasizing English and computer subjects, which raised the necessity of "professionalism" in subject teaching, put more of a burden on primary teachers, who are

⁵³ The national curriculum in Korea has been revised seven times since its first version for primary and secondary schools was announced in 1954. The most recent one, the Seventh Curriculum, was released in December 1997. The new Curriculum differs from the previous one, considering that while the latter emphasis was supplier (teacher)-centered, the former is oriented to demand (student)-centered. In the previous curriculum, the curricular subjects that fit the secured teaching force were given to students; in the new one, students freely select from an expanded list of elective subjects and the government is obliged to secure the necessary teachers and have them teach those subjects to students. So, the new Curriculum caused an increase in the demand for teachers who can teach diverse subjects in secondary schools. It had already generated new demands for teachers in primary school education because of the new Curriculum emphasis upon English and computer education. (Kim & Han, 2002, p. 6)

teaching all subjects. The document identified problems with the current in-service training provided for teachers to get a minor in that it was impairing subject “professionalism.”

Remedies suggested: The *Comprehensive Measure* had two major themes: a) to increase teacher morale and b) to enhance teacher professionalism.⁵⁴ The document described the goal of policy in enhancing teachers’ morale as follows:

In order for teachers, having both worth and pride as main actors in the education community, to focus on education activities, it is necessary for all of society to create an environment of respect for teachers and to improve their economic status and working conditions. (p.6)

With regard to enhancing teacher morale, major remedies suggested by the *Comprehensive Measure* included: building an environment that respects teachers; lightening the heavy teaching workload; improving working conditions and welfare; and expanding teachers’ participation in the policy making process (pp.6-14). In relation to respecting teachers, the document recommended reenacting laws to benefit teachers as key actors in education reform. The *Comprehensive Measure* defined the teaching occupation as the ‘clergy’ and recommended launching a social campaign to respect teachers:

[MOEHRD] should emphasize at all times that [the teaching profession] educates future generations [and] is just like the decent occupation of the clergy. This message should be disseminated through various paths, including the media, and various events that praise teachers’ service on teachers’ day should be held, in an effort to let teachers respect themselves and to help them take pride in themselves at the governmental level. (p.7)

Second, to deal with the problem of a heavy teaching workload, the *Comprehensive Measure* suggested various tasks including a drastic increase in the number of teachers in 2002-2003 and the employment of assistant staff to support teachers’ work (p.8).

⁵⁴ According to Kim & Han (2002, p.7) and Park (2001), teacher morale was low because parents and other community members distrusted the public education system, due to skyrocketing costs for private tutoring, increased incidents of school violence, continued use of corporal punishment, and the sudden reduction of the retirement age from 65 to 62 (introduced as a part of structural reform policies widely made in all areas since the 1997 national currency crisis).

Third, in the case of improving working conditions and welfare, the *Comprehensive Measure* proposed that by 2004 teachers' salaries should be increased to the same level as private companies employing 100 workers. The report also recommended various allowances for teachers should be increased as well (p.10).

Fourth, in order to expand teachers' participation in the policy-making process, the *Comprehensive Measures* recommended participation at the very beginning of educational policy making and in evaluation through national- and local education authority-level advisory committees that consists of teachers (p.13).

With regard to improving teacher professionalism, the *Comprehensive Measure* made a variety of proposals (pp.16-28), including : a) developing by 2002 new, more relevant teacher education curricula in both colleges of elementary teacher education and schools of secondary teacher education; b) establishing strong partnerships between teacher education institutes and elementary and secondary schools; c) requiring as a graduation requirement that student teachers engage in social service activities with special needs students; d) hiring faculty who are specialized in subject teaching methods; e) hiring experienced teachers to be faculty members of schools of education; f) instituting a Doctorate of Education' degree in order to prepare faculty specialized in subject teaching methods; and g) introducing by 2001 an accreditation system for teacher education institutes and teacher training centers, to evaluate both curriculum and management and then raise their quality.⁵⁵

In order to strengthen in-service teacher training, the *Comprehensive Measures* proposed a variety of remedies as follows (pp.19-23): a) implementing a special orientation and transition

⁵⁵ To that end, the MOEHRD has the authority to accredit teacher education and qualification programs at the national level, while local education authorities have authority at provincial and city level job training programs. According to the documents (2001, p.18), the MOEHRD and local educational authorities should have the power to warn and then withdraw accreditation by employing administrative and financial control, if teacher education institutes and training centers are not qualified.

program for new teachers to adjust quickly to their jobs; b) establishing a mentor system for new teachers; c) having beginning teachers train at least two weeks with local education authorities; d) introducing ‘voluntary training leave’ for experienced teachers; e) introducing self-initiated training and research activities funded by the MOEHRD and local education authorities; f) encouraging teachers to get minor certification for their promotion; g) expanding teacher in-service training abroad or in private firms.⁵⁶

With regard to certifying elementary teachers, the Comprehensive Measures suggested instituting a ‘specialized subject teacher’ license system in order to reduce the heavy burden of late primary school teachers who have to teach all subjects, to enhance subject matter “professionalism”, and to run integrated primary and secondary schools more effectively. In addition, the document suggested that, to fit with the seventh curriculum, students at primary school teacher education colleges be taught to earn both certifications to teach all subjects and specialized subjects together through intensive courses. For all prospective middle school teachers in schools of education, the documents also recommended earning minor certifications.

Educational Policy Proposal for the 16th Presidential Election

(Korean Teachers’ and Educational Workers’ Union, 2002)

On November 4, 2002, the KTU released its educational policy proposals for the 16th presidential election in order to provide its vision on a variety of issues on education (Chonkyojo Shinmun, 2002, Nov 4, pp. 4-5.). This proposal was based upon two previous proposals, the 1997 proposal for the 15th presidential election and the 2000 proposal for a general election. The proposal consisted of five parts; establishing the public education system as a welfare charged by

⁵⁶ According to the document, long-term training overseas should last in universities or training centers from two to three months and short-term experiences at primary and secondary schools sites from one to two weeks. (pp.25-26)

the government; founding the base and reforming the system for normalizing public education and for educational democratization; education welfare and educational decentralization for the 21st century; and teacher policies guaranteeing professionalism and autonomy.

Problems identified: The proposal identified three big issues facing Korean education and the Korean society. First, the KTU found Korean education more as a burden rather than as a hope for the public, because Korea was a country where, on the one hand, the country had the highest enrollment ratio per capita in higher education (83%) around the world, on the other hand, the public suffered from the largest amount of private tutoring for those wishing to enter prestigious universities.

Second, the KTU criticized the country for having too many alternative of educational issues that differ among government departments and organizations, and teachers unions, thus the public tended to distrust any policy suggestions issued by any of these organizations.

Finally, the KTU identified the current trend of education reform as not enhancing public education and not progressing educational democratization policy. They included in their criticism a return to supplementary classes and an implementation of academic achievement tests in order to motivate academic competition.

Remedies suggested: The position of the KTU on the notion of teacher “professionalism” has shifted slightly since 1997, when the KTU, as an illegal organization, released its policy proposal on variety of educational issues as a way of delivering its position to the presidential candidates before the 15th Korean Presidential Election. In 1997, a remedy suggested by the KTU under the subheading of “training competent teachers and improving educators’ welfare” focused on reforming teacher education institutions in order to enhance the “professionalism” and the quality of teaching. For the task to be implemented, the KTU

suggested integrating elementary school teacher colleges and secondary school teacher colleges into special teachers colleges focusing on teacher education, one where graduate courses could be increased. In addition, all graduates from the institutions should be recruited by settling a total number of students admitted. (Chonkyojo shinmun, 1997, Sep.10, p. 5)

Five years later, prior to the 16th Presidential Election in 2002, the KTU, as a legal organization, released another education policy proposal that illustrates its position on aggressively accepting the notion of teacher “professionalism.” Particularly, under the sub heading of “teacher policies guaranteeing professionalism and autonomy,” the KTU suggested a variety of remedies to enhance teacher “professionalism.”

On the issue of teacher education institutions, the KTU suggested expanding the curricular connecting schools of education to elementary/secondary schools and instituting at least six months of teaching practice for prospective teachers. In order to prevent abusing the usage of certifying teacher licensure and to enhance the professionalism of teacher education for secondary teachers, the KTU also suggested establishing formal regulations.

With respect to recruiting teachers, the KTU recommended abolishing the current teacher selection system, which is based on paper test, and introducing a comprehensive selection system that includes the scores of practicum at schools, the GPA, a written comprehensive test, and an interview in order to evaluate the aptitude and quality of applicants.

Regarding teacher in-service training, the KTU suggested the idea that the government should support teachers who want to participate in education graduate courses. Research leave for the purpose of teachers’ self-training was suggested. In addition, it was recommended that teachers be involved as main lecturers of teacher training courses. The KTU particularly opposed the current system that reflects the results of the training in promotions and salaries.

On the issue of remuneration, the KTU suggested teachers' salaries should be increased to a level equal to those in companies run by the government.

As for teachers' working conditions, the KTU recommended establishing standard teaching hours, such as nineteen hours for elementary schools, eighteen for middle schools, and sixteen for high schools, which would be institutionalized by law. In addition, posting a full-time staff member to deal with administrative work was recommended along with abolishing miscellaneous non-instructional work.

5.3 Comparison of Documents

This section summarizes the similarities and differences evidenced in the various documents with respect to the problems identified and the remedies proposed in the same manner as for the U.S. cases. To facilitate the comparisons, I categorized the following types of problems: a) in pre-service teacher education programs (quality of applicants, curriculum, clinical experience), b) in teacher certification and licensing, c) in teacher's status and remuneration, and d) in in-service professional development. With respect to proposed remedies I categorized the following: a) increasing the length of pre-service teacher education programs, b) enhancing the status of teachers, c) increasing teachers' salaries, d) enhancing teachers' autonomy and power, and f) improving the condition of teachers' work. In addition, I analyzed how the selected documents draw implicitly or explicitly on some versions of the ideology of professionalism both in framing the problem identified and in proposing the remedies for teaching and teacher education.

5.3.1 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the Documents

As can be seen in Table 4, which displays major problems identified, there are sharp differences between documents issued by the government and documents released by the KTU. While the governmental documents focuses on more technical or practical issues related to teaching, teachers, and teacher education, except *July 30 Reform* (1980) and *Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21st Century Korean Education* (2000),⁵⁷ the KTU documents (1986, 1989) raises more essential questions on various issues from a socio-political perspective.

With regard to the issue of pre-service teacher education, almost all documents issued by the Presidential Commissions focus primarily on teacher education curricular with some different expressions and points. Although there are some similarities in defining the problems under the theme among the governmental documents, the problems vary from non-professional curriculum in teacher education program (*Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform*, 1987; *Education Reform for a New Education System*, 1995; *Comprehensive Measure*, 2001) to low reputation of teacher education institutions (*Education Reform for a New Education System*, 1995) to imbalanced faculty members' background (*Comprehensive Measure*, 2001).

For pre-service teacher education programs, in *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), the Commission raises the issues in a simple way, saying that teacher preparation programs are not “professional” and therefore caused teacher “professionalism” to be weak. In *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995), the Commission points out that teacher preparation curriculum lacks “professionalism,” making it a difficult for schools of education to

⁵⁷ As discussed in the earlier section of overview documents, the *July 30 Reform* (1980) do not raise any specific problems in teaching, teachers, and teacher education, but it offers some remedies for the reform of teacher education. See the details on page xx-xx. Neither does *Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21st Century Korean Education* (2000) focus on specific problems, instead it makes a statement of evaluating policies suggested in the previous government (1995).

attract and prepare excellent candidates. As can be recognized from the problems identified, these documents provide neither a detailed definitions of the term “professionalism” nor evidence to clarify its rationale. It is impossible to understand what correlation between curriculum and “professionalism” exists from this kind of framing problem. On the low reputation of teacher education institutions, identified in *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995), the Commission finds it is the result of social attitudes toward teaching occupation having a low status. They too offer no evidence to clarify their argument. In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), the issue of teacher education programs is also discussed under the agenda of enhancing teacher “professionalism” too. The Report criticizes the current curriculum structure of teacher education programs, saying that it does not reflect the character of a rapidly changing knowledge and information society and students do not have enough choice in selecting courses because of strict curriculum policies. In addition, imbalanced faculty members’ background in teacher education programs, more faculty members specializing in subject-content rather than subject-instruction method are pointed out.

With regard to the issue of certification and licensing, only *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987) among the selected documents identifies the issue as a problem to appeal to teacher “professionalism” and education effectiveness by just mentioning “the contradiction between licensing and recruiting” without making clarification.

On the issue of teacher status and remuneration, the way in which the problems have been framed is a little different in each document issued by the KTU (1986, 1989) and in documents issued by the Presidential Commission (1992,1995, 2001). On the one hand, *the Declaration of Education Democratization* (1986, p. 51) and *the Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers’ and Educational Workers’ Union* (1989, p.348) find a degraded teachers’

status and depressed teachers' authority largely resulting from the political and education situation facing Korean society in general and the school system in particular. Both the KTU documents criticize that teachers' status and authority are never guaranteed under the extremely controlled bureaucracy and therefore teachers are treated as agents of a military dictatorship and non-democratic education system. The 1989 document by the KTU describes teachers as salespersons of knowledge or university entrance examination experts, which mean that teachers have no autonomy in educating their students. On the other hand, the governmental documents, *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987) simply mention the lack of teacher welfare, which are blamed for weakening teacher "professionalism." In *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995) the current personnel system, including promotion and salary systems, is blamed for not attracting both citizens and teachers. *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) and *Comprehensive Plan* (2001) find the problem of degraded teachers' status resulted from the low salary scale compared to other occupations, such as public servants or employees in large companies. As can be seen by the comparison, there are sharp differences in framing the issue of teachers' status and remuneration. While the unionized teachers define the problems in considering current socio-political conditions oppressing their autonomy, the governmental documents tended to discuss around the issues, avoiding the structural problems criticized by the unionized teachers.

On the issue of teachers' working conditions, all documents raise concerns in little different ways. On the one hand, the documents (1986, 1989) by the KTU criticize a situation facing education in Korea with no political neutrality of education or no teachers' autonomy; on the other hand, the documents (1992, 2001) issued by the governmental organizations frame problems in practical ways within the systems, such as teachers' work overload, closed

promotion system, and teachers' low morale. For example, in *the Declaration of Education Democratization* (1986), the KTU describes the current education system as "No political neutrality of education is guaranteed and the bureaucratization of educational administration and the non-democratic system occupy the whole education" (p.51). The same kind of problem on the issue of working conditions is identified in *Declaration of Organizing Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union* (1989). The other documents focus primarily on the issue of working conditions of overloaded teachers, low morale, infringements on teachers' rights to teach, and a closed promotion system. The heavy teaching burden caused by overcrowded classrooms is also identified as a problem in *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992). *Comprehensive Plan* (2001) accuses various social situation not being favorable to the teaching occupation, for example, students and parents challenging teachers' right to teach, the conflict between teachers and parents/students on the issue of corporal punishment, and teachers' feeling of being victimized in education reform.

With regard to the issue of teacher in-service training as a problem identified in *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992), and *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), the three documents addresses the same issue but in slightly little different ways. While both *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987) and *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) discuss the problem in brief, saying "superficial teacher in-service training" resulted in weakening teacher "professionalism" and lowering education effectiveness, *Comprehensive Measure* (2001) raises the question by identifying relatively specific items, for example, beginning teachers not having a systemic training and the current regulation of limiting opportunities for teachers to developing their knowledge and skills, etc. As can be recognized through the findings mentioned, the way in

which the issue of teacher in-service training was framed has been specified since the document was issued in 1987. However, no clarification of teacher “professionalism” across documents is evident.

Table 4 Comparisons of Problems Identified in the Korean Documents

Problems Documents	Problems			
	Pre-Service Teacher Education	Certification and Licensing	Teacher's Status and Remuneration	In-service Professional Development
July 30 Reform (1980) The Declaration of Education Democratization (1986)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No political neutrality of education (No teacher autonomy) · Degraded teachers' status 	
Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform (1987) The Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union (1989)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Non-professional curriculum in teacher preparation programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The contradiction between licensing and recruiting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The lack of treatment and welfare for teachers · Degraded teachers' authority (·Infringement of educational autonomy and political neutrality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The superficial teacher training
Basic Framework of Education Development (1992)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Teachers' work overload and their low morale · Decreased social economic status of teachers · Weakened teachers' professionalism · Contested teaching society 	

Problems	Problems			
	Pre-Service Teacher Education	Certification and Licensing	Teacher's Status and Remuneration	In-service Professional Development
Documents				
Education Reform for a New Education System Leading Toward a Globalization and Information Era (1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Low reputation of teacher education institutes · Flawed teacher education programs 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Closed promotion and salary systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Flawed teacher training systems
Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21 st Century Korean Education (2000)				
Comprehensive Measure to Develop a Teaching Profession (2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Flawed teacher professionalism; untimely and inflexible teacher education curriculum; imbalanced faculty structure in colleges of education 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Low teachers' morale: infringement on teachers' rights to teach; poor working condition; low salary; lack of mechanism to create education community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · unsystematic teacher training
Educational Policy Proposal (2002)				

5.3.2 Comparison of Remedies Proposed in the Documents

Remedies proposed in the selected reform documents are also discussed around the same categories and themes I employed for the U.S. cases. The categories to classify the proposed remedies are more articulated to cover common themes of teacher professionalism and professionalization, since the remedies were suggested both to solve the problems identified and to provide directions for achieving the notion of professionalism and professionalization. As can be seen in Table 5, which displays the remedies proposed, while the governmental documents focus primarily on how to strengthen pre-service teacher education programs and how to enhance teacher status, along with other strategies for improving working conditions and remuneration, the KTU documents emphasize the structural and political issues facing Korean education and society.

With regard to the issue of strengthening pre-service teacher education programs, including curriculum, certification, and licensing, the Commission reports suggest a number of remedies, which vary from extending the education period (*July 30 Reform, 1980*) to introducing rigid selection and a differentiated licensing system (*the Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform, 1987*) to introducing an internship (*the Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform, 1987; Basic Framework of Education Development, 1992*) to developing a teacher education curriculum model, introducing a Doctor of Education degree, and strengthening an accreditation system (*Comprehensive Measure, 2001*). Solutions for pre-service teacher education programs are suggested, but vary in form and content from document to document to such a degree it would be not easy to categorize them the way I did for the U.S cases. For this reason, the discussion proceeds by dividing into the main theme sub-categories.

In *July 30 Reform* (1980), the necessity of extending a two-year elementary teachers' college to a four-year college is suggested, considering various factors including the big burden of course work required for teaching students professional knowledge and teaching skills in two years, and the low morale and pride of graduates from two-year colleges of education. In the *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), a differentiated teachers' licensure system, along with lengthy education, is proposed. For example, kindergarten teachers must be trained at four-year colleges and elementary teachers are recommended to be specialized in a certain subject along with possessing licensure to teach all subjects. In the case of secondary teacher licensure, the recommendation was to differentiate their licensures according to middle or high school licensure. In addition, a scholarship program for all candidates in both public and private teacher education institutes is recommended in order to attract good teacher candidates. In *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992), the Commission emphasizes the importance of the instructional method of each subject, adding the necessity of hiring professors majoring in specific subject matter and of establishing an accrediting system for teacher education institutes. In *Education Reform for a New Education* (1995), getting a minor for students in colleges of education for elementary and secondary schools is proposed. In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), three remedies are proposed: the curriculum should reflect the character of a society in which knowledge and information change rapidly and where students in colleges of education deserve more chances to learn through a flexible curriculum, and greater need for faculty specializing in subject-instruction methods. In addition, the graduate level of professional schools of education is proposed to responding to a rapidly changing society, and a Education of Doctor degree for teachers and administrators is recommend for enhancing their "professionalism."

On the issue of an internship for teacher candidates, while *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987) suggests a certain period of time for teacher candidates who are supposed to be recruited, *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) suggests introducing a one-year internship to evaluate the qualifications and eligibility of candidates in order to increase teacher “professionalism.” According to the documents, interns should be trained to teach classes, prepare materials for teaching, and observe other classes. In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), the partnership between teacher education institutes and schools is emphasized in order to solidify prospective teachers’ clinical experiences.

With regard to the issue of teacher in-service training, the governmental documents has elaborated their idea and strategies since *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), where a diversified training system was introduced, such as training in schools, general in-service training, and in-service training for a certificate. In *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992), a four-level training course is proposed: basic courses for beginning teachers; settling courses for subject matter teachers; developing courses for leadership skills; and intensive courses for professional leadership skills. In *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995), the issue of teacher in-service training focuses on individual teachers’ responsibilities, encouraging them to develop their own competence. The Commission suggests respecting teachers’ own decisions to choose training institutes and allows those results to be reflected in promotion and salary. In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), teacher in-service training is suggested in order to differentiate according to career levels. A special adjustment program for beginning teachers before and after deployment is introduced. A mentor teacher system for beginning teachers is also proposed. For experienced teachers, voluntary training leave, self-initiated in-service training, and research activities abroad and in private firms are

suggested. As can be seen, the idea and practice of teacher in-service training for increasing teacher professionalism has been made more diversified and specialized for teachers.

The issue of improving teachers' salaries is always mentioned in all governmental and the KTU documents. The way of framing the issue is usually very simple, such as "improving teachers' salary and welfare", but some documents specifically suggest creating a new salary system. In *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995), a merit pay system, paying an overtime allowance for teachers working more teaching hours than assigned by law, is suggested, along with a promotion system that values individual competence. *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987) recommends making teachers' salaries equivalent to those in other professions. *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) suggests establishing salary regulations separate from general public servants. *Comprehensive Measure* suggests that the scale of salary be placed on the same scale as that of large private companies employing 100 workers by 2004. That differs from other documents in terms of setting specific guide-lines for remuneration.

With regard to the issue of enhancing the status of teachers, a master teacher system as a way of improving teacher "professionalism" is suggested in *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987). A "new teaching career layer," differentiating the current two layers from four layers, is articulated in the document *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) as follows: second-class teachers, first-class teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers. In this Report, the Commission particularly emphasizes the teaching occupation as a "profession" similar to the mission of the clergy and tries to differentiate it from a concept of "workers." In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), a lead teacher system is also suggested, to make the current

simple promotion system more diverse in order to respect those who have been working only as teachers.

With regard to the issue of enhancing teachers' autonomy and power, two documents (1986, 1989) issued by the KTU and three governmental documents (1992, 2000, 2001) reference the issue in slightly little different ways. For example, the KTU, having criticized the socio-political situation with which teachers were faced in the 1980s, propose a few remedies guaranteeing teachers' autonomy and power in education. In *the Declaration of Education Democratization* (1986), ending a top-down administration of education, guaranteeing the political neutrality of education and teachers' rights to teach, and establishing teachers' organizations are suggested to ensure teachers' autonomy and power. In the same context, *Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union* (1989) argues for teachers' participation in the curriculum decision making process, abolishing the system of government issued textbooks, and breaking down bureaucratic educational administration. A way of referencing teachers' autonomy and power by governmental documents (1992, 2000, 2001) seems to be focused on the behavioral approaches of teachers themselves rather than on structural approaches. For example, in *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992), teachers' rights are emphasized with the assumption that teachers themselves could make the effort to recognize the importance of the right of teachers and ensure it with "professional pride" (p.158). In *Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21st Century Korean Education* (2000) and *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), the way of referencing the issue of autonomy and power is remarkable because the documents themselves use words and expressions that illustrate vast

differences from previous documents on teacher policy.⁵⁸ For example, *Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21st Century Korean Education* (2000) describes teachers as main actor to reform teacher community and suggests encouraging their autonomy and reform mind set. In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), under the heading of enhancing teachers' morale, building an environment to respect teachers and increasing teachers' participation for policy-making process are recommended.

With respect to the issue of improving the condition of teacher work, the governmental documents focus on "decreasing heavy burden of teaching" (1992, 2001) by suggesting "increasing the number of teachers," "hiring assistant staff," "building a comprehensive information system," and "decreasing administrative paperwork" (2001). On the other hand, the KTU documents (1986, 1989, 2002) propose somewhat detailed solutions to improve teachers' working conditions by referencing "eliminating non-instructional duties" and "ending supplementary classes" (1986), and "introducing research leave for teacher self-training" (2002).

⁵⁸ The main reason of this change is found in the fact of the legalized teachers' union, the KTU. Since being recognized as a legal labor union in 1999, the KTU has been one of the most prominent factors in influencing teacher policy. (Kim & Han, 2002, p.4)

Table 5 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed in the Korean Documents

Documents	Remedies		Remedies		
	Increasing the Length of Pre-service Teacher Education (Restructuring Pre-service Teacher Education and in-service training)	Enhancing the Status of Teachers	Increasing Teachers' Salaries	Enhancing Teachers' Autonomy and Power	Improving the Condition of Teachers' Work
July 30 Reform (1980)	· Extending a two-year elementary teachers' college to a four-year college		· Improving teachers' welfare		
The Declaration of Education Democratization (1986)				· Ending top-down administration of education · Guaranteeing the political neutrality of education · Guaranteeing teachers' rights	· Establishing teachers' organizations · Eliminating miscellaneous business for teachers · Ending supplementary classes and night learning
Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform (1987)	(· Rigid selection · Differentiated licensing systems by school levels · Introducing scholarship programs for all candidate)	· Introducing a master teacher system	· Increasing salary and treatment		
The Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union (1989)			· Improving teachers' welfare and salary	· Guaranteeing teachers' participation in the curriculum decision making process · Abolishing the system of government-issued textbooks · Breaking down bureaucratic educational administration	· Improving teachers' working conditions
Basic Framework of Education Development (1992)	· Introducing an one year internship	· Introducing a differentiated career layer system		· Guaranteeing teachers' rights to teach	· Decreasing heavy burden of teaching

Remedies	Remedies				
	Increasing the Length of Pre-service Teacher Education (Restructuring Pre-service Teacher Education and in-service training)	Enhancing the Status of Teachers	Increasing Teachers' Salaries	Enhancing Teachers' Autonomy and Power	Improving the Condition of Teachers' Work
Documents					
Education Reform for a New Education System Leading Toward a Globalization and Information Era (1995)	·Improving teacher education programs ·Reforming teacher recruiting systems)		· Introducing merit pay systems		
Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21 st Century Korean Education (2000)		· Respecting teachers as main actors		·Encouraging teachers' autonomy and reform mindset	
Comprehensive Measure to Develop a Teaching Profession (2001)	· Increasing teachers' professionalism: developing teacher education curriculum model; solidifying prospective teachers' clinical experience; hiring faculty specializing in subject teaching method; introducing Doctor of Education degree; strengthening an accreditation system; reinforcing teacher training		· Increasing salary	·Enhancing teachers' morale; building an environment that respects teachers ; Enhancing teachers' participation in policy making process	· Increasing the number of teachers · Hiring assistant staff · Decreasing administrative paperwork · Building a comprehensive information system
Educational Policy Proposal (2002)	(·Expanding curricular connecting schools of education to grade schools ·Instituting six months of teaching practice for prospective teachers ·Abolishing the current teacher selection system ·Supporting teachers to have graduate course ·Establishing standard teaching hours)	·Involving teachers as key instructors for teacher training courses			·Introducing research leave for teachers' self training

5.3.3 Analyzing Some Versions of Ideology of Professionalism

In order to explore how the selected reform documents draw explicitly or implicitly on some versions of ideology of professionalism in framing problems about and in proposing remedies for teaching and teacher education, the same categories used in the U.S case are employed for the Korean case. As discussed in the conceptual issue, general attributes for claiming a professional model include: 1) a body of knowledge and techniques that practitioners apply to their exclusive occupational groups; 2) an extended period of training in order to master such knowledge and skills; 3) enhancing teaching status; 4) a high level of remuneration; 5) a system of having colleagues in control of selection; and 6) a high degree of autonomy and power. These characteristics represent a trait model of professionalism or the structural-functional model of professionalism, which are considered to be the most obvious characteristics of a profession in the current capitalist society. Therefore, analyzing some version of the ideology of professionalism that might be incorporated into the selected reform documents can be accomplished by examining how the attributes are justified in the documents selected.

With regard to a body of knowledge and techniques unique to teaching, no documents make the issue or discussed it. Given the idea that claims for the professional model rest on conceptions of the knowledge underlying practice that may be represented in the curriculum, licensure, and characteristics of the professional school, Korean documents including *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992), *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995), and *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), which all argue particularly for teacher “professionalism,” are not clear, because there existed no clarification as to why teaching is a “profession” and why it has unique knowledge

which practitioners apply in their exclusive occupational groups. In addition, there is no clarification in framing a problem that teachers education programs are not “professional.” Considering the absence of clarification on the issue, the documents mentioned above seem to briefly present the notion of “professionalism” in framing the problems and in proposing the remedies under the rhetoric that teaching is a profession. Therefore, for the governmental documents, the notion of “professionalism” is a goal that must be reached, not a theme to clarify through founding knowledge and skills unique to the teaching occupation.

On the issue of an extended period of education in order to master such knowledge and skills unique to teaching, *July 30 Education Reform* (1980) provides an example that suggests extending a two-year elementary teachers’ college to a four-year college, but the main reasons for the extension are not related exclusively to knowledge and skills, but rather to other factors, such as low morale and low pride caused by the differences in degree of four-year graduates as secondary teachers and two-year graduates as elementary teachers. In *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), kindergarten teachers are also recommended to be trained in four-year colleges. *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) suggests a one-year internship that would compensate for training not learned in colleges of education. In *Comprehensive Measure* (2001), introducing a graduate professional program in teacher education and a Doctor of Education degree are recommended for improving teachers’ and administrators’ “professionalism.” Therefore, an obvious tendency is evident through the governmental documents—a movement toward lengthening the education period for teachers in the name of improving teacher “professionalism.”

With regard to the issue of enhancing teaching status, a few documents, *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987) and *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992),

attempt to differentiate the flat teaching career into four career ladders by instituting a lead teacher. It seems that a more hierarchical structure to the teaching occupation, to reformers, would have the public think of the teaching as a more competitive and preferred occupation parallel to other professions. There seems to be an assumption that differentiating staffing patterns would eventually increase the image of the teaching occupation and enhance teaching status in the public view.

With regard to the issue of a high level of remuneration, all documents reference it by connecting it to the concept of profession or professionalism. As can be recognized in framing the problem of remuneration, the level of teachers' remuneration seemed to be far less than for other professions. For example, *July 30 Education Reform* (1980) emphasizes the necessity of improving teachers' welfare including salary and research funds, without offering further clarification. In *Comprehensive Plan for Education Reform* (1987), the salary scale of other professions is offered as criteria for the teaching occupation, and *Basic Framework of Education Development* (1992) suggests special regulations for teachers' salary, while *Comprehensive Measure* (2001) references the scale of private companies for teacher salaries. The KTU also argues for increasing teachers' salaries, but they do not propose any guide-lines, instead suggesting detailed ways in which their salaries could be more realized in the action plan of the *Declaration of Organizing the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union* (1989). Overall, the idea of increasing teacher salaries has been developed from setting criteria (1987) and passing a regulation (1992) to introducing a merit system (1995) or a more detailed criteria (2001).

On the theme of a high degree of autonomy, the KTU documents have continually argue for autonomy as a basic element for the teaching occupation since the 1986 document. In its

recent document (2002), the KTU has combined the notion of “professionalism” with “autonomy” in order to appeal its position to accept the concept of “professionalism,” which was not employed during the 1980s and the early 1990s, known as a period of focusing on socio-political democratization. Unlike the KTU documents, the governmental documents never explicitly mention the element of teacher autonomy except the *Reform Direction and Tasks for the 21st Century* (2000). This document is written after the KTU was been legalized as a trade union in 1999. Therefore one may assume that the concept of teacher autonomy seems not a common element recognized both by the government and the KTU, but as an element included as a result of negotiation between those two parties.

With respect to the element of having colleagues in control of selection, training, and advancement in teaching, only the KTU document (2002) suggests a recommendation that teachers be involved as main lecturers of teacher training courses. No other documents raise the issue in considering the notion of professionalism.

Overall, the selected reform documents include, implicitly and/or explicitly, the basic attributes of the notion of professionalism. Particularly, the documents issued by the Presidential Commissions and MOEHRD demonstrate the movement toward the notion of professionalism and professionalization by partially and explicitly including some of the basic elements, though there are no documents clarifying the notion of the terms. On the other hand, the documents issued by the unionized teachers never mention the terms profession or professionalism; instead, they try to define the teaching occupation and its working conditions from socio-political perspectives until it mentioned the term in the 2002 document. In sum, the major attributes found in the governmental documents and the recent KTU document evidence that a movement toward teacher professionalism and professionalization has been underway. However, the way

in which the governmental documents frame the problems about and the remedies for teaching and teacher education in the name of professionalism are not as formative as the terms are emphasized in the documents, because the argument proceed without providing any clarification or offering anything more than a simplistic list of items regarding the notion of professionalism.

6. CROSS-COUNTRY ANALYSIS

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter I compare the U.S. and the Korean cases with respect to the problems identified, the remedies proposed, and the ideology of professionalism presented in various documents. I also sketch the evidence pointing to cross-country influences with regard to problems identified, remedies proposed, and ideologies of professionalism presented. I then pay special attention to time-lags in when these ideas appear in documents within two countries.

6.2 Comparisons of Problems Identified

As can be seen in Table 6, which displays the problems identified in U.S. and Korean documents, there are some similarities and more differences in what problems were mentioned when framing the need for reform of teaching and teacher education.

With respect to the issue of pre-service teacher education, the common problems identified between the U.S. and Korea concern the quality of teacher education, but the ways in which the detailed problems identified are framed differ from each other. Overall, while the U.S. cases tended to identify the problems by detailing specific points and providing examples, the Korean cases frame the problems more abstractly without providing clarification. For example, in the case of applicants to teacher education, the U.S. documents (1983, 1986a, 1986, 1999, 2000) evidence that the low quality of teaching applicants has been a problem since the issue was raised in 1983. This applicant problem eventually is lead to the development of standards for entry/exit, and is emphasized in both *What Matters Most* (1996) and *Building a Profession* (2000). The Korean documents *Education Reform for a New Education System* (1995) identify

the poor reputation of teacher education institutions in attracting excellent students in teaching. This issue is also identified in U.S. cases, but addressed differently. The U.S. documents cite the low status of teaching as a primary reason that it is unable to attract top applicants.

On the issue of framing the curriculum for pre-service teacher education as a problem, the U.S. cases provide many extensive and specific examples, but the Korean documents provide relatively few examples, stressing only the terms “professional” or “professionalism.” For example, the U.S. documents address the heavy dependence on education courses and lack of recognition as a professional school: “too many educational method courses (1983, 1986b)”; “theory driven research (1995, 1996, 1999)”; “emulating disciplinary department and emphasizing graduate students (1990, 1995, 2000); disconnection between subject matter and subject matters’ teaching methods (1996); “too brief a period of student teaching experience (1986a, 2000), and “lack of special demonstration sites for student teaching” (1986a, 19990). The Korean documents (1987, 1995, 2001) employ the terms related to professionalism in order to call attention to the problems, but provided no additional clarification. For example, a problem like “lack of professionalism in the teacher education curriculum” (1987, 1995, 2001) is a good example illustrating the way in which the problem is framed in the Korean documents. In general, when dealing of the problems, while the U.S. documents deal with them directly, employing statistical data that indicate levels, such as “low quality of teachers”(1996, 1999), “low standards for public schools” (1995), and “under-investment in teacher education by the university” (2000), the Korean documents rarely incorporate specific cases. Therefore, lacking particular information, it is difficult to trace how the Korean documents frame the issue as a problem. I assume that, as Kwag (2001, p.5) argues, the authors writing the reform documents might think that it would not be necessary to define or clarify the meaning of the terms of

professionalism and professionalization in this world of knowledge and information. To them, the terms would be a good slogan for teachers to motivate themselves as to be “professionals” and to impress the importance of the teaching occupation on the public.⁵⁹ That is, people taking initiative to use the terms would have, at least, power to influence teachers’ perception and attitude with regard to the issue of status of teachers, teacher education, and teacher quality.

With respect to the issue of certification and licensing, a big difference between the U.S. and Korea can be seen in their concerns with “standards.” The US documents (1996, 1999) are concerned about developing “standards” for entry/exit to teacher education programs as well as certification. In the U.S., standards and assessments have been defined by national organizations at many different levels and in most academic subjects. Professional teaching standards and assessment for the certification of experienced teachers by NBPTS and professional teaching standards and assessment for new teachers by INTASC are examples. According to Delandshere & Petrosky (2004), the standards-based reform of teacher education is defined as a “ policy of social control that includes both text and action, words and deeds, it is what is enacted as well as what is intended (Ball, 1994, p. 10 cited in Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004, p.3).” However, in the Korean documents, “standards” seems not an issue yet for certification and licensing. Rather, the Korean documents (1987, 2001) are interested in differentiating licensing for

⁵⁹ In 2001, Kwag Byong Sun, former President of KEDI, published a paper entitled “*Classroom Teaching Reform and Teachers’ Instructional Professionalism*,” addressing the issue of teacher professionalism, stressing professionalism as a strategy to impress the importance of the teaching occupation on the public and as a tactic for national survival in today’s global competitive society:

“Today, any occupation would lose its foundation of being a profession if it didn’t have professionalism as an occupation. Teachers’ instructional activities require higher professionalism than any other profession, since teaching must contribute to developing [students’ potential] for knowledge creativity and must change students [to survive this society]. Any nation can not defend itself without the best armed system, and any company can not survive in this super competitive global market without competitive productivities. Teaching would be more important than developing the armed system and producing the goods. Therefore, we need teachers holding world level teacher professionalism.” (Kwag, 2001, p.5)

elementary teachers in specializing in certain subjects and for teacher preparation programs for middle school and high school teachers.

With respect to the issue of teacher status and remuneration, the way in which the problems are framed differs from each other in considering their content. On the one hand, the U.S. documents (1986b, 2000) illustrate the nature of the teaching occupation as it relates to teacher status, referencing feminized occupation (1986b), semiskilled workers (1986b), lack of respect for the teaching occupation (2000), and teachers' autonomy in terms of textbook selection (1983, 1986b). The Korean documents (1986, 1989, 1992, 2001), on the other hand, frame the problems from the perspective of how teachers are treated by the government and other factors. For example, the documents issued by KTU (1986, 1989) indicates that teachers lost their authority and that the social status of teachers was degraded significantly because of unauthorized power. The governmental documents points out that teachers' rights to teach were infringed (1992, 2001) and that teachers were treated as targets of reform policies. The major reason for these differences in framing the issue might be found in their different teaching status backgrounds. While teachers in the United States are considered to have lower status than other occupations, teachers in Korea historically and culturally have enjoyed a reputation and status as leaders in the community. However, teachers in Korea have begun facing challenges as part of the process of the country's industrialization or capitalization, which, because of the dynamic situation, have degraded their socio-political, cultural position. Regarding remuneration, the low salaries are identified as a major problem in both countries. In particular, while the U.S. documents (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1999) have raised the issue since the 1980s, the Korean documents (1992, 1995, 2001) have continually explored the issue in different ways. For

example, first, the low level of salaries is raised as a problem, then the single payroll system is criticized, and finally, the issue is compared to the scale of other occupations' salaries.

With respect to the issue of in-service teacher training, the ways in which the two countries frame the problems are quite similar when considering the content of the documents; however, the problems are identified in different terms. Regarding beginning teachers, for example, while U.S. documents (1996, 1999) point out the inadequacy of the induction programs, the Korean document (2001) that indicates no program existed for beginning teachers, thereby seeming to ignore the issues. As to the quality of in-service teacher training, Korean documents (1987, 1992, 2001) criticize it, saying that the training is superficial and that there is disconnection and overlap between teacher education institutions and training institutions as well as criticizing the training do not respond to the needs of the field, but there is no similar mention in the U.S. documents. In addition, both the U.S. documents (1996, 1999) and the Korean document (2001) identify a lack of support or rewards for knowledge and skills that teachers should learn. Overall, while the U.S. documents frame the problems as a lack of programs at the institutional level, the Korean documents criticize the way in which the teacher training is managed and operated at the institutional level.

On the issue of working conditions, the Korean documents raise a greater variety of questions compared to the U.S. documents. Although the reality of working conditions between the countries, such as class sizes and the number of teaching hours, evidently differ from each other, both the U.S. documents (1986a, 1986b, 1999) and the Korean documents (1987, 1992, 2001) indicate a heavy workload for teachers. In addition, safety concerns about accidents in schools and too many non-instructional activities (2001) are identified as problems. As can be seen, the Korean documents cover issues ranging from physical conditions of the education

system to teaching hours for individual teachers. Considering the fact that the government is in charge of the issues raised, the detailed descriptions of the problems identified evidence the extent of government power and intervention in all the issues raised.

Beyond the thematic problems mentioned above, the two countries also view a variety of different issues as problems, but that problems seem indirectly and/or directly relate to the main issue of teaching and teacher education. Although the U.S. documents are relatively specific in framing these issues, Korean documents still employ abstract or broad ways to frame the issues under the condition kept over the last two decades. For example, the U.S. documents address teacher shortages in certain fields (1983, 1986), the simple conception of teaching by the public (1986b), the academic achievement gap between rich and poor (2001), and the decreasing academic ability of students (2001). Korean documents incorporate broad issues such as examination hell or super competition for test scores (1980, 1986, 1992, 1995, 2002), lack of a mechanism to connect the public with the education community (2001).

Table 6 Comparisons of Problems Identified Between USA and Korea

Countries		United States of America	Republic of Korea
Issues			
Pre-service Teacher Education		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Low quality of teaching applicant (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1996, 1999, 2000) · Too many educational methods courses (1983, 1986b) · Theory-driven research in schools of education (1995, 1996, 1999) · Emulating disciplinary department and emphasizing graduate studies (1990, 1995, 2000) · Disconnection between subject matters and subject teaching methods (1986a, 1996) · Too brief a period of student teaching experience (1986a, 2000) · Lack of special demonstration sites for students teaching (1986a, 1990) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Lack of professionalism in teacher education curriculum (1987, 1995, 2001) · Low reputation of teacher education institutions (1995) · Lack of faculty members specializing in subject teaching methods (2001) · Not up-dated curricular (2001)
Certification and Licensing		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Pseudo-credentialism/blind credentialism(1986) · Lack of standards (1996, 1999) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Contradiction between licensing and recruiting (1987)
Autonomy and Power		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No autonomy for textbook selection (1983, 1986b) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Non-democratic and authoritarian school management system (1986, 1992) · Too much influence from the government and teachers' union on teacher policy (2000)
Teacher's Status and Remuneration		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Feminized occupation (1986b) · Semi-skilled workers (1986b) · Low salary (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1999) · Lack of respect for teaching occupation (2000) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Degraded teachers' authority (1986, 1989) · Infringement of teachers' right to teach by students and parents (1992, 2001) · Relatively low level of salary compared to the major private company employers (1992, 1995, 2001) · Closed promotion and salary system (1995)
In-service Teacher Training		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Inadequate induction for beginning teachers (1996, 1999) · Lack of professional development (1996, 1999) · Lack of support for training and research (1996, 1999) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Superficial on-the-job training (1987, 1992) · Disconnected and overlapped in-service training between teacher education and training institutes (1992, 2001) · Inadequate induction for beginning teachers (2001) · Lack of support for training and research (2001)

Countries	United States of America	Republic of Korea
Issues		
Working Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Overworked occupation (1986a, 1986b, 2000) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Overcrowded class size (1987, 2001) · Heavy teaching workload (1992) · Safety concerns about accidents in school (1992) · Too much non-instructional activities (2001)
Educational Problems Related to Social Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Teacher shortages in certain fields (1983, 1986b) · Simple conception of teaching by the public (1986b) · Academic achievement gap between rich and poor (2001) · Decreasing academic ability of youth from grade schools through college level (2001) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Super competition for examination (1980, 1986, 1992, 1995, 2002) · Lack of mechanism to connect the public with education community (2001)

6.3 Comparisons of Remedies Proposed

As can be seen in Table 7, there are more similarities than differences in what remedies were suggested when proposing the alternatives for teaching, teachers, and teacher education. In general, the content and form of the remedies are somewhat similar because the documents selected are concerned mainly with developing and achieving the common theme of teacher professionalism or professionalization of teaching and teacher education. One striking difference is that the U.S. documents are written in a tone that endorses the notion of professionalism, regardless of whether they are governmental documents, from private foundations, or authored by teachers unions (AFT and NEA), but the Korean documents endorse only those authored by the government and by conservative teacher association, KFTA (1998) and finally by progressive teachers' union KTU in 2002.

With regard to extending length of education, the two countries reveal a common trend. U.S. cases already began reforming the lengthy education requirement from the middle of 1980s (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000), and the Korean cases show that the country was in the middle of discussion in the 1990s through 2001. The remedies suggested in the U.S. cases include their development of extending the period of education by creating graduate professional programs (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000). The Korean remedies suggested differ by decade, from the 1980s to the 1990s and finally the early 2000s. The 1980s trend was to extend the two-year elementary school teachers college to a four-year college (1980) and to require of kindergarten teachers at least three years, or even four years of college (1987). The 1990s was when a year long internship program for prospective teachers was suggested. In the current decade, introducing both graduate teacher education programs and Ed.D. for teachers and administrators (2001) have

been suggested in the context of enhancing teacher “professionalism” by extending the education period. Given the fact that from 1900 to 2000 the type of institution preparing teachers has changed from normal schools to teacher colleges to universities, the trend of increasing the length of pre-service teacher education seems to continue. Perhaps, in the future most teachers will be trained in graduate schools of education similar to those of other professional schools like law and medicine schools.

On the issue of restructuring pre-service teacher education and teacher in-service training, the two countries frame the remedies differently. The U.S. cases are concerned with developing various tools with which both to screen applicants to teacher education program and teacher candidates, such as instituting higher standards for teachers (1983, 1986b, 1996, 2000), introducing the professional teacher examination (1986a, 2000), introducing a national entry test (2000). As recognized by the remedies suggested, developing standards for teachers has been one of the U.S.’s major concerns. On the other hand, Korea had few remedies regarding the issue of controlling quality applicants and teacher candidates, with the exception of changing entry and/or exit requirement (1986, 1992), which address developing more diverse tools with which to evaluate applicants to teacher education programs, such as implementing an interview. Overall, such differences between the two countries may stem from the way in which reformers viewed the realities of teaching, teachers, and teacher education institutions. As indicated in earlier section, which outlined the documents, the U.S. cases have been more concerned with low quality of the applicants and teachers (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1999, 2002) than were the Korean cases (1995). Another similar remedy found between the countries under the issue of teacher in-service training addresses introducing a mentor system for beginning teachers. The idea of mentoring beginning teachers (1996, 1999, 2000) has appeared in U.S. documents since 1996;

however, the idea was just starting to be discussing in the 2001 Korean reform document. With respect to developing pre-service teacher education programs, some remedies unique to the Korean cases are hiring professors specializing in subject matter teaching methods (1995, 2001) to introducing an accrediting system (2001). The issue of teacher in-service training is also unique to the Korean cases. The Korean documents presented a variety of ideas regarding restructuring the training system to make it more rewarding: diversifying teacher training (1987, 1992); introducing a self-initiated teacher training system (1995, 2001); and extending teacher training opportunities both domestically and abroad (2001).

On the issue of enhancing the status of teachers, both the U.S. cases and the Korean cases are quite similar in proposing the remedies suggested to address the form and content themselves. The key idea of the issue is in differentiating the staffing patterns of the career ladder by providing individual teachers with mobility. During the 1980s, the U.S. cases tried to differentiate the flat teaching career into three or four layers: one three layer career ladders separated the levels into beginning instructors, experienced teachers, and master teachers (1983); another three layer career ladders offered instructors, professional teachers, career professional teachers (1986a) and a four layer career ladders suggested licensed teachers, certified teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers (1986b). In Korea, the idea of differentiating the flat teaching career was discussed in a way that introduced a master teacher system (1987) and a new teaching career layer that consisted of four ladders: second-class teachers, first-class teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers (1992). As can be recognized, although the two countries named the layers somewhat differently, the concept of differentiating the teaching career is another common factor, but the background of introducing the system differs. While the U.S. documents recognizes that a flat career structure was not enough to motivate teachers, who

should be recognized for differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment, the Korean cases aims to differentiate the current two-layer system into three-or four-layer one in order to solve the problem of personnel deadlock—teachers’ frustrations caused by not being promoted to administrative positions such as vice principal or principal. One aspect unique to the Korean reform document on the issue is the strategy of establishing an environment of respect for teachers by employing social campaigns that could be run by MOEHRD. Here, the government illustrates its power to frame issues regarding teaching, teachers, and teacher education issues that are not addressed in the U.S. cases. Actually, it would be very unexpected for the U.S. government to launch a national social campaign to increase respect for teachers, because education in the U.S. is more decentralized and in conducted at the local level.

With regard to the issue of increasing teachers’ salaries, the two countries are quite similar in framing the remedies. As can be seen in table 7, the necessity of increasing remuneration in the US (1983, 1986b, 1996, 1999) and Korea (1980, 1987, 1995, 2001) is directly suggested. Also, both countries show a common approach, connecting teacher compensation to competition or a merit pay system when they tried to changed the salary system. When considering the governmental or private foundations’ documents, linking teacher salaries to market-driven force is obvious. That is, they were interested in imposing a sort of market oriented education reform into the teaching occupation.

Regarding the issue of enhancing teachers’ autonomy and power, the U.S. and Korea frame the remedies in totally different ways. While the U.S. reform documents never mention the issue, the Korean documents suggest various ideas that might be included in the concept of autonomy in education. For example, in the middle and late 1980s, military government’s socio-political oppression was a primary concern of unionized teachers, who argued for ending the top-

down educational administration (1986, 1989), guaranteeing the political neutrality of education (1986), and guaranteeing the freedom to establish teachers' organizations (1986) as well as being able to participate in curriculum decision making (1989), as well as teacher policies guaranteeing teacher professionalism and teachers' autonomy (2002). However, governmental documents by PCER illustrate a narrower concept of autonomy, one that guaranteed a teacher's right to teach (1992), introduced self-regulated working hours (1995), and participated in curriculum decision making (2001). Overall, although the Korean documents reference some elements related to autonomy, but do not clarify their position, for both countries, autonomy do not seem to be a central component of professionalism at the governmental level, except the KTU (2002) that emphasizes the idea of professionalism with the concept of teachers' autonomy. There might be two reasons for not exploring the issue of teachers' autonomy and power in the U.S. documents. First, the issue of teachers' autonomy or working conditions might be determined by teachers' collective bargaining sessions with school boards, since the U.S. education system is very much decentralized. So the national level reform documents selected seemed not to speak directly to the issues related. Second, standard based accountability system for student academic achievement might overshadow the issue of teachers' autonomy or working conditions, since teachers in the U.S. have been forced to achieve the goal set by school districts, states, and federal government.

Each country addresses the issues regarding working conditions in a different way. The U.S. documents do not address this issue at all. As mentioned above in the section on teachers' autonomy, the issue might not be included since the issue would be determined by teachers' collective bargaining sessions with school boards; the Korean documents, on the other hand, suggest remedies to problem with working condition from various perspectives. For example,

during the 1980s, protecting teachers' basic right to teach (1986) and ending supplementary classes and night classes (1986) were major concerns for unionized teachers. The remedy of eliminating non-instructional activities has been a constant presence in both the KTU document (1986) and governmental documents (1992, 2001). In addition, introducing a part-time teacher, volunteers, assistant teacher system (1992) and decreasing class size (1995, 2001) are on the list of remedies. The introducing part-time teachers and volunteers to teaching, in fact, has been contested by those who wish to advance the idea of teaching as a profession (1992), which takes into account that teaching has its unique set of knowledge and skills not developed in those who have not been certified.

Table 7 Comparisons of Remedies Suggested Between USA and Korea

Issues		Countries	
		United States of America	Republic of Korea
Lengthening the Period of Pre-service Teacher Education	Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Creating a graduate professional program (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Extending the two-year elementary school teachers' college to a four-year college (1980) · Extending the period of teacher preparation for kindergarten teachers (1987) · Introducing a year-long internship (1992) · Introducing graduate teacher education programs and Ed. D. for teachers and administrators (2001)
Improving Pre-service Teacher Education and Teacher In-service Training		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Changing entry and/or exit requirements (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1996, 1999, 2000) by employing standards · Creating a professional development program (1996, 1999) · Mentoring beginning teachers with an evaluation of teaching skills (1996, 1999, 2000) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Changing entry and/or exit requirements (1986, 1992) · Establishing attached schools to schools of education (like PDS) (1987, 2001) · Hiring professors specialized in subject matter (1995, 2001) · Introducing six-month of teaching practice for prospective teachers (2002) · Introducing an accreditation system (2001) · Extending teacher training (2001) · Introducing research leave (2002) · Integrating elementary and secondary school teacher colleges into a special teachers college (2002)
Enhancing the Status of Teachers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Creating differentiated staffing patterns of career ladders (1983, 1986a, 1986b): beginning instructors, experienced teachers, and master teachers (1983); instructors, professional teachers, and career professional teachers (1986a); licensed teachers, certified teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers (1986b) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Establishing a new teaching career layer: second-class teachers, first-class teachers, advanced teachers, and lead teachers (1987, 1992) · Creating an environment that respects teachers (2001)
Increasing Salaries	Teachers'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Introducing a rigorous salary system based upon evaluation (1983, 1986b, 1996) · Paying teachers for knowledge and skills (1996, 1999) · Raising teachers' salaries (1983, 1986b, 1996, 1999) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increasing salary (1980, 1987, 1989, 2001) · Establishing a regulation for teacher salaries that is different from general public servants (1992) · Introducing a merit pay system based on competence (1995)

Issues	Countries	United States of America	Republic of Korea
Enhancing Teachers' Autonomy and Power		N/A, since the issue might be determined by teachers' collective bargaining sessions with school boards or overshadowed by standard based accountability systems for students academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ending the top-down administration of education (1986, 1989) · Guaranteeing the political neutrality of education from the power(1986) · Guaranteeing the freedom to establish teachers' organizations (1986) · Allowing teachers to participate in curriculum decision making (1989, 2001) · Encouraging teachers' autonomy and reform mindset (1992, 2000, 2001) · Introducing self-regulated working hours (1995)
Improving the Conditions of Teachers' Work		N/A, since the issue might be determined by teachers' collective bargaining sessions with school boards, the documents seemed not to speak directly to a number of issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Protecting teachers' rights (1986) · Ending supplementary classes and night learning (1986) · Eliminating non-instructional activities (1986, 1992) · Introducing the part-time teacher, volunteer, assistant teacher system, and a full time staff member to support teachers (1992, 2002) · Decreasing overcrowded classes (1995, 2001) · Establishing standard teaching hours (2001)

6.4 Comparison of the Ideologies of Professionalism Presented

In this section I compare how similar and/or different are the discourses presented in the documents of the two countries, with respect to their versions of the ideology of professionalism. All of the documents selected for the study, except two Korean documents (1986, 1989)⁶⁰ issued by the KTU, draw explicitly on an ideology of professionalism in framing the problems about and in proposing the remedies for teaching and teacher education. As can be seen in Table 8, although, both countries differ somewhat in the ways in which they frame or articulate the issues, there are similar characteristics illuminating the ideology of professionalism.

First, with respect to defining the teaching occupation as a profession by developing a body of knowledge and techniques, the U.S. discourses in the selected documents have elaborated on: why the occupation should be raised to the status of a profession (1986a, 1986b, 1995); how to advance the teaching occupation into a profession, in terms of lengthening the education requirement (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000); enhancing the status of teaching (1983, 1986a, 1986b); higher levels of remuneration (1983, 1986b, 1996, 1999); and having colleagues in control of selection (1996). Korean discourses, in general, introduce the notion of professionalism in a simple way, without providing further clarification on the major concepts of profession and professionalism. Moreover, the terms profession and professionalism seemed to be used as a slogan in the appeal regarding the necessity of reforming teaching and teacher

⁶⁰ Considering the problems identified and the remedies suggested by the KTU, the main issues addressed how to bring more autonomy and power to the school setting for teachers in order to democratize education and society. In addition, the KTU, unlike the KFTA, who endorsed the notion of professionalism in order to advance the goal of its association, fought status as a trade union during the 1980s. Therefore, other factors regarding the ideology of professionalism were not as much characterized in the documents as they were revealed in other governmental documents. Instead, the documents served as a source in interpreting how teaching in Korea under the dictatorship had become deprofessionalized or oppressed.

education. Therefore, the term professionalism tended to be equated directly with teachers' attitudes toward their role and status, regardless of the reality they faced.

In terms of defining the teaching occupation as a profession, all of the U.S. documents selected, including those from teachers unions, the government, and private foundations, illustrate that their attempts to transform public school teaching into a "true profession." In the movement toward professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education, the NEA was the teachers union that finally jumped on the "professionalization" bandwagon with its announcement of "The New Unionism" by NEA president Bob Chase in 1997, after the AFT, which had endorsed the notion of professionalism more than ten years prior in 1985. Therefore, while the terms profession or professionalism in the U.S. documents are conceived to be a linchpin in helping change teaching from an occupation into a "genuine profession" (1986a) or a "true profession" (2000), the Korean documents do not offer such an extensive rationale, choosing, instead, to label their efforts as enhancing the "professionalism" of teacher education institutions (1987, 2001) or treating the teaching occupation as a "profession" (1987). Moreover, the terminology was sometimes inter-mixed with that of other occupations, such as the clergy, making the Korean documents less elaborate and concrete than their U.S. counterparts. The terms in the Korean documents seemed to be used to emphasize the role of teachers, which, historically and culturally, has been considered highly prestigious job. Along with the rapid growth of the current capitalistic society, which recognizes the profession as that of a prestigious class, the government seemed to use the term to label teachers as the clergy, such as "teaching as a profession with a mission of clergyman (1992)" and "teaching as a clergymen" (2001) in order to control them. Therefore, the terms of profession or professionalism used in the Korean documents may be nothing but an illusion manufactured by those wishing to control the teaching

force in a socio political situation until the KTU positively endorsed the notion of professionalism in the late 1990s and the early 2000s.

With respect to lengthening the education requirements, which is a central component of the discourse on professionalism, the U.S. documents have illustrated the necessity of extending teacher education to graduate level professional programs since the early 1980s, emphasizing the academic and field experience components of professional education and their close articulation.⁶¹ The idea of extending the educational period is suggested as a way of “creating a graduate professional program” (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 1999, 2000). However, the Korean cases illustrating the idea of extending the period of education and practicing the idea are either far behind their U.S. counterparts or just start discussion of the possibility. For example, a year-long internship program (1992) for clinical experiences has not yet been implemented and introducing Ed.D. for teachers and administrators (2001) just started gaining attention from policy makers and educators. Therefore, the trend of extending the period of teacher education has been part of the agenda of both countries in developing the idea of professionalism, although the issues arose at completely different times.

⁶¹ In universities associated with the Holmes Group, a variety of programs beyond the bachelors’ degree, along with different labels, such as Master of Art in Teaching, Integrated Bachelor’s/Masters, Professional Immersion MAT, are now offered, according to the Holmes Partnership (2002). Among them, professional development schools are also labeled differently, according to universities providing the program, but generally known as a Professional Year program called the Teacher Instructional I Certificate, which differs from a Master of Arts in Teaching in terms of the length of the education period and its content. During the first quarter of the “Professional Year” (i.e., four years for undergraduate, one year for just-entering post-baccalaureate studies) teacher education program, students enroll in an instructional planning class, which it requires students to teach two ten-minute mini-lessons to peers while being videotaped. During the second quarter, students complete a 60-hour field experience at a local middle or high school. It is coupled with their certification discipline (e.g., social studies) methods class so that in-class learning can be applied in the school setting. During the third quarter, students participate in a 50-hour field experience in a demographically different school, thus allowing all pre-service teachers to experience both suburban and urban classrooms. To be placed at a school for their internship year, the pre-service teachers are interviewed at the professional practice schools at which they are interested in teaching. During their internship year (e.g., the fifth year of the undergraduate program or second year of the graduate program), the pre-service teachers serve as half-time teachers-of-record at a professional practice school (PPS), a public school that collaborates with universities. A substitute teaching certificate provides the legal authority for assuming this role. (Marks, 2002, p.11)

The ideology of professionalism in relation to teaching status did not seem to be a core element in constituting the idea of professionalism in the documents selected, according to the remedies expected, because the status of the teaching occupation or teachers' social prestige were already not high as much as they expected in the two societies as modern capitalism expanded. Although other variables (historical and cultural heritage, or economic condition) would elevate teaching status or its social prestige,⁶² society tends to rank the status of teachers in the United States in terms of earning potential. In Korea, it is ranked in terms of job security. Taking these factors into consideration, the efforts of differentiating staffing patterns of career ladders in the United States (1983, 1986a, 1986b) and establishing a master teacher system (1987) or a differentiated teaching career layer (1992) in Korea would not be strong enough to change the current status of teaching as an occupation to one of social prestige, as the remedies thought would take place by restructuring the career ladders.

With respect to a high level of remuneration, most documents selected from both countries emphasize the necessity of raising teachers' salaries, which is a characteristic of competitive capitalism. For example, the U.S. documents refer to conditional increases as a "rigorous salary system based upon evaluation" (1983), "a positive incentive for excellence" (1986b), "a career linked to assessment and compensation" (1996), and "removing incompetent teachers" (1996). Unlike the U.S. remedies, which reflected their market oriented system, the

⁶² Historically, teachers and teacher educators in the U.S. and Korea have been treated a little differently in terms of their social status and remuneration, even though reform documents issued in both countries have continuously raised the issue as a problem. For example, teachers and teacher educators in the U.S. have a relatively low status compared to other university graduates in considering the average salary they receive (for more detail see Long & Reegle, 2002, pp. 63-64, p. 161). In contrast, teachers in Korea have a higher social reputation compared to in other countries. The average salary for teachers is relatively high and teacher turnover rates are very low (see KEDI, 2004; Santiago, 2002). Therefore the teaching occupation is considered to be one of best occupations for high school graduates. Given the fact mentioned above, the two countries have developed a different concept of teachers' status and remuneration based on each one's historical and social background, the method of enhancing teacher status mainly by improving salary is common.

Korean documents demonstrate a certain naivety constituting remedies in related to the notion of professionalism. For example, the 1987 document suggests that teachers' salaries should be equivalent to those in other professions without providing further justification. In 1995, introducing a merit pay system is a remedy similar to one that was tried in the United States. Overall, there are explicit concerns about raising salaries, however, there are no explicit concerns about specific levels of remuneration, as is frequently the case in discourse on professionalism.

On the issue of having colleague control over defining the needs of clients and how those needs are met, the U.S. documents (1983, 1986b, 1996, 2000) propose the necessity of setting standards related to the control of selection, training, and advancements in teaching, the Korean documents do not develop the issue at all. For example, the strategies needed to reach these standard settings, which are considered the essential elements in defining effective teaching and student learning, are articulated and developed most effectively in *What Matters Most* (1996), with the introduction of the role of three private different organizations (NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS). Considering the fact that at least a majority of the members of one organization, the NBPTS, are classroom teachers and that they are taking part in setting standards for what teachers should know and be able to do, in certifying teachers who meet those standards, the U.S. cases illustrate the process of developing the issue of having colleague control over teaching related to the ideology of professionalism. On the other hand, neither the term peer evaluation nor the context of having standards for defining clients' needs and how those needs are met are addressed in Korean documents. Instead, the idea that the authority for power to evaluating and accrediting teacher education programs and teacher training programs belongs solely to the Ministry of Education and to Local Educational Authorities, respectively (2001), is remarked. Therefore, it might be assumed that the Korean government does not want to recognize the

necessity of having peer control over teacher selection and certification, or it would be premature to address the issue in relation to Korean version of professionalism. This notion of professionalism has been an issue only at the government or KFTA level, and had never been developed at the grass roots level of the teaching society until KTU endorsed it in 2002.

One of core components consisting of the ideology of professionalism is the idea of practitioners' autonomy and power.⁶³ While the U.S. cases apparently do not view autonomy as being relevant to questions about professionalism, the Korean cases indicate serious concerns. Neither the term autonomy nor the way in which professionalism should be constructed around the issue are found in the remedies suggested in the U.S. cases. However, the Korean documents at least reference the term autonomy (2000, 2002) and the context of deprivation of the autonomy and power (1986, 1989). The point is not that teachers in the United States have more autonomy as individual practitioners or more power as an occupational group, but that the Korean documents articulate concerns about these issues with regard to professionalism, while in U.S. documents the issue do not seem to be a central element of the ideology of professionalism at national level reform documents, because the issue would be included and settled in the process of collective bargaining session with local school boards. The Korean documents include more of the issue because Korea's rapid social and political transition over the last two decades, along with its strong empowerment of the teachers union, the KTU, has influenced the policy making process since achieving its legal status as a trade union in 1999. For example, the KTU (1986, 1989) strongly criticized the top-down administration of education and argued for the political neutrality of education, both of which were close related to the issue of practicing teachers' autonomy. In recent reform documents (2000, 2001, 2002), the term autonomy in

⁶³ Larson describes the issue as having roots in the liberal, competitive phase of capitalism and as having its most "clear-cut emphasis" in two paramount examples of laissez-faire capitalist industrialization – England and the United States (Larson, 1977, p. vii).

regard to teachers and their opportunity to take part in the curriculum decision-making process appear in governmental documents, which had not been the prior case.

Table 8 Comparisons of Ideology of Professionalism Incorporated Between USA and Korea

Attributes	Countries	
	United States of America	Republic of Korea
A Body of Knowledge and Techniques that Practitioners Apply to Their Exclusive Occupational Groups	Teaching as a profession by founding knowledge (1986a, 1986b, 1995)	No clarification on the major terms of profession and professionalism (1987, 1992, 2001, 2002)
An Extended Period of Training in Order to Master such Knowledge and Skills	Lengthening the period of pre-service teacher education (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000)	Lengthening the period of pre-service teacher education (1980, 1987, 1992, 2001)
Enhancing Teaching Status	Creating differentiated staffing patterns of career ladders (1983, 1986a, 1986b)	Creating differentiated staffing patterns of career ladders (1987, 1992)
A High Level of Remuneration	Raising teachers' salaries (1983, 1986b, 1996, 1999) by employing various incentive system	Increasing salary (1980, 1987, 1989, 1995, 2001)
A System of Having Colleagues in Control of Selection	Colleagues' control of selection (1996)	N/A
A High Degree of Autonomy and Prestige	N/A	Moving toward enhancing teachers' autonomy and power (1986, 1989, 1992, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2002)

6.5 Cross-Country Influences

The similarities found across documents between the two countries in conceptualizing the notion of professionalism and in framing certain ideas and practices for teaching, teachers, and teacher education are key factors in identifying what cross-country influences, if any, exist. Given that explicit referencing or quoting that would help illustrate direct influences in recognizing time differences was not available, particularly, because of language issues, attention was paid to classify similar themes or categories common to the two countries.

As can be seen from Table 8, defining the teaching occupation as a profession and using the terms professional or teacher professionalism has appeared in the reform documents issued in the United States since the early 1980s, although the NEA endorsed the notion of professionalism only as recently as 1997 while the AFT had already taken a position of upholding the highest professional standards for the teaching occupation as early as 1985. The overall trend toward teacher professionalism or professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education that appeared in the United States seems not to be faced with opposition from the teachers unions. Therefore, key points found in the documents focus on devising a rationale that defines the concept of profession, professionalism in relation to teaching, teachers, and teacher education, and/or on developing detailed tasks to establish the case.

In Korea, the terms profession or professionalism appeared in the late 1980s and the early 1990s mainly in governmental documents; the KFTA and the KTU then endorsed the terms in the late 1990s. Particularly, the KTU, an organization that did not consider the concepts of profession or professionalism in defining the teaching occupation and teaching activities in the 1980s, eventually accepted the notion of “professionalism” in the late 1990s, then went on to

strongly uphold it, in part, in the early 2000s. Because the ways in which the terms profession and/or professionalism were referenced in defining teaching occupation, and in creating a rationale that differentiated it from other occupations, were similar in both countries, despite time differences, the Korean government and teachers unions might have been influenced by the United States' conceptualization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education and may have incorporated that thinking into Korean concept's of profession and/or professionalism.⁶⁴

On the issue of reforming pre-service teacher education programs and in-service teacher training, in a larger perspective, the Korean cases have followed the way in which the U.S. cases have tried to develop teacher education since the 1980s. For example, the remedy of creating a graduate professional program (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000) is still on the list of proposals as one of major issues in the U.S., and is awaiting further expecting more expansion, but Korea has not developed it, despite the suggestion of introducing a year long internship in 1992. Overall, the U.S. has already been institutionalizing a variety of lengthy education remedies through a fifth year or graduate professional programs since the middle of 1980s, while Korean cases illustrate that Korea just started discussing such possibilities in the early 2000s. In addition, introducing the Doctor degree of Education for teachers and administrators, already popular in the U.S., shows that Korea has been in the way of following the results of the U.S. cases. Finally, the intent in establishing a mentor system for beginning teachers has appeared in U.S. documents

⁶⁴ The KTU position on the concepts of profession and professionalism is a little different from what the traditional attributes of the terms mean. For example, the KTU emphasizes the notion of the teaching occupation as a profession, particularly focusing on teachers' autonomy as teachers' rights where teachers should have the power to develop their curriculum and to choose textbooks as well as to evaluate students (*Chonkyojo shinmun*, 1998, p. 2). Regarding the ideology of teacher professionalism, the KTU articulates the concept in a way of incorporating both the role of subject teacher and the role of classroom teacher, which are very valued in Korea. Considering the U.S. cases emphasizing the capability of teaching subjects, the KTU viewpoint of professionalism is unique. However, both seem to have the same goal of differentiating the teaching occupation from other occupations by aggressively modifying the terms profession and/or professionalism for the teaching occupation.

since the middle 1990s (1996, 1999, 2000), but the idea is suggested in Korean documents only recently (2001). Therefore, the context of reforming teacher education in order to enhance teacher professionalism has illustrated that the U.S. ideas and practices were introduced and discussed in Korea a short time later.

On the issue of establishing differentiated staffing patterns for teaching career ladders, the remedies suggested in the Korean documents (1987, 1992) are quite similar to the suggestions proposed in the U.S. reform documents (1983, 1986a, 1986b). For example, the U.S. documents suggest a three tier system (1983, 1986a) and a four layer system (1986b); shortly thereafter, the Korean documents suggest introducing a master (lead) teacher system (1987) and a four layer system (1992). Although the labeling is a quite similar, the background, in fact, seems to be different. While the U.S. documents recognize that a flat career structure was not enough to motivate teachers, who should be recognized for differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment, the Korean cases aim to differentiate the current two-layer system into three-or four-layer one in order to solve the problem of personnel deadlock—teachers’ frustrations caused by not being promoted to administrative positions such as vice principal or principal. The KTU, however, officially opposed the idea of differentiating the teaching careers because, once the idea was instituted, those in charge of promotions, particularly the administrators, could use the power to control teachers and could create another level of competitive culture for promotion, none of which improve the goals of education (Kim, 2002). Overall, even though the idea of creating differentiated staffing patterns for career ladders appeared originally in the U.S. documents and on the list of remedies for the Korean cases some years later, the background of applying it in Korea and its interpretation by both the government and the KTU show a gap in both ideology and strategy.

Regarding remuneration, the two countries propose quite similar remedies. In the U.S., the ideas that teachers salaries should be based upon evaluation (1983) or have a positive incentive for excellence (1986b) or link it to assessment and compensation (1996) are suggested. That is, the salary system should be connected to quality, which would reflect market forces. In Korea, the idea of introducing a merit pay system based on competence (1995) seemed to be a version that has also been tried in the U.S. Because the 1995 Korean education reform document apparently make an appeal for the acceptance of a neo-liberalism perspective in which education systems operate under the principle of a market system through competition, the Korean remedies can be viewed in the context that the U.S. has been a leading in producing and diffusing neo-liberalism and that Korea, as a peripheral country, has come under its influence.

In sum, on the direction of influences between the United States and Korea, as discussed above, Korea is a country that has imported or discussed or adapted, according to its own context, many ideas and practices regarding teaching, teachers, and teacher education that had been tried in the United States. In developing a discourse of the reform content and framing remedies for the main issues, the Korean cases particularly resemble the U.S. cases. This also illustrate that there exists some common issues and concerns on that theme under current global capitalism. Given that the two countries have maintained strong ties in politics, economics, and the military, and that Korea has been deeply influenced by the idea and products of U.S. education throughout last fifty years, the similarities found in the Korean reform documents, in fact, can contribute to prove a solid evidence of U.S. influence on the relationship. In some sense, considering the fact that the KTU, having a history of ignoring the ideology of professionalism for political struggle against an authoritarian government, actually endorsed professionalism in its documents and developed variety of remedies similar to those in the U.S. cases, the themes of profession,

professionalism, or professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education at last might become a shared agenda in national education reform.

6.6 Summary

The cross country analysis, conducted by classifying similarities and differences in the main issues in framing the problems identified and the remedies suggested and in conceptualizing some version of the ideology of professionalism, illustrated that there clear differences and close resemblances between the two countries exist. In the case of framing the problems identified, similar issues were raised about teacher education, teacher training, teacher status, working conditions, and remuneration, all of which seem to be of general concern throughout the world. Although the frequency of appearance and how to frame the problems indicated slight differences between the two countries, the common main theme focused on causes of the low quality of teachers and teacher education. In a larger perspective, a flawed pre-service teacher education curriculum, including a theory-driven curriculum and a disconnection between subjects matters and subject matter teaching methods, inadequate teacher in-service training, a low social status of teachers, conditions of overwork, and low salaries were common major issues between the two countries.

While the U.S. cases indicate that problems occurred at the graduate program level, the Korean cases focus on problems at the undergraduate level, quite a different setting in raising the questions. The teacher shortage in a certain disciplines has been an on-going issue in U.S. documents, but was not treated as a major problem in Korea. In addition, the low quality of applicants and teachers is repeatedly mentioned in framing the problems in the U.S documents, while in the Korean cases, the issue seems to be lesser concern. Rather, Korea has been faced with the problem of over supply for secondary school teachers. Regarding how to frame the

issues, while the U.S. documents generally provide descriptive explanations accompanied by a rationale and specific examples, the Korean documents in defining the problems and emphasizing the terms profession or professionalism are normative and regulative in nature.

With respect to proposing the remedies suggested, although there exist some differences unique to each country, overall the content and form of framing the remedies show a close resemblance on major issues because the selected reform documents are related to the common theme of professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education. Similarities include defining teaching as a profession, extending the length of education, enhancing teachers' status, and raising remuneration— all good examples underscoring common concerns and development of a rationale and the tasks of addressing the problem.

A dramatic difference found in framing the remedies suggested is the way in which the two countries define both the teaching occupation as a profession and teacher autonomy. The U.S. cases illustrate the process of constructing the ideology of professionalism in accordance with basic components typical in professionalization of traits' model, while the Korean cases, apparently seem to follow the typical elements of professionalization in developing a version, reflect Korea's social, political, and cultural background. One good example can be discussed in autonomy, a basic element of the notion of professionalism. While the U.S. documents are not concerned as much about autonomy, the Korean cases are— emphasizing teachers' rights to teach or other aspects of teacher autonomy that illustrate Korea's unique socio-political background since the 1980s. The KTU, in one document (2002), support combining the ideology of professionalism with the notion of autonomy.

Analyzing both countries' versions of the ideology of professionalism incorporated into the selected reform documents illustrates that, despite differences in defining and concretizing

the notion of professionalism for teaching and teacher education, in general some characteristics illuminating the ideology of professionalism explicitly occupied major portions of reform documents. The U.S. discourse, based upon a typical procedure of professionalization, is developed and elaborated upon the ways in which the teaching occupation could become a profession; advancing the occupation into a profession by extending the length of time of education; enhancing teaching status by increasing teacher remuneration and establishing national boards of standards, including organizations such as the NCATE, the INTASC, and the NBPTS. Considering the fact that the ideology of professionalism is endorsed and supported by teachers unions (the AFT and the NEA), the movement toward professionalization of teaching and teacher education at least face no obstacle to proceed.

The Korean discourse illustrate that the rationale and tasks developed both at the governmental and the teachers' associations (the KFTA and the KTA) levels seek an ideology of professionalism. Unlike the U.S. cases, however, the ways in which they define the terms and apply them to the agenda of professionalization differ: the Korean documents use the term to make an appeal for the necessity of reforming teaching, teachers, and teacher education and to differentiate teachers' behavior or teachers' status or to protect teachers' rights to teach. In some sense, the terms profession and professionalism seem to function as mysterious words or as a good slogan for the both government, which is interested only in controlling teachers, and also for the union, which is interested in protecting their position from the government.

The influences of the United States on Korea illustrate a typical trend of educational reform happening around the world as the world system level equilibrium perspective implies. Clearly, on the theme of professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education, Korea shows a tendency to converge toward a common structure and set of practices taking place in the

United States. Particularly, Korea has imported and disseminated a variety of ideas and practices tried in the United States in order to reform the teacher education structure and to improve working conditions from a technical perspective. However, in constructing an ideology of professionalism in terms of controlling the teaching force, between the government and KTU, Korea relied less on U.S. influence.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

This research was triggered by the major trends in education reform toward professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education taking place around the world, with particular attention paid to the United States and Korea. Considering the fact that the two countries have been closely tied in the area of politics, economics, and the military throughout the last over fifty years, the way in which the two countries framed problems about and remedies for teaching and teacher education in terms of the ideology of professionalism was expected to serve as a litmus test for the ways in which each country approaches reforming teaching, teachers, and teacher education and what relation, if at all, exists between the two countries. In this final chapter, I first briefly summarize the problem, conceptual issues, and methodology. I then discuss findings of the study based upon a few themes commonly found in framing the problems identified, in proposing the solution suggested, and in incorporating the ideology of professionalism.

7.2 Summary of the Problem, Conceptual Issues, and Methodology

Whether teaching has, or should have, professional status is of concern not only to teachers but also to teacher educators, students, citizens, and other stakeholders (Darling-Hammond, 1990, 2000; Ginsburg, 1996; Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989; Hargreaves, 2000; Kwag, 1998, 2001; Popkewitz, 1991). In this regard, it is not surprising that the professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education has been a key issue in educational reform discourse in many countries, particularly in the United States and Korea during the last two decades. Given

that the terms of profession, professional, professionalism, and professionalization have a direct implication in guiding and influencing policy direction and practice for reforming teaching, teachers, and teacher education, this study was designed to examine what is meant by the terms and what implications they have for teaching, teachers, and teacher education. In addition, given that the relationship between the United States and Korea has been, since 1945, most extensive and intense economically, politically, and militarily, this study was interested in exploring how educational reform discourse with regard to the ideology of professionalism has been constructed and circulated and/or disseminated from one country to another.

In order to achieve the goal of the study mentioned above, I specifically sought to address the following five research questions. First, in order to identify the ways in which each country concerns itself with teaching, teachers, and teacher education since the 1980s, I illuminated the problems identified and the remedies suggested in the selected reform documents. I then analyzed how such documents draw explicitly or implicitly on some versions of the ideology of professionalism in framing the problems about and in suggesting the remedies for teaching, teachers, and teacher education.

I next sought comparisons across documents within each country and between the countries in order to identify how the reform discourse presented in the documents is similar and/or different regarding the problems identified, the remedies proposed, and the versions of ideology of professionalism articulated. Finally, I illustrated the direction of the influences between the two countries by examining similarities found in framing the problems identified and in proposing the remedies suggested, and by examining the ways in which the ideology of professionalism were constructed.

In grounding conceptual issues for the study, I drew upon two different perspectives - equilibrium and conflict paradigms - to discuss educational reform, world system levels of education reform, and the major terms of profession, (de)professionalization, and professionalism. The two paradigms are considered the basis for ideology on which the ideas and practices of educational reform efforts, particularly with respect to teaching, teachers, and teacher education, may be treated and/or interpreted differently on different local, national, and international levels (Ginsburg et al. 1991). In addition, teachers' work and status was also discussed based upon how they were conceptualized in relation to the major terms of the different perspectives.

From the equilibrium perspective, the analysis of educational reform tends to focus on the efficiency of the educational system in responding to the needs of a capitalist political economy. Whether the educational system can maintain social order and/or meet changing societal requirements has been a major concern for the functionalist perspective, particularly in focusing on economic development, representing the equilibrium paradigm (Merritt & Coombs, 1977; Sack, 1981). Overall, as Archer mentioned (1979), the education system, as part of a larger homeostatic and consensual social system, is seen to evolve as society evolves or to adapt as functional incompatibilities or dysfunctions arise. In a broader context, educational reform discourses articulated at the governmental level or by private foundations may be classified as having this perspective, since they are concerned more with a harmonious progression of evolutionary stages towards greater differentiation and specialization of the different parts of the system (Sack, 1981). For example, the reform discourse of teaching, teachers, and teacher education in both countries has been emphasized in situations where a special need arises in a rapidly changing society and a new role to meet the need is expected from teachers and teacher educators.

The conflict perspective, in contrast, emphasizes the inherent instability of a social system and the conflict between over values, resources, ideology, and power. From a conflict perspective, educational change or non-change occurs through conflict and competition between social classes, or ethnic, national, religious, and gender groups whose interests are incompatible or when structural contradictions are not being successfully mediated. Researchers identifying with the conflict perspective (Apple, 1986; Carnoy & Levin, 1976; Ginsburg et al, 1991; Ginsburg & Cooper, 1991, Popekewitz, 1988) define educational reform as rhetoric that provides a powerful symbolic form of legitimation of change, not necessarily associated with any real changes in education and society. This perspective, combined with the critical discourse analysis used as a method in the study, contributed to analyzing and understanding how education reform policy documents construct a certain version of the ideology of professionalism, one which considers professionalism to represent the nature of a capitalist political economy. Within the conflict perspective, educational reform discourses illustrate the ways of responding to change in ideas and practice between the government, business groups, and teachers unions with regard to the notion of professionalism.

In order to understand global-level educational reform discourse based upon world system analyses and globalization approaches, I examined how the global structural and ideological contexts with respect to the issue of professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education is diffused across countries. Special attention was paid to the coincidental nature of educational reform with respect to issues between the United States and Korea. If we consider that the assumption that the entire world has become integrated into a single economic system mainly representing a world system level equilibrium perspective and an economic globalization perspective (Clayton, 1998; Davies & Guppy, 1997) is correct, there is a tendency

for all national educational systems in the world to converge toward a common structure and set of practices in education (Boli, Ramirez, Meyer, 1986; Davies & Guppy, 1997; Inkeles & Sirowy, 1984). For example, Korea can be classified as a country that chose to imitate a strategy in order to meet its nation's economic development during the formative decades of the 1950s through 1970s by adopting the technical training, the teacher training, and the teaching methods practiced and supported by the United States (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993; Lee, 1986).

In contrast, the conflict perspective of world system or globalization analyses stresses the dominance of a world capitalist economic system that is stratified into core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral countries (Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002; Clayton, 1998; Ginsburg et al., 1991, Samoff, 1993). Researchers identifying with the conflict perspective argue that educational assistance, programs, or ideas provide a vehicle for the transmission of ideologies from core to periphery and, subsequently, for the intellectual socialization of periphery individuals (Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002; Samoff, 1993). In relation to the influence of the United States, Korea, as a peripheral county, can be classified as a nation that shows where ideas and practices are similar to levels of constructing discourses on educational reform with regard to national economic competitiveness and particularly the notion of professionalism, without facing any criticism.

The study focused on grounding theoretical discourse with respect to the key terms profession, professionalization, deprofessionalization, and the ideology of professionalism, all of which have played a major in constructing and/or guiding educational reforms of teaching, teachers, and teacher education around the world over time. Recognizing the concepts as not having a neutral meaning (Ginsburg, 1987, 1996, 1998), I discussed such terms generally based on different theoretical perspectives. In sum, from a functionalist perspective, the term "profession" grew and was applied to industrial societies as an ideology at the global level and

was considered to have a privileged status and provide highly valued services based upon a complex body of knowledge (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Doyle, 1990; Esland, 1980; Leberman, 1956). According to the conflict perspective, the term “profession” has its roots in the process of development of competitive capitalism (see Ginsburg, 1996, Larson, 1977); no consensus on the definitions of a “professional” nor of “profession” exist (Densmore, 1987; Freidson, 1983; Runté, 1995).

The other terms - “professionalization,” “deprofessionalization,” and “proletarianization,” - were discussed from different perspectives, focusing on what elements and processes are involved in and identified with defining those terms and arriving at those stages. In the case of professionalism, I focused on addressing how the term functions as an ideology that influences peoples’ practice. From a conflict perspective, the concept of professionalism, neither as an ideal type nor as an actual description of work (Densmore, 1987), distorts or only partially reflects social reality, serving to mobilize or immobilize individuals and collective actions in ways that support the interest of certain groups in society (Ginsburg, 1987, 1996; Larson, 1977).

Finally, I drew upon theoretical discourse on how teachers’ work and status are conceptualized in relation to the terms “profession,” “professionalization,” and “the ideology of professionalism.” Regarding teaching as a profession, the traditional functionalist perspective views profession as an ideal-typical description of teachers’ work having pedagogical expertise (knowledge and skills) and significant autonomy in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1985, 1990; Hargreaves, 1994). In reality, however, teaching falls short of being regarded as a profession, or at best is considered a semi-profession (Gore & Morrison, 2001; Etzioni, 1969; Labaree, 1995; McDaniel, 1979). With respect to the professionalization of teaching, the U.S. case has increasingly met the criteria of a profession suggested by the functionalist perspective

along with more complex and complicated rationales and practices to justify a movement toward professionalization (see Darling-Hammond, 1990, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1995; Hargreaves, 1994, 2000; Pickle, 1990). In Korea, as well, a viewpoint similar to that held in the U.S. has been introduced in academia which focuses on developing a variety of criteria in order to define a profession (see Kim, 1998; Kwag, 1998; Kwag, 2001; Park, 2001; Roh, 2003; Song, 2001; Yang, 2000). Unique to Korea is classifying teachers as educational professionals according to the job classification released by the Korean Statistical Association (1992, pp.46-48). The teaching occupation was considered a professional one in a survey of teaching occupation by both teachers and the public who were asked to categorize the teaching occupation as being either a clergy, a professional or a worker. However, the result probably reflects a view of what “ought to be” rather than the reality of what is (Koo, 2002, p.72).

In terms of the deprofessionalization of teaching, I discussed how teachers’ work is portrayed as more routinized and deskilled, where teachers have less discretion in exercising their judgment in their own classes. Individual teachers are not afforded the practice of autonomy, because an externally produced and imposed apparatus of behavioral objectives diminish their power and autonomy (Apple, 1995). Two examples of educational reform, a standard based accountability system for student academic achievement in the US and examination oriented schooling in Korea are cases to illustrate this point.

Finally, regarding professionalism in teaching, I illuminated how the notion of professionalism in teaching, adopted and adapted by the government or by teachers, has different definitions. From a functionalist perspective, major countries deeply engaging in the project of professionalism and professionalization in teaching have made few serious attempts to explore the meaning of the terms and have, consciously or unconsciously, adopted a favorable attitude

towards professionalism, requiring accountability based on the competencies of practitioners and their effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Hargreaves, 2000). From a conflict perspective, professionalism in teaching is considered to be a conservative ideology promoted by state administrators and may be used by teachers who believe that the teaching occupation has more significance than the occupation of other workers (Ginsburg, 1996; Ozga & Lawn, 1981).

To address the research questions of the study, I employed primarily a critical discourse analysis and interpretative text analysis. The focus of the analysis includes written educational reform documents such as government reform documents, educational reform reports, proposals, legislation, and documents issued by governmental and non-governmental organizations in the United States and Korea. In analyzing each document, I used both an inductive and a deductive process in order to identify descriptions of the problems identified, the remedies suggested, and some versions of the ideology of professionalism articulated, based on several categories composed of the basic elements of professionalism. For a cross-country analysis, I employed a juxtaposition approach by classifying the similarities and the differences of the main themes.

7.3 Summary of Findings and Implications for Policy Makers: Global Convergence versus Local Divergence

Examining the discourses of educational reform documents in the two countries, the study was designed to focus on the problems of teaching, teachers, and teacher education and their solutions. In addition, the analysis highlighted whether and how the reform documents incorporated the ideology of professionalism. In summary, I found there are global convergence and a few local divergences in constructing reform discourses.

While a continual global convergence of educational reform discourse at governmental organizations/private foundations has proceeded, it is relatively rare to see local divergence in

constructing ideas and practices on the ideology of professionalism. With regard to the global convergence in constructing reform discourse, the two countries have developed ideas and practices based upon the economic imperatives of national development. Although the United States and Korea have slight differences in wording and in creating systems, it is obvious to see a global trend of convergence of educational reform discourse as simply reflecting the assumption that the entire world has become integrated into a common structure and set of practices, particularly the needs of the global economy (see Burbules & Torres, 2000; Inkeles & Sirowy, 1984). For example, the phrases of “the nation’s economic competitiveness in the global economy” (1983), “America’s ability to compete in world market” (1986b), and “Korea would become more competitive in the global market” (1995) “Professionalism as a tactic for national survival in today’s global competitive society” (Kwag, 2001) are evidences that major reform rationales or discourses are focused on exploring the link between economic growth and quality teaching forces.

Moreover, the economic imperatives of educational reform discourses by governmental organizations and private foundations tend to emphasize promoting government power through the ideas and practice of standard based reform (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1996, 1999, 2000), or through an accrediting system (2001), or through market oriented teacher compensation (1983, 1986b, 1996 in the U.S and 1995 in Korea). Thus, some major phrases or words like “global competition,” “national development,” “national standard for entry/exit,” and “introducing accreditation” have been used to justify call for educational reform and a change in teaching, teachers, and teacher education. Given that Korea, as a peripheral nation, didn’t have a hand in major terms of profession and professionalism historically and culturally, the Korean reform discourse illustrates remarkably similar levels of constructing the ideology of professionalism.

Not only the idea of conceptualizing the notions of profession, professionalization and professionalism but the number of ideas and practices devoted to achieving the goal is almost identical to those developed in the United States or other core advanced countries. Therefore economic globalization (world system theory) helps significantly in understanding how movements toward convergence around ideas and practices on major issues of educational reform proceed.

On the other hand, a few local divergences at the micro level can be found from the position of the KTU when considering the KTU has tried to make its own version of professionalism different from the Western concept, although it apparently takes a similar position to American teachers unions, calling for professionalism in their work. For example, with regard to the notion of teachers' autonomy, the KTU (1999, 2002) highlighted practitioner's autonomy as something taken-for-granted in constructing the ideology of professionalism, which is not clearly visible in the US reform documents. Particularly, the KTU emphasized the notion of teacher professionalism by articulating both the role of the subject teacher and that of classroom teachers (Kim, 1999). The traditional attributes of teacher professionalism, which emphasize subject teaching ability, do not cover the Korean cases that value the role of class teachers.

Another example is, while governmental reform documents issued in Korea demonstrate their position to maintain the equilibrium of their social and education system, the KTU has attempted to create a new system that would change the social/ political system by challenging the oppressive regime (1987, 1989) and by expanding the scope of teachers' work and their involvement in solving social and education problems facing Korean society (1987, 1989, 2002). It means that the KTU has more actively struggled for better schools and communities at local

and national levels, rather than just simply investing its energy and interests in advocating higher salaries, promotion, and better working conditions.

Overall the problems identified and the solutions suggested varied across the selected reform documents and between the two countries, but there are a few themes commonly found in framing the problems identified, in proposing the solution suggested, and in incorporating the ideology of professionalism as follows:

The Insistence on the Weakness of Pre-service Teacher Education: A commonly identified problem is that the perceived weakness of teaching, teachers, and teacher education is primarily due to poor quality teacher preparation. This has brought the same issue to be repeated in the reform documents and seems to be used for reformers to make a rationale for the ideology of professionalism. Although the analyzed reform documents have been issued by different organizations, they all frame pre-service teacher education program both as a problem and a solution. Similarities, although they do not explicitly match in phrasing, are observed in both the recruiting systems and in the curriculum management in schools of education. For example, the problems identified in the United States include recruiting the ablest students to the teaching occupation (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1996, 1999, 2000) and theory driven research in the schools of education as well as the emphasis on graduate studies (1990, 1995, 1996, 1999).

Unlike the U.S. cases, the Korean reform documents (1987, 1995, 2001) repeated a problem called “lack of professionalism in teacher education curriculum” that has no clarification to support the claim. In general, the problems identified in the Korean documents are not classified in the manner in which they are identified in the U.S. documents. The Korean documents provided neither a detailed definition of the terms nor evidence to justify its rationale of framing the problems. Despite the rhetoric embedded in framing the problems in this way

about pre-service teacher education, all of the organizations responsible for issuing the reform documents seem to assume that pre-service teacher education is the key place responsible for improving the quality of teaching, teachers, and teacher education. Therefore, the issue of teacher professionalism will increase the impact of teacher educators on developing both the shape of institutions and the content of curriculum. However, pre-service teacher education institutions, as a perceived platform to drive educational reform, seem to have no determination to change the problems faced. This is most likely because the problem has existed for such a long period of time due to major issues related to the social and economic conditions of teachers.

Rationalizing the Image of the Teaching Occupation as a Profession: Given the fact that classifying the teaching occupation as a profession has been controversial among stakeholders and scholars, analyzing both the arguments that hold that the teaching occupation as a profession and how it is developed in the reform discourses will give us a sense of how to construct the power relationship embedded in the reform documents with regard to notions of profession, professionalism, and professionalization. I think, as Dove argues (1986, 1995), that under the current capitalist system, getting initiatives to frame the problems and to propose the solutions on educational reform agenda is directly related to demonstrating the presence or absence of power by either the government or teachers' unions.

The U.S. reform discourses since 1983, regardless of the organization issuing the documents, have retained the position of clarifying the teaching occupation as a "profession" (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1990, 1995, 2000). For nearly the last two decades in the U.S., terms have been developed within documents that articulate the knowledge and skills needed for the teaching occupation (1995) and suggest the need for institutionalizing professional development

schools (1986a, 1986b). This means that both governmental organizations and teachers' unions run parallel in their position to construct the image of the teaching occupation as a profession.

However, the Korean reform discourses issued by governmental organizations have not demonstrated such consistency and clarity with regard to this issue. For example, the Korean documents label the teaching occupation as a profession (1987), a profession with a mission similar to that of a clergy, even equating teachers to the clergy (2001). Overall, the Korean documents illustrate the notion of profession or professionalism in the documents but do not develop the notions in a clear and articulated way. One striking difference is that the U.S. discourses systemically endorse the idea of profession or professionalism, regardless of whether the documents were from the educators' organization (1986a, 1990, 1995), from private foundations (1986b, 1996), or authored by teachers unions (the AFT(1985) and the NEA (1997)). In Korea, however, only those documents authored by governmental organizations or by a conservative teacher association (KFTA) raise a discourse endorsing these ideas. The KTU in contrast endorsed the terms aggressively and positively, but only recently (2002). These developments lead us to think that Korean reformers had no responsibility in originating the terms due to the fact that reformers in Korea consider that the reform of professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education has been proven in advanced countries, therefore no criticism with regard to the terms and the agenda is required.

Extending the Length of Pre-service Teacher Education: Extending the length of time of per-service teacher education is one of the core elements constructing the ideology of professionalism embedded in the educational reform discourse according to the traits' model. Also, it is a common theme found in the reform documents, across documents and between the two countries. With regard to extending the length of education, the remedies suggested in the

U.S. include a variety of ideas, including creating graduate professional programs (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000) and a five year program (2000). The remedies suggested by Korean documents differ by decade, from the 1980s to the 1990s and finally the early 2000s. The early 1980s trend was to extend the two-year elementary school teachers college to a four-year college (1980), and to require of kindergarten teachers at least three or even four years of college (1987). In the 1990s, a year-long internship program for prospective teachers for clinical experiences was suggested.⁶⁵ In the current decade, introducing both graduate teacher education programs and an Ed.D. for teachers and administrators (2001) has been suggested in the context of enhancing teacher professionalism.

Overall, while the U.S. discourses illustrate that the U.S. had already begun reforming the lengthy education requirements in the middle of the 1980s, the Korean cases show that Korea has been in the middle of discussions from the 1990s through 2001, mainly reflecting ideas and practices of the U.S. Given the fact that from 1900 to 2000 the type of institution preparing teachers has changed from normal schools to teacher colleges and to universities, the trend of increasing the length of pre-service teacher education seems likely to continue (Long & Reigle, 2002). Perhaps in the future, most teachers will be required to be trained in graduate schools of education similar to those of other professional schools such as with law and medicine. However, considering the fact that a long-lasting imbalance between demand and supply for secondary school teachers has been a big issue in Korea,⁶⁶ teacher educators and policy makers should pay

⁶⁵ Considering the remedies suggested in both countries with regard to student teaching requirements, it is likely that clinical experience will continue to increase in length and importance. In the United States, several universities have adopted fifth-year programs and internship programs and many reform documents emphasize the importance of field-based preparation of teachers (see Long & Reigle, 2002; Marks, 2002). In Korea, both the government and teacher unions all agree it is necessary to lengthen the period devoted to student teaching experience. It turns out that lengthening of student teaching clinical experiences in the two countries has become common over the last two decades at least in the reform documents selected.

⁶⁶ Secondary school teachers certified in Korea have been in over supply, compared to elementary school teachers, who have been in short supply. The number of teacher candidates graduated from various teacher education

attention to dealing with the issue rather than simply extending the length of pre-service teacher education. Because the imbalance would cause a serious question regarding the credibility of secondary school teacher education institutions in terms of the real possibility of hiring new teachers (see Roh, 2003). Therefore, it is imperative that researchers, policy makers, and practitioners reconstruct the way in which teacher education institutions control both the number of students entering and the quality of their graduates.

Increased Control: An obvious feature found in the reform documents in the two countries is that there exists a strong tendency toward centralization of control over teacher education programs and teacher in-service training. Particularly with regard to improving the quality of pre-service teacher education, the US reform documents strongly emphasize standardized testing for entry and/or exit requirements at pre-service teacher education institutions (1983, 1986b, 1996, 2000), a professional teacher examination (1986a, 2000), and a national entry test (2000). Also, the creation of NBPTS (1987), which aims at establishing high standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do, evidence that professionalism would be achieved by recognizing teachers who meet those standard at national level.

In the U.S. cases, considering the US historical background of a decentralized education system, the use of standardized tests for teachers as well students creates pressures toward national convergence and federal control. Such a standardization movement aims at promoting curriculum uniformity by forging common goals, aims, and standards for teacher education. In the Korea document (2001), although the country is recognized as having a highly centralized

institutions are reached about 25,000 a year, but only 20.5% of them, about 5,200 candidates, are employed every year, according to averages taken from 1998 to 2001. Put more specifically, in 2001, about 25,453 certified second-class teachers were graduated and only 4,235 of them, 16.2% were hired through open competition run by local educational authorities for public schools. (Roh, 2003, p.44-45)

education system, there is discussion of introducing an accreditation system for teacher education institutions and certification programs at the national level and controlling teacher in-service training at local level. Both cases aim at elaborating means for more central control over teaching, teachers, and teacher education. Overall, standardized testing for teachers and an accreditation system for teacher education requires a central authority to provide leadership and action and so provides a mechanism for the surveillance of schools that allows the government to justify its extended power over teacher, teaching, and teacher education. Therefore, these reforms must have the effect of exercising control at central levels of the administration and perpetuating the power of government to control teaching, teachers, and teacher education (see Delandshere & Petorsky, 2004; Labaree, 1992; Sears, Marshall, & Otis-Wilborn, 1988).

Contesting the Idea of Teacher Autonomy: The concept of teacher autonomy is a core component of the construct of the ideology of professionalism. However, in the selected reform documents, the way in which the concept is framed seems not to be concrete enough to support construction of the ideology of professionalism. Also, there exists a distance between how governmental organizations and teachers' unions conceptualize the notion of teacher autonomy. The term autonomy is never mentioned directly in constructing teacher professionalism in the U.S. reform discourses regardless of the author. I think the absence of the concept of teacher autonomy is due to the fact that the issue would be included and settled in the process of collecting bargaining sessions with local school boards. Or the issue of teacher autonomy might be overshadowed by standard-based accountability systems for students' academic achievement, and so wouldn't get a attention from stakeholders, since the federal and state government, local educational authorities and parents are more likely interested in academic achievement on high stake tests. This could be a reason the concept is never mentioned in the selected reform. This

situation will remain until authorities decide there is more to education than academic achievement. Teachers on their part feel that they have lost autonomy in their practice due to having to comply with high stake testing preparation in schools.

The Korean documents suggest various ideas that might be included in the concept of teacher autonomy. In some sense, the governmental documents illustrate both a narrow and abstract concept of autonomy by suggesting guaranteeing teachers' right to teach (1992) and introducing self-regulated working hours (1995). However, the concept, allowing teachers to participate in curriculum decision making (2001), has been articulated in the governmental reform document, since the KTU was legalized (1999) and took part in various reform processes with the government. This means that the KTU has strongly influenced the process of educational reform. However, given the fact that university entrance oriented examination in Korea gives teachers little room to exercise an authentic concept of teacher autonomy, where they can generally compose the content to teach a subject and evaluate the results, the effect of the recent development of Korean reform documents referencing the concept of teacher autonomy seems to be questionable.

The reform documents do not clarify the authors' position on the concept of teacher autonomy, as recognized above, and by just mentioning it in the abstract and not referring to the power for both countries at the governmental level, the concept of autonomy seems not a central component of professionalism for teachers. However, in Korea at the level of teachers unions, unlike in the US cases, the KTU has demonstrated a recent position which stresses both the concept of professionalism and autonomy together in creating teacher policies (2002). The Korean case illustrates complicated and dynamic situations dealing with the concept of teachers' autonomy mainly because the society has experienced a rapid change in terms of social,

economic, and political democratization along with increased power of teachers' unions in the process of educational reform. At least, it is obvious that the KTU has focused its position on improving teachers' autonomy as a mean to solve educational and/or social problems facing the Korean society, including the highly examination-oriented education and the resulting student alienation, rather than simply improving its salary, promotion, and working condition considered one of core interests of trade unions. The concept of teacher autonomy will always be contested as long as a conflict between government, parents and teachers' unions with respect to education and society exists.

Failure of the Market Oriented Teacher Compensation System: The remedies suggested in both countries with regard to remuneration are basically very similar in their concern of increasing the scale of teachers' salaries and the ways in which they want to reach this goal. They all reflect the desire for a market oriented compensation system in order to solve the problem of motivating teachers. Reformers representing governmental organizations (1995 in Korea) and private foundations (1986b, 1996 in the U.S.) argue that under the current uniform salary system there is no financial reward for superior performance and no financial penalty for inferior performance. Such performance-based compensation plans are typically called a merit pay system. The U.S. cases (1983, 1986b, 1996) suggest introducing a more rigorous salary system based upon evaluation and incentive for excellence, thereby reflecting the market force. The idea of linking assessment and compensation has remained in reform discourse in the U.S. since the early 1980s. However, according to Murnane & Cohen (1986), the U.S. history proves that most attempts to implement merit pay for public school teachers over the last seventy-five years have failed.

In Korea, a market-oriented salary system, for example, merit pay based on competence or performance, was introduced in the 1995 reform document and implementation was attempted in 2001 but failed because of the resistance of teachers associations (see Koo, 2002, pp. 331-334). The main reason they resisted is that merit pay would be a control mechanism to strength the power of administrators and/or the government over teaching and school administration at various levels. Considering the challenge against merit pay from teachers' unions, it would be difficult to implement it in the near future with the rationale developed so far.

Questioning of Differentiating Staffing Patterns: Improving teachers' social status has been continually addressed in the reform documents issued in both countries, although teachers in the two countries have been treated differently according to the differing public attitude toward the teaching occupation and the remuneration they receive. In general, teachers in the U.S. have a relatively low status compared to other university graduates considering the average salary they receive (Long & Reigle, 2002). For example, the reform documents mention the reality of teachers' status as being influenced by gender (feminized occupation, 1986b), the nature of the job (semi-skilled workers, 1986b), and the societal attitude toward the teaching occupation (lack of respect for the teaching occupation, 2000).

In contrast, although the same kind of problems identified in the US documents exist in Korea, teachers in Korea have a relatively higher social reputation compared to other countries when considering the average salary and the low rate of teacher turnover as well as the historical background of respecting educator in Korea (see Santiago, 2004). Unique to the Korean case is that the KTU documents (1986, 1989) find teachers' social status degraded from the oppressive regimes' efforts to downgrade teachers and keep power. Considering the facts mentioned above, to improve teachers' social status it is necessary to consider the social, historical, and economic

conditions of a society. However, the idea of differentiating the flat teaching career into three or four layers in the US (1983, 1986a, 1986b) and introducing the idea of a master (lead) teacher in Korea (1987, 1992, 2001) has something to do with developing a system that motivates teachers to compete with each other, where the winner would be given a higher position and a reward, so the winner will be recognized by the public. I think the remedy suggested to improve teachers' social status by differentiating staffing pattern of the flat teaching career seems to be out of context, because it is just concerned with changing the career system and that doesn't reflect teachers' self identify considering them as educators not as bureaucrats. This could be a reason why the remedy suggested has not been implemented yet in either country.

Increasing U.S. Influences on the Korean Education Reform: Given that the global trend toward a common system of education under current global capitalism can not be avoided, Korea shows a tendency to appropriate ideas and move toward a structure and set of practices similar to those in the U.S. during an earlier period. Considering the fact that the two countries have maintained strong ties in politics, economics, and the military and Korea has been deeply influenced by the idea and products of U.S. education throughout the last fifty years, the similarities identified in the Korean reform documents provide solid evidence of U.S. influence on the relationship. For example, in governmental documents, labeling teaching as a profession (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1990, 1995, 2000 in the US documents and 1987, 2001 in the Korean documents), creating graduate programs (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000 in the US documents and 2001 in the Korean document), differentiating staffing patterns (1983, 1986a, 1986b in the US documents and 1987, 1992, 2001 in the Korean documents), and introducing merit pay (1983, 1986b, 1996 in the US documents and 1995 in the Korean document) are the cases showing the influence relationship between the two nations.

Also, in the case of teachers' unions, the KFTA (1997) and the KTU (1999, 2002) have a similar position to that of the NEA (1997) and the AFT (1985) with regards to conceptualizing the issue of professionalization of teaching, teachers, and teacher education. I think that Korea, as a peripheral nation, will continue to invest its effort to follow the US experiences as a model of global trends as long as the United States maintains its status as a core country in conceptualizing and developing reform ideas and practices as well as its global economic power. Korea's reform efforts will depend on how the country reacts and organizes ideas and practices to respond to the main stream of global trends initiated by core economic countries.

APPENDIX A

Educational Reform Documents Addressing Teaching, Teachers, and Teacher Education in the United States

American Council in Education (1999). *To touch the future: Transforming the way teachers are taught*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Federation of Teachers. (2000). *Building a profession: Strengthening teacher preparation and induction*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (2001). *Higher education's challenge: New teacher education model for a new century*. New York: Author.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1984). *Staffing the nation's schools: A national emergency*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Education Commission of the States. (1983). *Action for excellence*. Denver, Co.: Author.

Forum of Educational Organization Leaders. (1983). *Educational reform: A response from educational leaders*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group, (1990). *Tomorrow's school*. East Lansing, MI: Author

Holmes Group. (1995); *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

National Alliance of Business (2001). *Investing in teaching*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). *A call for change in teacher*

- education*. Washington, D.C. Author.
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1999). *ETS study shows NCATE makes a difference*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Education Association. (1982). *Excellence in our schools teachers education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Governors' Association. (1986). *Time for results*. Washington, D.C.: Author
- National Science Foundation (1983). *Educating Americans for the 21st century. A report to the American people and the national science board*. Commission on pre college education, mathematics, science and technology. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. New York, NY: Author.
- Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. (1983). *Making the grade*. New York: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education (1999); *A talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in every classroom: information kit*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Public Law 102-325, *Higher Education Amendments* (1992).
- Public Law 103-227, *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (1994).
- Public Law 107-110, *No Child Behind Act of 2001* (2002).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, A. (1991). The order of professionalization: An empirical analysis. *Work and Occupations*, 18(4), 355-384.
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (Eds.). (1990). *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Acedo, C. (Ed.). (2002). *Case studies in secondary education reform*. Arlington, VA: IEQ.
- Adams, D., & Gottlieb, E. E. (1993). *Education and social change in Korea*, New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- American Federation of Teachers. (2000). *Building a profession: Strengthening teacher preparation and induction*. Washington: New York: Author.
- Apple, M. W. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). Power, meaning and identity: Critical sociology of education in the United States. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17(2), 125-144.
- Apple, M. W. et al. (Ed.). (2003). *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Archer, M. (1979). *Social origins of educational systems*. London: Sage.
- Arno, R. F. (1980). Comparative education and world-system analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 24(1), 48-62.
- Aronowitz, S. (1973). *False promise: The shaping of American working class consciousness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Avis, J. (1994). Teacher professionalism: One more time. *Educational Review*, 46(1), 63-71.
- Ball, S. J. (1994). *Educational reform: A critical poststructural approach*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Banks, J. (1987). The social studies, ethnic diversity, and social change. *Elementary School Journal*, 87(5), 531-543.

- Baritz, L. (1960). *The servants of power: A history of the use of social science in American history*. New York: Wesleyan University Press.
- Barton, L., Barrett, E., Whitty, G., & Furlong, J. (1994). Teacher education and teacher professionalism in England: Some emerging issues. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15(4), 520-544.
- Bates, I. (1998). The 'empowerment' dimension in the GNVQ: A critical exploration of discourse, pedagogic apparatus and school implementation. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(1), 7-22.
- BBCNEWS. (2004a). *Country profile: United States of America*. Retrieved May 28, 2004, from <http://newsvote.bb.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/>
- BBCNEWS. (2004b). *Country profile: South Korea*. Retrieved May 28, 2004, from <http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/>
- Bergvall, V. L., & Remlinger, K. A. (1996). Reproduction, resistance and gender in educational discourse: The role of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 7(4), 453-479.
- Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1996). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's schools*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bidwell, C., & Kazamias, A. M. (October 1962). Religion, politics, and popular education: An historical comparison of England and America. *Comparative Education Review*, pp.97-110.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boli, J., Ramirez, F., & Meyer, J. (1986). Explaining the origins and expansion of mass education. In P. Altbach & G. Kelly (Eds.), *New approaches to comparative education* (pp. 105-130). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Buchert, L. (1998). *Education reform in the south in the 1990s*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Bullough Jr., R. V., Burbank, M., Gess-Newsom, J., Kauchak, D., & Kennedy, C. (1998). What matters most: Teaching for America's future? *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 24(1), 7-32.
- Burbules, N., & Torres, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Burnett, S. (1989). *Korean-American relations*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Campbell, D. (1982). Experiments as arguments. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 3(3), 327-337.
- Carlson, D. (1987). Teachers as political actors: From reproductive theory to the crisis in schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 283-307.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York. (2001). *Higher education's challenge: New teacher education models for a new century*. New York: Author.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*: Author.
- Carnoy, M. (1982). Education, economy and the state. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Essays on class, ideology and the state* (pp. 79-126). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Carnoy, M. (1984). *The state and political theory*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Carnoy, M., Levin, H. (1986). Educational reform and class conflict. *Journal of Education*, 168(1), 35-46.
- Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? A comparative approach. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(1), 1-9.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectives and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. ColnLin (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publication.
- Cherryholmes, C. (1988). Thinking about education poststructurally. In C. Cherryholmes (Ed.), *Power and criticism* (pp. 31-48). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cho, H-J. (1996). *Hakkyo rul kõvbuhanũn aidul, aidulũl kõvbuhanũn sahoe* [*Children rejecting a school, a society avoiding children*]. Seoul: Another culture.
- Cho, K-W. (2001). *Kyoyukbu, shinchayuju tyahyaengcha* [*The ministry of education, an agent for new liberalism*]. Retrieved June 12, 2001, from <http://www.hani.co.kr/selection.html>.
- Chon, H-O. (2000, May 15). Kyoyukbu chariphong sahak toip palpyo [The release of self-financed schools by Ministry of Education]. *Chõnkyojo shinmun*, p. 6.
- Chongnyon tanchukboda tõ chyungyo hanil [Things important than reducing the retirement age]. (November 18, 1998). *Chõnkyojo shinmun*, p. 2.

- Chun, B-S., & Kim, H-H. (1998). *Shinchayujuui wa hankukui milae* [Neo-liberalism and the future of Korean education]. Seoul, Korea: Hanul.
- Clayton, T. (1998). Beyond mystification: Reconnecting world-system theory for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4), 479-496.
- Coburn, C. E. (2001). Collective sensemaking about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 145-170.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. K. (2001). Sticks, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational researcher*, 30(8), 3-15.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. K. (2002). The discourse of reform in teacher education: Extending the dialogue. *Educational researcher*, 31(6), 26-28.
- Coeyman, M. (2003, April 22). Twenty years after 'a Nation at Risk'. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved March 31, 2004, from <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0422/p13s02-lepr.htm>
- Cohn, M., & Kottkamp, R. (1992). *Teachers: The missing voice in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Collins, R. (1979). The politics of profession. In *The credential society: A historical sociology of education and stratification* (pp. 131-181). New York: Academic Press.
- Conway, P. F., Goodell, J. E., & Carl, J. (2002). Educational reform in the USA: Politics, purposes, and processes. In R. Griffin (Ed.), *Education in transition: International perspectives on the politics and processes of change*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Symposium Books.
- Cookson, P., Sadovnik, A., & Semel, S. (Eds.). (1992). *International handbook of educational reform*. New York: Greenwood.
- Corbridge, S. (1997). Uneven development, new geopolitical orders and the internationalization of capital. In R. D. Dikshit (Ed.), *Developments in political geography: A century of progress*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Covert, J. B. (1975). Second thought about the professionalization of teachers. *Educational Forum*, 39, 149-154.
- Crozier, G. (1998). Parents and schools: Partnership or surveillance? *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(1), 125-136.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational researcher*, 2, 3-13.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teacher professionalism: Why and how? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now* (pp. 25-50). New York: The Falmer Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(3), 193-200.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). The quality of teaching matters most. *Journal of Staff Development*, 18(1), 38-41.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teaching for America's Future: National commissions and vested interests in an almost profession. *Educational Policy*, 14(1), 162-183.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). *The evolution of teacher policy*. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation. ED 298599.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1995). Teacher professionalism and the commission reports: The prospects for creating a learner-centered profession of teaching. In R. Ginsberg & D. N. Plank (Eds.), *Commissions, reports, reforms, and educational policy* (pp. 151-169). Westport: Praeger.
- Davies, S., & Guppy, N. (1997). Globalization and educational reform in anglo-American democracies. *Comparative Education Review*, 41(4), 435-459.
- Delandshere, G., & Arens, S. (2001). Representations of teaching in standards-based reform: Are we closing the debate about teacher education. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 17(5), 547-566.
- Delandshere, G., & Petrosky, A. (2004). Political rationales and ideological stances of the standards-based reform of teacher education in the US. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 20, 1-15.
- Delisio, E. R. (2002). *No Child Left Behind: What it means to you*. Retrieved March 31, 2004, from http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues273.shtml
- Densmore, K. (1987). Professionalism, proletarianization and teacher work. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Critical studies in teacher education*: (pp. 130-160). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Diesing, P. (1991). *How does social science work? Reflection on practice*. Pittsburgh, PA: The University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dove, L. (1986). *Teachers in politics in developing countries*. London: Croom Helm.

- Dove, L. (1995). The work of schoolteachers as political actors in developing countries. In *The politics of educators' work and lives* (pp. 115-132). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Dreeben, R. (1970). *The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Dreeben, R. (1988). The school as a workplace. In J. Ozga (Ed.), *School work* (pp. 73-102). London: Croom Helm.
- Dwyer, C., & Villegas, A. (1991, October). *Guiding conceptions and assessment principles for the PRAXIS series: Professional assessments for beginning teachers*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Elliott, J. (1999). Introduction: Global and local dimensions of reforms in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*, 133-141.
- Emener, W. G. & Cotton, R. R. (1989). Professionalization, deprofessionalization, and reprofessionalization of rehabilitation counseling according to criteria of professions. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 67*, 576-581.
- Esland, G. (1980). Professions and professionalism. In G. Esland & Salaman (Eds.), *The politics of work and occupation* (pp. 213-250). University of Toronto: The Open University Press.
- Espinoza, O. (2002). *The global and national rhetoric of educational reform and the practice of (in)equity in the Chilean higher education system (1981-1998)*. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Esteve, J. M. (2000). The transformation of the teachers' role at the end of the twentieth century: New challenges for the future. *Educational Review, 52*(2), 197-217.
- Etzioni, A. (1969a). *The semi-professions and their organization*. New York: Free Press.
- Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969b). *The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.

- Filson, G. (1988). Ontario teachers' deprofessionalization and proletarianization. *Comparative Education Review*, 32(3), 298-317.
- Fiske, E. B., & O'grady, B. (2000). *A report of the United States to the International Consultative Forum on Education for All*. Retrieved May 28, 2004, from <http://www2.unesco.org/wef/countryreports/usa/contents.html>
- Foucault, M. (1973). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans). New York: Vintage.
- Fowler, R. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press.
- Fraser, N. (1991). *The uses and abuses of French discourse theories for feminist politics in critical theory*. In P. Wexler (Ed.), (pp. 98-117). London: The Falmer Press.
- Friedson, E. (1983). The theory of the professions: The state of the art. In R. Dingwall & P. Lewis (Ed.), *The sociology of the professions* (pp. 47-59). Keele, England: University of Keele.
- Friedson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Fusarelli, L. (2004). The potential impact of the No Child Left Behind Act on equity and diversity in American education. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 71-94.
- Gaffield, C. (February 1994). Children's lives and academic achievement in Canada and the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 38 (1), pp. 36-64.
- Gage, N., & Berliner, D. (1998). *Educational psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gallagher, K. S., & Bailey, J. D. (2000). The politics of teacher education reform: Strategic Philanthropy and Public Policy Making. *Educational Policy*, 14(1), 11-24.
- Garman, N. B., & Holland, P. C. (1995). The rhetoric of school reform reports: Sacred, skeptical, and cynical interpretation. In R. Ginsberg & D. N. Plank (Eds.), *Commissions, reports, reforms, and educational policy* (pp. 101-118). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ginbson, R. (1986). *Critical theory and education*. London: Hodder & Stroughton.

- Ginsberg, R., & Plank, N. D. (Ed.). (1995). *Commissions, reports, reforms, and educational policy*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Ginsburg, B. M., Cooper, S., Raghu, R., & Zegarra, H. (1990). National and world-system explanations of educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, 34(4), 474-499.
- Ginsburg, M. (1987a). Reproduction, contradiction, and conception of professionalism: The case of pre-service teachers. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Critical studies in teacher education* (pp. 86-129). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Ginsburg, M. (1987b). Teacher education and class and gender relations: A critical analysis of historical studies of teacher education. *Educational Foundations*, 1(2), 4-36.
- Ginsburg, M. (Ed.). (1991). *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state*. New York: Garland Publishing, INC.
- Ginsburg, M., & Chaturvedi, V. (1988). Teachers and the ideology of professionalism in India and England: A comparison of cases in colonial/peripheral and metropolitan/central societies. *Comparative Education Review*, 32(4), 465-477.
- Ginsburg, M., & Cooper, S. (1991). Educational reform, the state, and the world economy: Understanding and engaging in ideological and other struggles. In M. B. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Understanding educational reform in global context: economy, ideology, and the state* (pp. 369-395). New York: Garland Publishing, INC.
- Ginsburg, M., & Lindsay, B. (Ed.). (1995). *The political dimension in teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Ginsburg, M., Cooper, S., Raghu, R., & Zegarra, H. (1991). Educational reform: Social struggle, the state and the world economic system. In M. B. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state* (pp. 3-47). New York: Garland Publishing, INC.
- Ginsburg, M., Wallace, G., & Miller, H. (1988). Teachers, economy, and the state: An English example. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 4(4), 317-337.
- Ginsburg, M. B. (1996). Professionalism or politics as a model for educators' work and lives. *Educational Research Journal*, 11(2), 133-146.
- Ginsburg, M. B. (1998). *Think piece: On being critical in reading, writing, thinking, and enacting*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

- Gore, J., & Morrison, K. (2001). The perpetuation of a (semi-)profession: Challenges in the governance of teacher education. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 17*, 567-582.
- Gottlieb, E. (1991). Global rhetoric, local policy: A case study of Israeli education and teacher training. In M. B. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state* (pp. 317-340). New York: Garland Publishing, INC.
- Gottlieb, E. E., & Cornbleth, C. (1989). The professionalization of tomorrow's teachers: An analysis of US teacher education reform rhetoric. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 15*(1), 3-12.
- Griffin, R. (2002). Education in transition: International perspectives on the politics and processes of change. In R. Griffin (Ed.), *Education in transition: International perspectives on the politics and processes of change* (pp. 13-28). Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Ha, B-S. (1999, May 26). Kyosa yonsu chedo [Teacher training system enhancing teacher professionalism]. *Chonkyojo shinmun*, p. 5.
- Hall, C., & Schultz, R. (2003). Tensions in teaching and teacher education: Professionalism and professionalisation in England and Canada. *Compare, 33*(3), 369-383.
- Hall, R. H. (1983). Theoretical trends in the sociology of occupations. *The Sociological Quarterly, 24*(Winter), 5-23.
- Han, Z-S. (1999). *Country report: Republic of Korea*. Retrieved May 28, 2004, from <http://www2.unesco.org/wef/countryreports/korea/contents.html>
- Hannay, L., & Ross, J. (1997). Initiating secondary school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33*, 576-603.
- Hantrais, L., & Mangen, S. (1996). Method and management of cross-national social research. In *Cross-national research methods in the social science* (pp. 1-12). New York: Pinter.
- Hardy, L. (September 2002). A new federal role. *American School Board Journal, 20-24*.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York, NY: Teachers' College Press.
- Hargreaves, A. (1997). Rethinking educational change. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational change with heart and mind, The 1997 ASCD yearbook*. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hargreaves, A. (1998). Teachers role in renewal. *Orbit, 129*(1), 10-13.

- Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching*, 6(2), 151-182.
- Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (1996). Teachers professional lives: Aspirations and actualities. In I. Goodson & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teachers' professional lives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hargreaves, D. (1994). The new professionalism: the synthesis of professional and institutional development. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 10(4), 423-438.
- Harris, K. (1990). Teachers and proletarianisation: A reply to Lauder and Yee. *Australian Journal of Education*, 34(2), 192-203.
- Hastings, A. (1998). Connecting linguistic structures and social practices: A discourse approach to social policy analysis. *Journal of Social Policy*, 27(2), 191-211.
- Haug, M. (1975). The deprofessionalization of everyone? *Sociological Focus*, 8(3), 197-213.
- Heidenheimer, A. (1974). The politics of educational reform: Explaining outcomes of school comprehensivization attempts in Sweden and West Germany. *Comparative Education Review*, 18(3).
- Helsby, G. (1995). Teachers' construction of professionalism in England in the 1990s. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 21(3), 317-332.
- Helsby, G. (2000). *Changing teachers' work and culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Helsby, G., & Knight, P. (2000). Continuing professional development and the National Curriculum. In G. Helsby & G. McCulloch (Eds.), *Teachers and the national curriculum*. London: Cassell.
- History of the United States. (2004). *History of the United States*. Retrieved May 24, 2004, from http://www.fact-index.com/h/hi/history_of_the_united_states.html
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, Mich: The Holmes Group Inc.
- Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's school of education*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Holmes Partnership. (2002). Member List. Retrieved December 20, 2002, from <http://www.holmespartnership.org/list.html>
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Howsam, R. B. (1980). The workplace: does it hamper professionalization of pedagogy? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62, 93-96.
- Hoyle, E. (1974). Professionalism, professionalism and control in teaching. *London Educational Review*, 3, 13-19.
- Hoyle, E. (1982). The professionalization of teachers: A paradox. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XXX(2), 161-171.
- Ingersoll, R. (1999). The problem of underqualified teachers in American secondary schools. *Educational researcher*, 28(2), 26-37.
- Inkeles, A., & Sirowy, L. (1984). *Convergent and divergent trends in national educational systems*. In G. Lenski (Ed.), (pp. 137-165). Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Jackson, J. (Ed.). (1970). *Professions and professionalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, K., & Manzi, T. (2000). Evaluating the social constructionist paradigm in housing research. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 17, 35-42.
- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge.
- Jennings, J. (September 2002). Knocking your door. *American School Board Journal*, 25-27.
- Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power*. London: Macmillan.
- Johnson, T. (1980). Work and power. In G. E. G. Salaman (Ed.), *The politics of work and occupation*. University of Toronto: The Open University Press.
- Kellner, D. (2000). Globalization and new social movements: Lessons for critical theory and pedagogy. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Ed.), *Globalization and education: critical perspective* (pp. 300-321). New York: Routledge.
- Kim, D-K. (1974). *American influence on Korean educational thought during the period of US military government, 1945-48*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Kim, D-Y. (1999, April 28). Chonkyojo kyowon jongchyaekan [KTU teacher policy]. *Chonkyojo shinmun*, p. 3.
- Kim, E., & Han, Y. (2002). *Attracting, developing, and retaining effective teachers: Background report for Korea*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.
- Kim, H-S. (1982). *A cross-cultural study of Korean and American Teachers' perception of behavior disorder as related to value concepts*. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Columbia University.

- Kim, J-Y. (1998). Kyoyukchöngchihakchöng kwanchömesö bon kyosa yangsöng chejae [Teacher education system analyzed by educational politics' viewpoint]. *The Politics of Education*, 5 (1), pp. 22-41.
- Kim, K-S. (1999). A statist political economy and high demand for education in South Korea. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 7(9).
- Kim, K-S. (2005, February 7). Globalization, statist political economy, and unsuccessful education reform in South Korea, 1993-2003. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(12). <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n12/>.
- Kim, S. (2003). OECD and Korean educational reform. *OECD FOCUS*, 9-13.
- Kim, S-H. (1996). Civil society in South Korea: From grand democracy movements to petty interest groups? *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, XV(1), 81-97.
- Kim, Y. (2000). The 21st century's vision of the Korean teaching profession: Issues and policy plans. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 3(1), 35-54.
- Kim, Y. S. (2002, November 4). Che16dae taetongryongsöngö Chonkyojo kyoyuk kongyak yokuan hae sol [The explanation of KTU's educational policy proposal requested for the 16th Presidential Election]. *Chonkyojo shinmun*, p. 5.
- Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Y. S. Lincoln & N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (second ed., pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Klees, S., & Wells, S. (1983). Economic evaluation of education: A critical analysis in the context of applications to educational reform in El Salvador. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 5(3), 327-345.
- Klegon, D. (1978). The sociology of professions: An emerging perspective. *Sociology at Work and Occupation*, 5(3), 259-280.
- Koo, J. (2002). *Hankukkyowon kwa kyowonchongchaek [Educators in Korea and teacher policy]*. Seoul, Korea: Hawooo.
- Korean Educational Development Institute. (2004). *Korea-OECD Seminar: Challenges and tasks for teacher policies in Korea* (a document for media). Retrieved December 9, 2004, from <http://now.kedi.re.kr/NKNews/NowKedi/UsBrdViw.php?LstNum1=96>
- Korean Federation of Teachers' Association. (2004). President message. Retrieved December 9, 2004, from <http://english.kfta.or.kr/message.asp>

- Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union. (September 10, 1997). Chönkyojo che15dae taetongryeongsöngö) kyoyuk chongchaek kongyakwan [KTU's educational policy proposal for the 15th Presidential Election]. *Chönkyojo shinmun*, pp. 4-5.
- Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union. (November 4, 2002). Che16dae taetongryeongsöngö Chönkyojo kyoyuk kongyak yokuan[KTU's educational policy proposal for the 16th Presidential Election]. *Chonkyojo shinmun*, pp. 4-5.
- Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic process in sociocultural practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. (1991). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 84-99.
- Kuhn, T. (1971). *The structure of scientific revolution* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kwag, P-S. (2001). Kyosilkyoyuküi kaehyokkwa kyosaüi suöb chönmunsoeng [Classroom teaching reform and teachers' instructional professionalism]. *The 32th Conference. The Society of Korean Teacher Education*. pp.3-10.
- Kwag, Y-U. (1998). Kyoyukkyeahyokkwa sabömtaehagui palchönkwaje [Educational reform and developing schools of education], *Hankuk Kyosa Kyoyuk*, 15 (1), pp. 88-108.
- Labaree, D. (1992a). Doing good, doing science: The Holmes Group report and the rhetoric of educational reform. *Teachers College Record*, 93(4), 628-640.
- Labaree, D. (1992b). Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 123-154.
- Labaree, D. F. (1995). A disabling vision: Rhetoric and reality in Tomorrow's School of Education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(2), 167-205.
- Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Larson, M. S. (1980). Proletarianization and educated labor. *Theory and Society*, 9, 131-175.
- Lee, C-J. (2003). Kongkyoyuk chongsanghwa gwajewa panghyang [Directions and tasks for returning Korean public education to its original purpose]. *Korean Educational Research Society*, 73-101.
- Lee, J-G. (1986). *Trans-national knowledge transfer: The case of inquiry teaching method in Korea*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Lee, J-G., Adams, D. & Cornbleth, C. (1988). Transnational transfer of curriculum knowledge: A Korean case study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(3), 233-246.

- Lee, J., & Ohu, C. (1998). *Hankuk kyoyukui shilpae wa kaehyok [Review: The failure of Korean education and its reform]*. Retrieved Oct. 4, 2003, from <http://hanbat.chungnam.ac.kr/~nhoew/research/comment/comment..>
- Lee, K-B. (1997). *Korea and east Asia: The story of a phoenix*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Lee, K-H. (2001, July). *Problems of educational policy associated with neoliberal globalization: The case of South Korea*. Paper presented at the WCCES, Chung won, S. Korea.
- Legatt, T. (1970). Teaching as a profession. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *Profession and professionalization* (pp. 53-77). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, A. C. (2003). *A horse called NCLB*. Retrieved March 2, 2003, from <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k0211lew.htm>
- Library of Congress. (1990). *South Korea: Relations with the United States*. Retrieved May 27, 2004, from <http://lweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/>
- Lieberman, M. (1956). *Education as a profession*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Linn, R. L., Baker, E. L., & Betebenner, D. W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Educational researcher*, 31(6), 3-16.
- Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers' College Record*, 91(4), 509-536.
- Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 129-151.
- Littler, C. (1982). *The development of the labour process in capitalist societies: A comparative study of work organization*. Heinman Educational Books.
- Locke, T. (2002). Curriculum, assessment and the erosion of professionalism. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 36(1), 5-23.
- Long, D., & Riegle, R. (2002). *Teacher education: The key to effective school reform*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.
- Louden, W. (2000). Standards for standards: The development of Australian professional standards for teaching. *Australian Journal of Education*, 44(2), 44-53.
- Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education 21* (pp. 3-48). Washington, D.C.: AERA.

- MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Macpherson, R. (1996). Accountability: Towards reconstructing a 'politically incorrect' policy issue. *Educational Management and Administration*, 24(2), 139-150.
- Manyin, M. (2002). *South Korea-U.S. economic relations: Cooperation, friction, and future prospects*: The Library of Congress.
- Marston, G. (2002). Critical discourse analysis and policy-oriented housing research. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 19, 82-91.
- Martin, D. T. (1991). The political economy of school reform in the United States. In M. B. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state* (pp. 341-367). New York: Garland Publishing, INC.
- Marzano, R. J., & Kendall, J. S. (1998). *Implementing standards-based education*. Washington, DC: National Educational Association.
- Mason, E. S., Kim, M-J., Perkins, D. H., Kim, K-S., & Cole, D.C. (1980). *The economic and social modernization of the Republic of Korea*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Mathis, W. (2003). Costs and benefits. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(9), 679-686.
- Mazzoni, T. (1993). The changing politics of state education policy making: A 20-year Minnesota perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4), 357-379.
- Mcdaniel, T. R. (1979). The de-professionalization of teachers. *The Educational Forum* (January), 229-237.
- McKinlay, J. B. (1973). On the professional regulation of change. In P. Halmos (Ed.), *Professionalization and social change* (pp. 61-84). Keele: University of Keele.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1997). Rebuilding teacher professionalism in the United States. In A. Hargreaves & R. Evans (Eds.), *Buying teachers back*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Megahed, N. M. (2004). *Stratified students, stratified teachers: Ideological of social mobility/reproduction, ideologies of professionalism, and teachers' perception of secondary education reform in Egypt*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

- Merritt, R. I., & Coombs, F. S. (1977). Politics and educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, 21(2/3), 247-273.
- Merton, R. (1976). *Sociological ambivalence and other essays*. New York: The Free Press.
- Millman, J., & Sykes, G. (1992, April). *The assessment of teaching based on evidence of student learning: An analysis (Research monograph)*. Washington, DC: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- Mills, C. W. (1951). *White collar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The power elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ministry of Education, & Korean Educational Development Institute. (2000). *Statistical Yearbook of Education*. Seoul: Creative System.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (2001). *Kyojikpaljeon Jonghapbangan [Comprehensive plan for developing the teaching profession]*. Seoul, Korea: Author.
- Mitchell, B. (1987). Higher education reform and ad hoc committees: A question of legitimacy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 11 (Winter), 117-135.
- Morley, L., & Rassool, N. (1999). *School effectiveness: Fracturing the discourse*. London: Falmer Press.
- Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (1995). *Social theory and education: A critique of theories of social and cultural reproduction*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2000). The state, globalization, and educational policy. In C. A. Torres & N. C. Burbules (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 27-56). New York: NY: Routledge.
- Murnane, R. J., & Cohen, D. K. (1986). Merit pay and the evaluation problem: Why most merit pay plans fail and a few survive. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 1-17.
- Murray, C. E. (1992). Teaching as a profession: The Rochester case in historical perspective. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(4), 494-519.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1989). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession*. Detroit, MI: Author.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1990). *Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units*. Washington, DC: Author.

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1991). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession. Initial policies and perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards* (3rd ed.). Detroit, MI: Author. ED 337440.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). Digest of education statistics, 2002. Retrieved March 31, 2004, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/dt243.asp>
<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/dt258.asp>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1992). *Approved program guidelines*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education .(1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Neave, G. (1988). Education and social policy: Demise of an ethnic or change of value? *Oxford Review of Education*, 14(3), 273-283.
- Newman, J. W. (1998). *America's Teachers: An introduction to education* (Third ed.). New York: Longman.
- Oh, M-S., Lee, G-S., Shin, J-C., & Park, B-K. (1995). *Hankuk kyoyukkaehyokui chonghabchök pyongga [A general evaluation of Korean education reforms]*. Seoul, Korea: The Research Institute for Mind and Culture in Korea.
- Oh, S. (2002). Kongkyoyuk ui chönmyonkaehyok [Sweeping reform in public education]. *On the United States*. Korea: MBC.
- Ozga, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Schoolwork: Approaches to the labour process of teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ozga, J., & Lawn, M. (1981). *Teachers, professionalism, and class: A study of organized teachers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Park, B-K. (1995). Hankuk kyosa kyoyuk chongchaek pyongga [An evaluation on teacher education policies in Korea]. In M-S. Oh et al. (Eds.), *General evaluation of the Korean educational reforms* (pp. 233-304). Seoul, Korea: The Research Institute for Mind and Culture in Korea.

- Park, B-K. (2003). Chamyojongpu kyoyukchongchaekui kwajewa chŏnmang [Educational policy tasks and their directions for Chamyojongpu]. *Korean Educational Research Society*, 9-27.
- Park, Y-S. (2001, Feb. 14-16). *New trend in the policy for elevating professionalism of the Korean teachers*. Paper presented at the International Forum on Education Reform in the Asia-Pacific Region, Hong Kong.
- Paulston, R. G. (1977). Social and educational change: Conceptual frameworks. *Comparative Education Review*, 21(2/3), 370-395.
- Paulston, R. G. (1983). Conflicting theories of educational reform. In J. Simmons (Ed.), *Better schools: International lessons for reform* (pp. 21-70). New York: Praeger.
- Peterson, P. E. (1973). The politics of educational reform in England and the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 17(2), 160-179.
- Pickle, J. (1990). Toward a reconstruction of teacher professionalism. *Educational Foundations*, 4(2), 73-87.
- Popkewitz, T. (1988). Educational theory. *Educational Reform: Rhetoric, Ritual, and Social Interest*, 38(1), 77-93.
- Popkewitz, T. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2000). The denial of change in educational change: Systems of ideas in the construction of national policy and evaluation. *Educational researcher*, 29(1), 17-29.
- Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Foucault's challenge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S., & Pereya, M. (1993). An eight country study of reform practices in teacher education: An outline of the problematic. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher education reform* (pp. 14-52). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Poulson, L. (1996). Accountability: A key-word in the discourse of educational reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, 11, 580-592.
- Presidential Commission on Education Reform. (1987). *Kyoyuk kyaehyŏg chonghab kusang [Comprehensive plan for education reform]*. Seoul: Author.

- Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Policy. (1992). *Kyoyukpalchon ui kibonkusang* [Basic framework for educational development]. Seoul: Author
- Presidential Commission for Educational Reform. (1995). *Segyehwa wa chongpohwa ul ikunun shinkyoyuk cheje* [Education reform for a new education system leading toward a globalization and information era]. Seoul: Author.
- Presidential Commission for New Education Community. (2000). *21segi hankukkyoyuk ui kaehyog panghyangkwa kwaje* [Reform directions and tasks for the 21st Korean education] Seoul: Author.
- Public Law 107-110, No child left behind act of 2001(2002)
- Race, R. (2002). Teacher professionalism or deprofessionalisation? The consequences of school-based management on domestic and international context. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 459-463.
- Ramirez, F., & Boli-Bennett, J. (1982). Global pattern of educational institutionalization. In P. Altbach, R. Arnove & G. Kelly (Eds.), *Comparative education* (pp. 15-36). New York: Macmillan.
- Ritti, R., Ference, T., & Goldner, F. (1974). Profession and their plausibility. *Socology of Work and Occupation*, 1(1), 24-51.
- Roh, J-H. (2003). Chamhojongbu kyowonchongchaekui kwajewa panghyang [Tasks and directions for teacher policies in Chamhojongbu]. *Korean Educational Research Society*, 31-53.
- Roth, J. (1974). The sociologist's decoy. *Sociology of Work and Occupation*, 1(1), 6-23.
- Rudalevige, A. (2003). *The politics of No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved March 31, 2004, from <http://www.educationnext.org/20034/62.html>
- Runté, R. (1995). *Is teaching a profession*. Retrieved April 16, 2004, from <http://www.edu.uleth.ca/runte/professional/teaprof.htm>
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Sack, R. (1981). A typology of educational reforms. *Prospects*, XI (I), 39-53.

- Sadovnik, A. R. (2002). Educational reform in the United States: 1980s and 1990s. In D. L. Levinson (Ed.), *Education and sociology: An encyclopedia* (pp. 221-233). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Samoff, J. (1993). The reconstruction of schooling in Africa. *Comparative Education Review*, 37(2), 186-222.
- Santiago, P. (2002). Teacher demand and supply: Improving teaching quality and addressing teacher shortages (OECD education working paper no.1). Retrieved February 22, 2005, from [http://www.oalis.oecd.org/OLIS/2002DOC.NSF/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/fe5d38a873bf5867c1256c95003a0adf/\\$FILE/JT00137104.PDF](http://www.oalis.oecd.org/OLIS/2002DOC.NSF/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/fe5d38a873bf5867c1256c95003a0adf/$FILE/JT00137104.PDF)
- Schudson, M. (1980). A discussion of Magali Sarfatti Larson's the rise of professionalism: a sociological analysis. *Theory and Society*, 9, 215-229.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 189-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Sears, J. T., Marshall, J. D., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1988). *Teacher education policies and programs: Implementing reform proposals of the 1980's*. Paper presented for the Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory at the request of University of South Carolina Educational Policy Center.
- Seddon, T. (1990). Who says teachers don't work? *Education Links*, 38, 4-9.
- Seth, M. J. (2002). *Education fever: Society, politics, and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Shin, G-W., & Robinson, M. (1999). Rethinking colonial Korea. In G-W. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Colonial modernity in Korea* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge, MA: The Harvard University Asia Center.
- Shin, J-C. (1988). *An application of critical theory to educational policy making in Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Shin, J-C. (1995). Kwangbokhu kyojukhaengjõng mich chaejonge taehan pyongga [Evaluation of educational reforms on administration and finance since the liberation of Korea. In M-S. Oh. (Eds.), *General evaluation of Korean educational reforms* (pp. 1-92). Seoul, Korea: The Research Institute for Mind and Culture in Korea.

- Silva, E. T. (1980). Cultural autonomy and ideas in transit: Notes from the Canadian case. *Comparative Education Review*, 24(1), 63-72.
- Simmons, J. (1983). Reforming education and society: The enduring quest. In J. Simmons (Ed.), *Better schools: International lessons for reform* (pp. 3-19). New York: Praeger.
- Sipe, L., & Constable, S. (1996). A charter of four contemporary research paradigm: Metaphors for the modes of inquiry. *Taboo: The Journal of Cultural and Education*, 1, 153-163.
- Slavin, R. (1989). PET and the pendulum: Faddism in education and how to stop it. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 752-758.
- Smyth, J. (2000). *Teachers' work in a globalizing economy*. New York, NY: Falmer Press.
- Smyth, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical discourses on teacher development*. Cassell: New York, NY.
- Soder, R. (1990). The rhetoric of teacher professionalism. In J. Goodlad, R. Soder & K. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Song, K-Y. (2001). Chisigkibansahoesõ hankuk kyowonüi chõnmunsõng sinchang pangan [Ways to enhance teacher professionalism in knowledge based society]. *The 8th Korea and Japan Joint Seminar on Educational Administration*. pp.31-50.
- Sotillo, S., & Starace-Nastasi, D. (1999). Political discourse of a working class town. *Discourse & Society*, 10(3), 411-438.
- Special Committee for National Security Measure (1983). *Chilsamkong kyoyuk kaehyok [The July 30 educational reform]*: Ministry of Education.
- Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Spring, J. (2002). *American education*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Strikwerda, C. (2000). From world-system to globalization: Theories of transnational change and the place of the United States. *American Studies*, 41(2/3), 331-348.
- Sykes, G., & Plastrik, P. (1993). *Standard setting as education reform*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Synott, J. (2001). Development, education and the teachers union movement in South Korea, 1989-1999. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 47, 130-148.

- Tabb, W. (2001). *Globalization and education as commodity*. Retrieved March 1, 2004, from http://tntee.umu.se/archive/sigma_pp/sigma_pr_en.html
- Talbert, J., & McLaughlin, M. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school context. *American Journal of Education*, 102, 123-153.
- The Compilation of Education Laws. (Ed.). (2000). *Kyoyuk pŏb [Education laws]*. Seoul, Korea: Kyohaksa.
- Tikly, L. (1999). Postcolonialism and comparative education. In C. Soudien & P. Kallaway (Eds.), *Education, equity, and transformation*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Torres, C. A. (1991). State corporatism, educational policies, and students' and teachers' movement in Mexico. In M. B. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (2002). *Human Development Indicators, 2001*. Retrieved May 23, 2002, from <http://www.undp.org/hdr2001/back.pdf>
- USA country profile. (2004). Retrieved May 26, 2004, from <http://www.trade.uktradeinvest.gov.uk/usa/profile/index/index.shtml>
- U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *A talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in every classroom: Information kit*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education, International Affairs Office. (2004). *Attracting, developing, and retraining effective teachers*. Washington D.C.: Author
- U.S. Government. (March, 2002). *A quality teacher in every classroom: Improving teacher quality and enhancing the profession.*, Retrieved May 28, 2004, from http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/education/teachers/quality_teachers.html.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1987). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (vol. 4). New York: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1990). Discourse and society: A new journal for a new research focus. *Discourse & Society*, 1(1), 5-16.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society*, 6(2), 243-289.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (vol. 1 Discipline of discourse). London: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997a). *Discourse as structure and process. Discourse studies 1: A multidisciplinary introduction 2*. London: Sage Publication.

- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997b). *Discourse as social interaction. Discourse Studies 2: A multidisciplinary introduction*. London: Sage Publication.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world system*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1984). *The politics of the world economy: The states, the movements, and the civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitty, G. (1997). Creating quasi-markets in education: A review of recent research on parental choice and school autonomy in three countries. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (Vol. 22, pp. 3-48). Washington: AERA.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1964). The professionalization of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology*, 70, 137-158.
- Wirt, F., & Harman, G. (1986). The editors: A view from across the board: The international recession and educational policy. In F. Wirt & G. Harman (Eds.), *Education, recession and the world village: A comparative political economy of education* (pp. 163-180). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- World Bank.(2004). *Korea, Rep. Data Profile*. Retrieved May 28, 2004, from <http://devdata.worldbank.org>
- Yang, S-S. (2000). Improving Korean teachers' professionalism: Issues of the recent personnel management reform. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 3(1), 99-116.
- Yeom, M-H. (1997). *Silchön parōdaimul tonghan kyoyukchojikui inshik* [Understanding educational organization through a praxis paradigm]. Unpublished Ph.D. doctoral dissertation, Chonnam National University. Gwangju, Korea.
- Yeom, M-H. (1992). *Kyoyukjachiwonrie pichobon hyonhaeng chedo* [The current education decentralization law analyzed by the principals of educational decentralization]. Unpublished master's thesis. Chonnam National University. Gwangju, Korea
- Yoo, H-J. (1983). Korean-American Educational Interchange. *Korea Journal*. pp. 4-17.
- Young, J., & Levin, B. (2004). *The origin of educational reform: A comparative perspective*. Retrieved February 1, 2004, from www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/younglevin.html