Asia Pacific Education Review
2007, Vol. 8, No.2, 298-310.

Professionalism and the Reform of Teachers and Teacher Education in the Republic of Korea & the United States of America

Minho Yeom
Chonnam National University
Korea

Mark Ginsburg
Academy for Educational Development
U.S.A

This paper compares how educational reform documents in Korea and the U.S.A. conceptualize teachers and teacher education and examines how, if at all, the discourses of one country appear to influence those of the other. Special attention is paid to the ways in which reform documents incorporate different conceptions of professionalism in framing and in proposing remedies for the problems with teachers and teacher education. Eighteen reform documents issued in the two countries by national governmental and non-governmental organizations since the 1980s were selected and analyzed. It was found that while both Korean and American documents seem to draw on elements of the functionalist (or trait theory) conception of professionalism, Korean documents put more emphasis on issues related to the power/autonomy of teachers. Regarding cross-country influence, Korea seems to have appropriated ideas and moved toward the structures and practices evidenced in the U.S.A. during an earlier period.

Key words: professionalism, the reform of teachers and teacher education, comparative education

Introduction

Educational reform has periodically been a major focus of rhetoric and occasionally a focus of 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 mold them into becoming 'good' citizens and 'productive' workers (Ginsburg et al., 1991; Lee, 2003; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993; Sadovnik et al., 2002; Yeom, 2005). Moreover, recent educational reform discourses in many countries often identify teachers and teacher education as the problem, while their proposed solutions include increasing the professionalism of teachers and teacher education. For example, in the U.S., increasing teacher professionalism – i.e., improving teachers' professional attitudes, behavior, and status – was at the heart of the reform agenda in the 1980s and at least the early 1990s (Gottleib & Cornbleth, 1989; Labaree, 1992, 1995). Moreover, in Korea, since the 1980s, the 'professionalization' (viz., improving the quality, status, and authority) of teachers and teacher education has featured prominently in educational reform documents of both the government and teacher unions.

Comparative and international education scholars have documented the transnational process of transferring educational reform ideas across core countries (Bidwell & Kazamias, 1962; Davies & Guppy, 1997; Gaffield, 1994; Peterson, 1973) and between core and periphery countries (Arnove, 1980; Clayton, 1998; Ginsburg et al., 1991; Samoff, 1993), including Korea and the U.S. (Adams & Gottlieb, 1993; Lee, Adams, & Cornbleth, 1988; Yoo, 1983). In line with cultural as well as economic and political globalization (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Morrow & Torres, 2000; Popkewitz & Pereyra, 1993), this phenomenon has been

Minho Yeom, Department of Education, Chonnam National University, Korea; Mark Ginsburg, Academy for Educational Development, U.S.A.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to the first author at Education Development Research Institute, Chonnam National University, 601 University Administration 300 Youngbong-dong, Buk-gu, Gwangju, S. Korea, 500-757. e-mail: minho@chonnam.ac.kr

characterized by a certain degree of convergence (versus divergence) in educational ideologies, structures, and practices across countries.

In this article we analyzed how the two countries' educational reform documents conceptualize teachers and teacher education with regard to different conceptions of professionalism, thus illuminating the process of international convergence or divergence. More specifically, this study sought to address the following questions:

1. What problems regarding teachers and teacher education are identified in selected reform documents in Korea and the United States?
2. What remedies are proposed to deal with these problems?
3. How, if at all, do such documents draw explicitly or implicitly on a certain conception of professionalism in framing the problems in regards to, and in proposing the remedies for teachers 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 conception of professionalism articulated?
5. What evidence do the documents provide that the problems, remedies, and conceptions of professionalism presented have been influenced by rhetoric and action based in the other country or other countries?

Profession, (De)Professionalization, and Professionalism

As with other social phenomena, profession, (de)professionalization, and professionalism can be framed from within functionalist or conflict theory perspectives. From a functionalist perspective, professionalism is tied directly to the 'social fact' that there are professions (prototypically medicine and law) and non-professions (lower status occupations, some of which might be termed 'semi-professions') (see Abbott, 1988; Becker, 1962; Parsons, 1954). Those adopting a functionalist perspective postulate the following positive, 'objective' indicators or traits to differentiate professions from other occupations: a) performing an essential service or task; b) engaging in (mental versus manual) work involving a high level of expertise and judgment, thus necessitating extensive pre-service education; c) functioning based on an ideal of service; d) operating with autonomy in the workplace; e) having colleagues (versus nonprofessionals) in control of selection, training, and advancement in the field; and f) receiving a high level of remuneration. Moreover, professionalization, often characterized as a universal process, potentially open to all occupations in all contexts, is seen to involve the acquisition of "the traits that functionalist theorists … [use] to differentiate between professions and other occupations" (Ginsburg, 1997, pp. 133-134; see also Halmos, 1973; Vollmer & Mills, 1966; Wilenski, 1964).

From a functionalist or trait theory approach, various social scientists and educators in a variety of societal contexts have addressed the question of whether or not teaching is a profession, semi-profession, aspiring profession, craft, or non-profession (e.g., see Etzioni, 1969; Hargreaves, 2000; Koo, 2002; Lieberman, 1956; Lortie, 1975; Park, 2001; Roh, 2003). Importantly, from this perspective, many scholars, policy makers and practitioners have promoted the idea that the occupation of teaching is undergoing professionalization and/or should strive to professionalize – that is, to acquire the traits associated with the ideal type of profession (see Darling-Hammond, 1990; Eggleston, 1986; Engvall, 1997; Gore & Morrison, 2001; Hall & Schultz, 2003; Hoyle, 1982; Jarausch, 1990; Labaree, 1992; McLaughlin, 1997; Pickle, 1990). For example, in Korea various overlapping sets of criteria have been suggested to define a profession (see Kim, 1998; Kwag, 1998; Kwag, 2001; Park, 2001; Roh, 2003; Song, 2001; Yang, 2000), and teachers have been classified as 'educational professionals' in official government documents and categorized by the public in an opinion survey as 'professionals' (versus other groups of workers) (Koo, 2002).

In contrast, conflict theorists claim that "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, pp. 32-33). From a conflict theory perspective, Johnson (1972) explains that professionalizaton is "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"(p.45). From this perspective, Ginsburg (1997) summarizes that educators experienced professionalization in Canada during 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), and in the United States in the mid-

1940s (Carlson, 1987) – during times of economic expansion and when they were viewed by state elites as key players in defusing and deflecting the impact of radical movements.

From a Weberian conflict perspective,[1] deprofessionalization is defined 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" (Haug, 1975, p. 197). Deprofessionalization occurs as a result of inter-occupational, occupation-state, and occupation-economic elite struggles. In particular, "the deprofessionalization of teachers has taken place as the social space of schools has been reconstituted to produce 'a new work order' whereby the work of teaching has come under new forms of surveillance and control" (Smyth et al., 2000, pp.6-9; cited in Race, 2002, p.460). The issue of teachers being deprofessionalized has been addressed by several scholars (e.g., Dove, 1986; Filson, 1988; Grace, 1987; McDaniel, 1979; Race, 2002). During the 1970s and 1980s, teachers in the United States (Carlson, 1987) experienced deprofessionalization, in the sense of losing autonomy over their work, because various forms of bureaucratic and technical controls were introduced. Additionally, during the 1990s in Europe (Esteve, 2000) and Korea (Seth, 2002) teachers were deprofessionalized in the sense of losing social status and respect in the eyes of the public – as the result of government and media criticism.

Moreover, from a conflict perspective, "professionalism [should be] 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; see also Friedson, 1970; Gyarmati, 1975; Johnson, 1980). Professionalism is "a mystification which ... obscures real social structures" because although "the conditions of professional work have changed, … the model constituted by the first movements of professionalization" persist (Larson, 1977, p. xviii). The ideology of professionalism represent claims made by members of an occupational group, including educators, to maintain or acquire a) a monopoly of the market for their 'expert' services, and thus b) obtain higher remuneration, c) elevated social status, and d) autonomy in their work. That is, professionalism can be viewed to be not an "objective description but an ideological commercial, designed to promote the interests of [an occupation's] members" (Metzger, 1987, p. 12).

Methodology

This study involved a cross-national comparison of educational reform discourses with respect to teachers and teacher education by employing interpretative textual analysis (Diesing, 1991, pp. 104-145). First, we analyzed the main issues and concerns reflected in selected reform documents in the Republic of Korea and the U.S., using both description and juxtaposition. Next, we examined the conceptions of professionalism incorporated in these discourses. Finally, we explored to what extent, if any, the ideas articulated at a particular time in one country later appear in the documents of the other country, signaling a process of international transfer and (perhaps) convergence.

Selection of Documents

Data sources for the study included original documents focusing on educational reform, such as commission reports, proposals, and legislation, issued by governmental and nongovernmental organizations at the national level in both Korea and the U.S. In Korea, all such government documents and those published by the Korean Teachers Union (KTU)[2] were included in the analysis. In the U.S., a systematic literature review was conducted for the years 1980 through 2002 using the following sources on the University of Pittsburgh Digital Library database: *ERIC* (*Education Abstract: Via EBSCO*) and *Digital Dissertation* (*ProQuest Digital Dissertation*). In addition, related journals were reviewed. Through these processes, we identified 24 reform reports and/or proposals dealing with the reform of teachers and teacher education in the U.S. Table 1 presents the documents selected for each country.

We selected the specific reform documents from the larger list reviewed for this study based upon three criteria: a) the documents' focus on the issues/concerns related to teachers and teacher education, b) the institutions or organizations responsible for developing or issuing the document, and c) 'when' the document was issued in each country.[3] In the U.S.A., due to its decentralized and privatized system of governance, there are a great many different proposals, reports, and documents issued by state or federal governments, teachers' unions, and philanthropic or private foundations.[4] Considering the variety of reform proposals and reports across states and institutions in the U.S.A., special attention was given to national level discourses. Therefore, we selected documents issued by the

Table 1
Key Documents Selected for Primary Sources

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

federal government and national level organizations, including teachers' unions and philanthropic foundations, (i.e., the American Federation of Teachers [AFT],[5] Carnegie Task Force, Holmes Group,[6] National Commission on Excellence in Education [NCEE], National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF], and the National Education Association [NEA],[7] the U.S. Department of Education [DOE]).

We analyzed documents that have received widespread attention and have had a continuing and lasting influence on discussions and action in the U.S.A. (see Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Ginsberg & Plank, 1995; Gottleib & Cornbleth, 1989; Sadvonik et al., 2002) and in Korea (see Kim, 1998; Roh, 2003). For example, in the U.S.A., the document *Nation at Risk* by NCEE (1983) was selected, because this report triggered public debate about educational excellence and teacher competence, and has been cited in most subsequent reports. The Holmes Group reports (1986, 1990, 1995) were selected not only because of the attention they received and their continuing influence, but because they were initiated and carried out by members of the education profession (see Gottleib & Cornbleth, 1989). *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (1996) was selected because it is viewed as a provocative report, criticizing and proposing changes in American schooling and teacher education (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) and AFT (2000), focus on teacher education reform, identifying problems and offering suggestions for change.

In Korea it was less complicated to select documents, because Korea has remained highly centralized and each administration has issued its own comprehensive educational reform reports since the 1980s. We selected documents issued

by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, which since 1987, has provided advice to the president, that addressed issues of teaching, teachers, and teacher education as well as the following national government documents: *Education Reform for a New Education* (1995) issued by PCER [8] and *Comprehensive Measure* (2001) issued by MOEHRD.[9] In addition, we included in our analysis 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). This is because the KTU has been recognized as one of major actors in shaping Korea's teacher policy, at least since it received its legal status in 1999 (Kim & Han, 2002).

Data Analysis

In employing primarily interpretative textual analysis, we treated the selected reform documents (data) as texts in which the U.S. and Korean educational reform discourses on teachers and teacher education manifest themselves. We analyzed each document for instances of 'problems' and 'remedies.' In order to present our findings, the descriptive method (Hantrais & Mangen, 1996) was used. For comparison, we employed a juxtaposition approach (Hantrais & Mangen, 1996), 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 among documents could be clearly identified and analyzed. Similarities in documents and the time of ordering the publication found across countries were considered to identify possible cross-country 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.

Results

The Weakness of Pre-service Teacher Education: A commonly identified problem is that the major perceived weakness of teachers is primarily due to poor quality teacher preparation. All documents frame pre-service teacher education program as both an existing problem and a potential solution. Similar concerns are raised about both the recruiting systems and the curriculum and management in schools of education. For example, the problems identified in the U.S.A. include not recruiting the ablest students to the teaching occupation (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1996, 1999, 2000), focusing on theory-driven research, and emphasizing graduate studies (1990, 1995, 1996, 1999). In Korea, the problems identified vary from non-professional curriculum in teacher education program (1987, 1995, 2001) to low reputation of teacher education institutions (1995) to the lack of faculty members specializing in subject matter-specific teaching methods (2001). Furthermore, all of the reform documents identified pre-service teacher education as the key for improving the quality of teachers and teacher education.

Extending the Length of Pre-service Teacher Education: One of the core proposals in all reform documents in both countries involves extending the length of time of pre-service teacher education. In the U.S.A., remedies include creating graduate professional programs (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000) and a five-year teacher preparation program (2000). The remedies suggested by the Korean documents differ over time; in the early 1980s they focused on extending the elementary school teachers college from two to four years (1980) and requiring kindergarten teachers to have at least three years of college (1987). In the 1990s they proposed a year-long internship program for prospective teachers to gain clinical experience (1992), graduate teacher education programs, and a doctoral degree program for teachers and administrators (2001).

Failure of the Market-Oriented Teacher Compensation System: In both countries the reform documents suggested similar strategies for increasing teachers' salaries. Reformers representing governmental organizations in Korea (1995) and private foundations in the U.S.A. (1986b, 1996) argue that under the current uniform salary system there is no financial reward for superior performance and no financial penalty for inferior performance. The remedy proposed is to institute performance-based compensation programs, typically called a merit pay system. The U.S. documents (1983, 1986b, 1996) recommend introducing a more rigorous salary system based upon evaluation and incentives for excellent performance, thereby reflecting market forces. In Korea, a performance-based, merit pay system was proposed in the 1995 reform document. Efforts to implement this proposal in 2001 failed because of the resistance of teachers associations (Koo, 2002), which perceived the proposed system as giving administrators and/or government officials too much control over teachers' work.

Rationale for Teaching as a Profession: Overall, the selected reform documents include, implicitly and/or explicitly, a rationale for teacher professionalization. The U.S. reform discourses since 1983, regardless of the organization issuing the documents, refer to teaching as a 'profession' (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1990, 1995, 2000). For instance, government, private foundations, and teacher union documents discuss the knowledge and skills teachers need to be considered fully professionalized (1995) and propose the creation of professional development schools (1986a, 1986b). However, Korean government reform documents have not demonstrated such consistency and clarity with regard to this issue. For example, the Korean documents do not offer such an extensive rationale as the U.S. cases, instead labeling their efforts as enhancing the 'professionalism' of teacher education institutions (1987, 2001) or treating the teaching occupation as a 'profession' (1987). Moreover, the documents sometimes discuss teacher professionalism in relation to other professional occupations, for example: 'teaching as a profession with a mission similar to the clergy' (1992) and 'teaching as the clergy' (2001). One striking difference is that the U.S. discourses systemically endorse the idea of profession or professionalism, regardless of whether the documents were issued by educators' organizations (1986a, 1990, 1995), private foundations (1986b, 1996), or teachers unions (AFT, 1985; NEA, 1997). In Korea, however, only those documents authored by governmental organizations or by a conservative teacher association (KFTA) mention and endorse these ideas. In contrast, the KTU endorsed the terms aggressively and positively, but only recently (2002).

Increased Control: The reform documents in the two countries promote greater centralized control over pre-service and in-service teacher training programs. For example, the U.S. reform documents strongly emphasize standardized testing as entry and/or exit requirements for students in pre-service teacher education (1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000). Additionally, the creation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 1987), which aims at establishing national standards for what teachers should know and be able to do, is framed in relation to increasing teachers professionalism. Given the history of a decentralized education system in the U.S.A., the use of standardized tests for teachers as well as for students creates pressures toward national convergence and federal control. In the Korean document (2001), 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 the local level. Overall, these reforms were designed to increase central government control over teachers and teacher education (see Delandshere & Petorsky, 2004; Labaree, 1992; Sears, Marshall, & Otis-Wilborn, 1988).

Contesting the Idea of Teacher Autonomy: Governmental organizations and teachers' unions conceptualize the notion of teacher autonomy differently. The term autonomy is never mentioned in the U.S. reform documents, regardless of the author. The lack of attention to teacher autonomy, particularly by the teacher organizations, is noteworthy because many teachers feel that they have lost autonomy in their practice due to having to prepare students for high stakes tests and to being subjected to other standards-based accountability systems (see Apple, 1995; Delandshere & Petorsky, 2004; Smyth et al., 2000). The Korean government documents illustrate both a narrow and abstract concept of autonomy by guaranteeing a teachers' right to teach (1992), introducing self-regulated working hours (1995), and allowing teachers to participate in curriculum decision making (2001). Moreover, the KTU (2002) stressed both the concept of professionalism and autonomy together in creating teacher policies.

U.S.A. Influence on Korean Education Reform Discourses: Considering that the two countries have maintained strong political, economic, and military ties for fifty years, and given the shared conception of differences in the status of the two systems (U.S.A. being higher than Korea), it is not surprising that the Korean reform documents reflect educational ideas previously articulated in documents from the U.S.A.[10] 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 earlier U.S. reform documents (1983, 1986a, 1986b). For example, the U.S. documents suggested 'a three tier system' (1983, 1986a) and 'a four layer system' (1986b); subsequently, the Korean documents suggested introducing 'a master (lead) teacher system' (1987) and 'a four layer system' (1992). Regarding remuneration, the two countries proposed 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) were proposed. That is, the salary system should be connected to quality, and based on 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 proposed earlier in the U.S. With regard to extending the length of education, the two countries revealed a common trend. The U.S. documents initially called for lengthening the period of pre-service teacher preparation in the mid-1980s (1986a, 1986b, 1996, 2000), while Korean documents raise the issue for the first time in the 1990s (1992).

Conclusion

In conclusion, we found evidence of a global convergence with a few local divergences in the reform discourses with regard to the reform of teachers and teacher education. In the case of framing the problems identified, similar issues were raised about teacher education, teacher training, teacher status, and remuneration, all of which appear in the reform discourse, globally(see Gottlieb & Cornbleth, 1989; Gore & Morrison, 2001; Hargreaves, 2000; Labaree, 1992, 1995; Park, 2001; Popkewitz & Pereya, 1993). Although there were some inter-societal differences in the frequency of appearance and the way the issues were framed, documents in both countries focused on the causes of the low quality of teachers and teacher education. The main factors they identified were a flawed pre-service teacher education curriculum, inadequate in-service teacher training, the low social status of teachers, and low salaries.

With respect to the remedies suggested, the reform documents in both countries called for the professionalization of teachers and teacher education by recognizing teaching as a profession, extending the length of pre-service education, enhancing teachers' status, and increasing remuneration. This approach is in line with a functional or trait theory of professionalism. However, the U.S. and Korean reform documents differed in the elements they highlighted in defining teaching as a profession. The U.S. documents mentioned performing an essential task, engaging in mental work, necessitating extensive pre-service education, and receiving a high level of remuneration. While the Korean documents, referenced the above-mentioned elements, and additionally the KTU documents (since 1986) have continually stressed the importance of teacher autonomy, and in its recent document (2002), the KTU linked explicitly the notion of 'professionalism' with 'autonomy.' It is noteworthy that by emphasizing issues of autonomy and power, the KTU positions its discourse closer to a (Weberian) conflict theory of professions and professionalism.

However, when considering the two countries' efforts to promote greater centralized control over pre-service and in-service teacher training programs, to introduce an accreditation system for teacher education institutions and certification programs at the national level, and to control teacher in-service training at the local level, the remedies would reduce teachers' (and teacher educators') autonomy, thus representing a move toward teachers' deprofessionalization (see Esteve, 2000; Race, 2002; Smyth el al., 2000). Here the deprofessionalization of teaching seems to occur as a result of the tension or struggles between the occupation and state elite, which in this case, results not only in reduced educator autonomy but intensification in the pace of teachers' work (a development that is given more attention in analyses by conflict theory scholars). In particular, this would be the case in the United States, where intense pressure is directed to teachers to prepare students for high stakes tests in the context of standard-based accountability systems (see Apple 1995; Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004). The same goes for Korea, where the government has issued detailed regulations in the scheduling and conducting of classes (see Seth, 2002).

That the problems and remedies identified in the reform documents in the United States, including a focus on teacher professionalism and professionalization, were referenced in subsequent years in Korea, provides support for the notion of educational convergence in the world system. In particular, the similar solutions suggested in Korean documents, such as creating graduate teacher education programs and Ed. D. for teachers and administrators, establishing a multi-level teaching career structure, and introducing a merit pay system based on competence represented the way Korea has imported, discussed or adapted, according to its own context, many ideas and practices regarding teachers and teacher education that have been proposed and/or implemented previously in the United States. Finally, at the same time, we observed that Korea reform discourses incorporated some elements (viz., a positive focus on autonomy) that were either not a part of – or contradicted by – the recent reform discourses in the U.S.A.

Notes

1. We can also consider the issues from a Marxist conflict perspective. In this case, the focus is on *proletarianization*, which involves the process by which the work of an occupational group – whether such work is considered manual or non-manual

and whether such workers are more or less educated – is altered regarding: a) separating the conception of work tasks from their execution; b) standardizing and routinizing work tasks; c) intensifying the demands of work; and d) reducing the costs (salaries, benefits, training, etc.) of workers (see Aronowitz, 1973; Braverman, 1974; Derber, 1982; Edwards, 1979; Johnson, 1980; Larson, 1980; Mills, 1951; Oppenheimer, 1973). Various authors have discussed how teaching and teachers have experienced proletarianization (Apple, 1995; Connell, 1995; Dibona, 1986; Harris, 1982; Jarausch, 1990; Laudner and Yee, 1987; Smyth, 2000).

2. 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. 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). The KFTA has as much legal approval to negotiate wages, working conditions and teachers' welfare as the KTU has, but the KFTA considers itself as the organization more concerned with the issues of enhancing teacher professionalism, curricula, and the professionalization of educational administration. 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 (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, the KTU released some documents directly related to the notion of teacher professionalism (KTU, 1997, 2002).
3. 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.
4. 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 Unites 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).
5. 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 (see 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 lager, 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 conditions, and job security, likely enhancing both the attraction and retention of teachers (see the US Department of Education, 2004, pp. 20-21).
6. The Holmes Group is a consortium of education deans and chief academic officers from the major research universities in each of the fifty states. 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).
7. 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) was selected to review.
8. 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).

9. 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), although for this study we use the original source of either MOE or MOEHRD according to materials we cite. 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), 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.
10. In contrast, we note some inter-societal differences, especially when comparing the discourses emanating from the teacher organizations. For example, in Korea the KTU (1999, 2002) highlighted practitioners' autonomy as something taken-for-granted for the teaching profession, but this element of professionalism was not addressed explicitly in the AFT and NEA documents in the U.S.A. Moreover, the KTU has called for creating a new 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 educational problems (1987, 1989, 2002), something that is not evident in the U.S.A. teacher organization documents or, perhaps less surprisingly, in the government and private foundations' documents in either the U.S.A. or Korea.

References

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Adams, D., & Gottlieb, E. E. (1993). *Education and social change in Korea*, New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

American Federation of Teachers(AFT). (2000). *Building a profession: Strengthening teacher preparation and induction*. Washington: New York: Author.

Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Arnove, 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.

Becker, H. (1962). The nature of a profession. In *Education for the Professions* [61st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II] (pp. 27-46). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bidwell, C., & Kazamias, A. M. (1962). Religion, politics, and popular education: An historical comparison of England and America. *Comparative Education Review*, 97-110.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capitalism: The degradation of work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bullough, R. V. Jr., 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.

Carlson, D. (1987). Teachers as political actors: From reproductive theory to the crisis in schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 283-307.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*: Author.

Chase, B. (1997). *Teacher unionism: Bob Chase defends his views*. Rethinking Schools Online, 11(4). Retrived March 1, 2005, from http://rethinkingschools.org/archive/11_04/chasltr.shtml

Clayton, T. (1998). Beyond mystification: Reconnecting world-system theory for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(4), 479-496.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. K. (2002). The discourse of reform in teacher education: Extending the dialogue. *Educational researcher, 31*(6), 26-28.

Connell, R. (1995). Transformative labour: Theorizing the politics of teachers' work. In M. Ginsburg (Ed.), *The Politics of educators' work and lives* (pp. 91-114). New York: Garland.

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.

Davies, S., & Guppy, N. (1997). Globalization and educational reform in anglo-American democracies. *Comparative Education Review, 41*(4), 435-459.

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.

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.

Derber, C. (1982). *Professionals as workers: Mental labor in advanced capitalism*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

Dibona, J. (1986). Profession at risk: Teaching and the labor process. *Education Foundations, 1*, 91-105.

Diesing, P. (1991). *How does social science work? Reflection on practice*. Pittsburgh, PA: The University of Pittsburgh Press.

Edwards, R. (1979). Three faces from the hidden abode. In R. Edwards (Ed.) *Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the Twentieth Century* (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Eggleston, J. (1986). Teacher professionalism and professinalization. In S. Ranson & J. Tomlison (Eds.), *The changing government of education* (pp. 113-23). London: Allen and Unwin.

Engvall, R. (1997). *The professionalization of teaching: Is it really much ado about nothing*. Lanham: University Press of America.

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.

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. (1969). *The semi-professions and their organization*. New York: Free Press.

Filson, G. (1988). Ontario teachers' deprofessionalization and proletarianization. *Comparative Education Review, 32*(3), 298-317

Friedson, E. (1970). *Professional dominance*. Chicago: Aldine.

Gaffield, C. (1994). Children's lives and academic achievement in Canada and the United States. *Comparative Education Review, 38*(1), 36-64.

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.

Ginsberg, R., & Plank, N. D. (Eds.). (1995). *Commissions, reports, reforms, and educational policy*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Ginsburg, M. (Ed.). (1991). *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state*. New York: Garland Publishing, INC.

Ginsburg, M. (1997). Professionalism or politics as a model for educators' work and lives. *Educational Research Journal, 11*(2), 133-146.

Ginsburg, M., Wallace, G., & Miller, H. (1988). Teachers, economy, and the State: An English Example. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 4* (4), 317-337.

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. 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.

Gyarmati, G. (1975). The doctrine of professions: Basis of a power structure. *International Social Science Journal, 27* (4), 38-52.

Hall, C., & Schultz, R. (2003). Tensions in teaching and teacher education: Professionalism and pofessionalisation in England and Canada. *Compare, 33* (3), 369-383.

Halmos (Ed.). (1973). *Professionalization and social change(* Sociological Review Monograph No. 20). Keele, England: University of Keele.

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.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching, 6*(2), 151-182.

Harris, K. (1982). *Teachers and classes: A Marxist analysis*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

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.

Hoyle, E. (1982). The professionalization of teachers: A paradox. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 30* (2), 161-171.

Jarausch, K. (1990). *The unfree professions: German lawyers, teachers and engineers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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.

Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power*. London: Macmillan.

Johnson, T. (1980). Work and power. In G. Salaman (Ed.), *The politics of work and occupations*. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Kim, E., & Han, Y. (2002). *Attracting, developing, and retaining effective teachers: Background report for Korea*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Kim, J.-Y. (1998). *Kyoyukchŏngchihakchŏg kwanchŏmesŏ bon kyosa yangsŏng chejae* [Teacher education system analyzed by educational politics' viewpoint]. *The Politics of Education, 5* (1), 22-41.

Koo, J. (2002). *Hankukkyowon kwa kyowonchongchaek* [Educators in Korea and teacher policy]. Seoul, Korea: Hawoo.

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. (1990). *Hanguk kyoyuk undong bakseo 1978-1990* [A report on Korean education movement 1978-1990]. Seoul: Pulbit.

Korean Teachers' and Educational Workers' Union. (2002). *Che16dae taetongryeongsŏngŏ Chŏnkyojo kyoyuk kongyak yokuan* [KTU's educational policy proposal for the 16th Presidential Election]. *Chonkyojo shinmun,* 4-5.

Kwag, P.-S. (2001). *Kyosilkyoyukŭi kaehyokkwa kyosaŭi suŏb chŏnmunsŏng* [Classroom teaching reform and teachers' instructional professionalism]. *Hankuk Kyosa Kyoyuk, 18* (1), 5-13.

Kwag, Y.-U. (1998). *Kyoyukkyaehyokkwa sabŏmtaehagui palchŏnkwaje* [Educational reform and developing schools of education], *Hankuk Kyosa Kyoyuk, 15*(1), 88-108.

Labaree, D. (1992). 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. (1980). Proletarianization of educated labor. *Theory and Society, 9*(1), 134-75.

Laudner, H. & Yee, B. (1987). Are teachers being proletarianized? In S. Walker & L. Barton (Eds.), *Gender, class and education* (pp. 58-71). Sussex, England: Falmer Press.

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., Adams, D. & Cornbleth, C. (1988). Transnational transfer of curriculum knowledge: A Korean case study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 20*(3), 233-246.

Lieberman, M. (1956). *Education as a profession*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lortie. D. (1975). *School teacher: A sociology study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLaughlin, M. (1997). Rebuilding teacher professionalism in the United States. In A. Hargreaves & R. Evans (Eds.), *Buying teachers back*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Metzger, W. (1987). A spectra haunting American scholars: The spectra of professionalism. *Educational Researcher*, 16 (6), 10-19.

Mills, C. W. (1951). *White collar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MOEHRD). (2001). *Kyojikpaljeon Jonghapbangan* [Comprehensive plan for developing the teaching profession]. Seoul, Korea: Author.

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.

National Commission on Excellence in Education(NCEE). (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational*

reform. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (NCTAF). (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110.

Oppenheimer, M. (1973). Proletarianization of the professional. In P. Halmos (Ed.), *Professionalization and social change* (pp. 213-27). Keele, England: University of Keele.

Ozga, J., & Lawn, M. (1981). *Teachers, professionalism, and class: A study of organized teachers*. London: Falmer Press.

Park, Y-S. (2001, Feburary). *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.

Parsons, T. (1954). The professions and social structure. In *Essays in Sociological Theory* (pp. 34-49). New York: Free Press.

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. 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.

Presidential Advisory Commission on Educational Policy). (1992). *Kyoyukpalchon ui kibonkusang* [Basic framework for educational development]. Seoul: Author

Presidential Commission on Education Reform. (1987). *Kyoyuk kyaehyŏg chonghab kusang* [Comprehensive plan for education reform]. 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 (PCNEC). (2000). *21 segi hankukkyoyuk ui kaehyog panghyangkwa kwaje* [Reform directions and tasks for the 21st Korean education]. Seoul: Author.

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.

Roh, J-H. (2003). Chamhojongbu kyowonchongchaekui kwajewa panghyang [Tasks and directions for teacher policies in Chamhojongbu]. *Korean Educational Research Society*, 31-53.

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.

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.

Shanker, A. (1985). The making of a profession. *American Educator*. *9* (3), 10-17,

Smyth, J., Dow, A., Hattam, R., Reid, A., & Shacklock, G. (2000). *Teachers' work in a globalizing economy*. New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Song, K-Y. (2001,October). *Chisigkibansahoeesŏ hankuk kyowonŭi chŏnmunsŏng sinchang Pangan* [Ways to enhance teacher professionalism in knowledge based society]. The 8th Korea and Japan Joint Seminar on Educational Administration. Seoul, Korea.

Special Committee for National Security Measure(SCNSM) (1983). *Chilsamkong kyoyuk kaehyok* [The July 30 educational reform]. Seoul: Ministry of 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.

U. S. Department of Education(DOE). (1999). *A talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in every classroom: Information kit*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vollmer, H., & Mills, D. (1966). *Professionalization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wilenski, H. (1964). The professionalizaton of everyone? *American Sociological Review 52* (2), 137-58.

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. (2005). *Professionalization and the reform of teaching, teachers, and teacher education in the United*

States and the Republic of Korea: A critical discourse analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Yoo, H-J. (1983). Korean-American educational interchange. *Korea Journal*, 4-17.

Received October 12, 2006
Revision received April 15, 2007
Accepted July 11, 2007