Teaching Standards, Globalisation, and Conceptions of Teacher Professionalism

A. Lin Goodwin
University of Hong Kong

Today's teacher operates in a globalised space where people everywhere are inextricably connected, and whose lives no longer exist in an isolated vacuum, but intersect and collide as part of a dynamic vortex. The COVID19 pandemic concretised that reality, as infection traveled across countries via multiple networks and brought into tension the personal and political, medical and economic, national and global. If ever there was a stark illustration of the reach and power of globalisation, this was it—around the planet we have all been soundly reminded how few are the degrees that separate our collective destinies. Teachers must now think, and teach beyond local boundaries, such that definitions of teacher professionalism will be reshaped by forces of globalisation. But have they, and in what ways?

This article examines the intersection of globalisation and teacher professionalism. It begins with working definitions of *globalisation* and *professionalism*. These definitions will conceptually frame an exploratory analysis of policy documents about teacher professionalism, specifically standards for teachers in Hong Kong, the United States (U.S.), and Australia. As a benchmark for teacher professionalism, an analysis of teacher standards across this international sample affords a broad portrait of what teachers are expected to know and do, juxtaposed against a rapidly evolving and globalising world.

Defining Globalisation and (Teacher) Professionalism

Globalisation and professionalism are both slippery concepts that escape easy definition (Goodwin 2020; Rizvi and Lingard 2000; Sachs 2016). Globalisation has been used 'in an inclusive sense, encompassing…[many]…'big concepts'' (Standish 2014, 170), not limited to any single event or place. Instead, it is an idea that 'refer(s) to both the process and consequences

of shrinking distances between places on this planet' (Zhao 2010, 422), resulting in 'intensified global interconnectivity' (Pauwels 2019, 257). In the context of this conversation,

> globalization refers to the intersection of and connections across countries, the blending and blurring of borders, the mutuality of their trajectories resulting from the intertwining of economies and cultures, and the trade in ideas (and ideologies), practices, technologies, and people. (Goodwin 2020, 2-3)

This increasing interdependency/interconnection is not a 21st century phenomenon, but one that originated with trade along the Silk Road which dramatically shifted commerce from a local transaction to an inter-national one (Vanham 2019), cementing the idea of goods exchange unimpeded by distance. Thus, globalisation has, from the start, inherently been driven by economic goals (growth and power), a concept expanded and fueled over the centuries by profit-making from human desires for commodities, which were previously unavailable but now were not only accessible in bulk thanks to advanced technologies in manufacturing, but accessible at all times and in a dizzying array of choices. Moreover, by the 21st century, according to the World Economic Forum, 'the internet, connected people all over the world in an even more direct way' resulting in 'a globalization on steroids' (Vanham 2019, para. 22, 23), which has led to today's 'digital economy' where 'the new frontier of globalization is the cyber world' (para 24). These technologies have 'demolish[ed] old limits - of time, space, language, custom, and ideology' (Rizvi and Lingard 2000, 423). 'Capital, labour and goods are now moving much more rapidly across national borders, unleashing much fiercer international competition' (Yang 2003, 274).

This brief history of globalisation makes visible its origins and its emphasis on trade, not just of goods, but marketable exchange along many different dimensions as a result of the ability

to digitally (and therefore instantaneously) traverse space and time. Thus, while globalisation may be subject to 'a variety of different discourses' and 'is a highly differentiated phenomenon' (Yang 2003, 271), globalisation is grounded in an economic model driven by multi-national conglomerates such that 'neoliberal discourses or hyper-liberalism entail the most important pillars of globalisation' (Hajisoteriou and Angelides 2020, 277). A consequence of contemporary global trading in goods, practices, and ideas has been the commodification of education (Gray and Whitty 2010; Werler 2015), 'a vehicle that assists the growing market economy', (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2001, 139). It follows then that the current emphasis on free markets, profit margins, and human capital in support of capitalism, has led to the importation of neoliberal ideals which are 'not directly about education at all, but about how education can best develop human resources to serve the needs of the globalized economy' (Angus 2017, 339), by producing workforce ready, competitive citizens.

Undoubtedly, 'globalization on steroids' has had an impact on how teacher professionalism is being defined. Similar to *globalisation*, teacher professionalism is contested territory, marked by 'reductive typologies of professionalism' (Gray and Whitty 2010, 7), and debates that span decades and national borders (Goepel 2012; Hargreaves 2000; Mausethagen and Granlund 2012; Nairz-Wirth and Feldmann 2019; Sachs 2016; Whitty 2000). The debates around fundamental markers of a profession, such as a codified and specialised knowledge base, consensus around standards of entry and practice, and ethical principles governing decision-making and service (Goodwin 2012), often conclude that its status as a full versus 'semi-profession' (Etzioni 1969) remains stubbornly tenuous (Darling-Hammond and Goodwin 1993; Glazer 2007; Goodwin 2012; Labaree 1992; Wilson and Tamir 2008).

This problematic characterisation of teaching as an *almost* profession has its roots in long held perceptions of teaching as low status (Ingersoll and Mitchell 2011; Lankford et al. 2014), technically simple work that attracts the least capable candidates (Goldhaber and Liu 2003; Schleicher 2012), most of whom are women (Goldhaber and Walch 2014). Moreover, teachers are typically paid less than those in professions requiring similar levels of education (Evans and Yuan 2018), plus they work with young people who are politically powerless and therefore discountable. It is unsurprising then that the professional status of teachers continues to be a/in question, with each 'age' of the professionalisation of teaching associated with different levels of autonomy and decision-making in relation to methods, practice, and ways of working (Hargreaves, 2000). In Hargreaves' discussion of 'the four ages of professionalism', he sees growing 'assaults on professionalism' that he predicts will 'return teaching to an amateur, de-professionalized, almost premodern craft' (2000, 168). His prediction seems prescient as we witness, particularly in the U.S., U.K., and increasingly in Australia, the proliferation of commercial and school-based providers of alternate teacher preparation routes (Beauchamp et al. 2015; Kosnik, Beck and Goodwin 2016; White 2019), coupled with an ongoing 'discourse of derision [where] the quality and value of the contribution of universities to initial teacher education has been brought into question' (Furlong 2019, 574).

The churn of debates around teacher professionalism has been further stimulated by international benchmarking assessments, especially OECD's PISA (Organisation for Co-operation and Economic Development; Programme for International Student Assessment). PISA ranks and sorts 15-year-olds in most of the world's countries or economies, in science, reading and mathematics (79 jurisdictions participated in PISA 2018). As 'the global yardstick for measuring success in education' (Schleicher 2017, 123, as cited in Ledger et al. 2019), PISA has

initiated world-wide competitiveness to advance up the league tables, and an increasing focus on the teachers needed to train a skilled work force to ensure economic productivity.

'Globalisation redefines and reinforces the links between education and the economy' (Brisard et al 2007, 210), reflected in education reforms underway in numerous countries, with their emphasis on measurement, accountability, explicit standards and competencies, and research-based practices (Cochran-Smith et al. 2017; Kosnik et al. 2016; Livingston and Flores 2017). This Global Education Reform Movement or GERM, forwards five principles aimed at 'standardization of education … focus on core subjects … low risk ways to reach learning goals … corporate management models … test based accountability' (Sahlberg 2012, paras. 5–9). Teachers are increasingly 'managed professionals' (Codd 2005), subjected across the world to policies of accountability and performativity (Appel 2020; Ball 2003; Chee 2012; Fu and Clarke 2019; Ingersoll et al 2016). At the same time, teachers are hailed as instrumental to national development as 'it is through education that nation-states can gain access to the new global economy' (Codd 2005, 198). Thus, teachers find themselves dually cast as both villain and saviour, the answer to both the failure and success of schooling and educational policies, at once deified and demonized.

Such, 'competing versions of teacher professionalism' (Whitty 2000, 282), are tied to an ongoing struggle for control over teachers' work and purpose, with notions of teacher knowledge, autonomy and responsibility buffeted and redefined by external factors including the social, political or cultural. Teacher professionalism is contextually sensitive and 'constructions of teacher professionalism from 'above' and 'within'' (Mausethagen and Granlund 2012, 819) have often proven to be dichotomous or in conflict. Evetts (2011) writes of a 'new professionalism' that subscribes to values of the organization (above) versus of those in the

occupation (within). She calls this 'a shift from notions of partnership, collegiality, discretion and trust to increasing levels of managerialism, bureaucracy, standardization, assessment and performance review' (407). Sachs (2016) speaks similarly of 'contractual' versus 'responsive accountability', Whitty of democratic versus managerial professionalism (2008), depending on whether standards of performance come from without/above or within. These dichotomies are echoed by Wermke and Höstfält (2014) who describe teacher professionalism in two dimensions: individual and institutional, and by Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo, and Hargreaves (2015) who contrast external versus internal accountability. However, Evans defines new professionalism as an 'instrument of change' (2008, 21 cited in Nairz-Wirth and Feldmann 2019, 798), underscoring contradictions in the literature.

An Enquiry into Contemporary Teaching Standards in Three Systems

Contradictions aside, there is general consensus that economic globalisation and its pervasive neoliberal ideologies have contributed to 'the rise of performance cultures which are expressed through increased accountability, and the continued imposition of teacher standards' (Sachs 2015, 414) (cf. Evetts 2011; Fullan et al. 2015; Goodwin 2012; Gray and Whitty 2010; Mausethagen and Granlund 2012; Torres, and Weiner 2018), a sort of 'tick-box professionalism' (Goepel 2012, 489). Thus, 'standards are seen both as a way to improve the teaching profession and to control teachers' practice' (Hilton et al. 2013, 432), to ensure quality as well as implementation compliance to externally mandated expectations (Appel 2020; Ball 2003; Fu and Clarke 2020). Teacher competency frameworks or standards are also increasingly employed as a technology (Mulcahy 2011), 'an effective tool for the exercise of performance management, a core strategy of neoliberal governance, through monitoring teaching outcomes and aligning teachers' abilities with national prospects' (Chiang and Trezise 2020, 11). The three jurisdictions

at the centre of this enquiry each have articulated standards as essential to achieving quality in both teachers and the teaching profession. An examination of the various standards makes visible different conceptions of teacher professionalism at a time when teacher quality has become 'a topic with high political priority' (Hilton, Flores, and Niklasson 2013, 432), in the context of globalisation forces that are powerfully affecting all aspects of life and drawing the world together in unprecedented ways.

Data and Analysis Procedures

The systems selected for this study each developed or renewed teaching standards within the last decade and represent specific contexts. In the U.S., education is a state not federal enterprise, but the InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) standards endorsed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) are, essentially, de facto standards for the country (https://ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10. Australia was selected given its more recent adoption of standards for teachers, and its apparent borrowing of education policies from the U.S. and U.K. (Dinham 2016; White 2016). One outcome of this policy shift was the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST), developed by AITSL (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2011). Hong Kong has undergone continuous education reform since about 2000 and recently completed yet another round of development in its continuous journey towards educational excellence, resulting in *T-Excel*, including *T-standard*— Professional Standards for Teachers (https://www.cotap.hk/index.php/en/t-excel-hk/t-standard-introduction).

Jurisdiction-specific teacher standards were downloaded from the internet. These are publicly available documents, each of which provides some background to and descriptions of

the standards. Each set of standards underwent several readings by the researcher using content analysis procedures to examine language usage and focus of the standards in order to address the research questions:

1) What conceptions of teacher professionalism do the standards convey?

2) In what ways do the standards reflect globalisation influences?

Content analysis as a method of interpreting data 'may focus on either quantitative or qualitative aspects of communication' (Berg 2004, 268), although in practice the process often involves both modes, with quantitative approaches used 'to determine specific frequencies of relevant categories' that enable qualitative examinations of 'ideological mind-sets, themes, topics, symbols and similar phenomena' (269).

In the context of this study, summative content analysis seemed an appropriate method for targeting the messages, words and meanings contained within the three sets of standards in order to gain an initial understanding of differing conceptions of professionalism and globalisation. While tallies of words may be perceived as reductionistic or superficial, summative content analysis 'goes beyond mere word counts to…discovering underlying meanings of the words or the content' (Hsieh and Shannon 2005, 1283-1284), and making visible what is both said and unsaid. Through summative content analysis, qualitative data, such as text, are rendered more accessible and concrete, affording the emergence of latent content (meaning) from manifest content (concrete representations) (Berg 2004; Graneheim and Lundman 2004; Hsieh and Shannon 2005).

It is important to underscore the exploratory nature of this enquiry and the 'researcher as key instrument' employed to 'winnow' the data (Creswell 2013, 185, 195). While knowledgeable peers were engaged as sounding boards during data analysis, one limitation of the

study is the possibility that conceptual blinkers might have limited the researcher's analytical

perspective. Still, data analysis focused on unearthing patterns and themes within and across the

standards, and supporting interpretations beyond isolated occurrences or examples with the

understanding that 'a text always involves multiple meanings and there is always some degree of

interpretation when approaching a text' (Graneheim and Lundman 2004, 106).

Findings

The discussion below is organized first by country, and then takes a look across the three

jurisdictions.

      U.S. Teaching Standards. InTASC began as INTASC in 1987, the Interstate *New*

Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium 'dedicated to the reform of the preparation,

licensing, and on-going professional development of teachers' (CCSSO 2016, para 1). Its aim

was: 'compatible educational policy on teaching among the states; new accountability

requirements for teacher preparation programs; new techniques to assess the performance of

teachers for licensing and evaluation' (CCSSO 2016, para 2). Thus, its early emphasis was on

standardisation, accountability and teacher performance for licensing purposes. Two decades

later, the Consortium remade the standards into the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards

(MCTS), 'no longer intended only for "beginning" teachers but as professional practice

standards, setting one standard for performance that will look different at different

developmental stages of the teacher's career' (CCSSO 2013, 6).

      MCTS is organised into 10 standards, grouped by learners, content, instructional practice

and professional responsibility. The standards are supported by 'learning progressions' that

'describe effective teaching with more specificity than the standards…make real the components

of the new vision of teaching described in the standards and articulate more effective practice'

(10). Thus, the standards are offered as 'a big picture vision of where we want to go' (7) while the progressions 'make concrete suggestions' (10) and spell out 'effective' teaching by 'degree of sophistication' (6), with the goal of achieving 'a new vision of teaching for improved student achievement' (3). The focus on 'effectiveness' (of teachers and teaching practice) is quite evident given 64 mentions, sending a strong message that connects teaching to outcomes.

To begin, the relationship between teachers' work and the economy is prominent as the MCTS 'outline what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure every PK-12 student reaches the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce in today's world' (3). The description of the 'new vision for teaching' emphasises that 'Educators are now being held to new levels of accountability for improved student outcomes' with the articulation of standards that are 'based on our best understanding of current research on teaching practice' and 'promote a new paradigm for delivering education' (3-4). From this introduction are hints that teachers are seen as accountable deliverers of learning, using research-based practices to prepare 'career ready' graduates. The new vision outlines 'key themes that run through the updated teaching standards': 'personalized learning for diverse learners; a strong focus on application of knowledge and skills; improved assessment literacy; a collaborative professional culture; new leadership roles for teachers and administrators' (4-5). Sprinkled throughout the themes are terms that additionally suggest the influence of globalisation and imply conceptions of teaching as technical and outcomes-focused: 'benchmarked to international standards…decisions informed by data…deliver rigorous and relevant instruction' (4-5). Teacher surveillance, the 'gaze from above' (Bourke, Lidstone and Ryan 2015, 88) is also apparent as the standards indicate 'new and higher expectations for teachers' and 'require teachers to open their practice to observation and scrutiny' (5) as characteristic of 'a collaborative professional culture' and 'new

leadership roles'. This observation is further supported by the statement that 'these standards…

[put]…performance first—as the aspect that can be observed and assessed in teaching practice',

underscoring performativity and measurement (Appel 2020; Ball 2003; Mulcahy 2011).

MTCS does speak of 'the complexity of the teacher's practice' (6) and acknowledges that

'teaching and learning are dynamic, integrated and reciprocal processes' (7). But these

statements seem contradictory to other statements that say that 'each standard emphasizes a

discrete aspect of teaching' (7), and 'define(s) a specific "bar" or level of performance that must

be met' (7), suggesting that teaching can be deconstructed into component parts. Interestingly,

the creation of MTCS was funded by three bodies, two of which are well known for standardised

testing, the Educational Testing Service (ETS), and Evaluation Systems group of Pearson. It is

not surprising then that one component of teaching especially emphasised in these standards is

content knowledge, since an indicator of quality teaching is 'rigorous content and application of

knowledge through high-order skills' (4), and content is more readily tested. Analysis revealed

that 'academic' appears 18 times in the document, with 'academic language' dominating. While

'academic standards' was only mentioned once, 'content standards' was mentioned nine times.

Content is clearly an important concept in MTCS, mentioned 143 times, with 'content

knowledge' highlighted as the most essential knowledge for teachers to possess (83 times—

excluding the 10 mentions of academic or content standards), apply in their teaching (25 times),

and convey to students (17 times). Moreover, the term "discipline(s)" also appears 42 times in

the standards in terms of teacher knowledge of concepts, and skill in making disciplinary

structures accessible to learners. Ensuring students' content knowledge emerged as a central

purpose for teachers, reiterated throughout almost 200 times.

Besides content knowledge, global knowledge was also referenced fairly frequently, 26 times. However, while global skills or awareness were mentioned 5 times, they lacked definition or detail; otherwise, 'global' was always appeared in relation to 'local,' such as 'local and global issues'; or 'local and global contexts.' Thus, global appeared to be a counter-balance to local, an add-on versus a key concept that warrants its own study. Other soft skills or qualities received infrequent mentions. 'Social' or 'emotional' was mentioned 11 and seven times respectively, usually as one item in a normative list of learner development characteristics. On the other hand, social as part of 'social media; was mentioned 19 times, along with 'technology' which warranted 33 mentions. Cultivating 'values' as part of instruction appeared three times, while anything related to 'equity' only appeared four times. The terms 'ethics' or 'ethical' were mentioned 35 times, usually in relation to teacher actions or practice, most typically in the context of 'ethical use of various assessments' (30), or 'us[ing] technology in safe, legal and ethical ways' (44). Again, the impression left by MTCS is that content knowledge and proper use of technology are central to teaching and learning.

Australian Teaching Standards. Says AITSL, 'the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST) are a public statement of what constitutes teacher quality' and 'contribute to the professionalisation of teaching and raise the status of the profession' (AITSL 2011, 3). The first paragraph describes the APST as 'Standards which outline what teachers should know and be able to do' (4), language identical to that used to introduce the MTCS 'that outline what teachers should know and be able to do' (CCSSO 2013, 3). The policy borrowing from the U.S. and the U.K. that scholars have theorized (Dinham 2016; White 2016; Rizvi and Lingard 2000), seems quite visible in the APST, which consists of seven standards 'grouped into three domains of teaching; Professional Knowledge, Professional Practice and Professional Engagement' (4). A

comparison of the APST with MTCS reveals a mirroring of standards, with core ideas and

practices shared, even while the organization and phrasing of them might differ (Table 1).

APST Domains of Teaching (AITSL 2011, 4)	Professional Knowledge 1. Know students and how they learn 2. Know the content and how to teach it	Professional Practice 3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning 4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments 5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning	Professional Engagement 6. Engage in professional learning 7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community
MTCS (CCSSO 2013, 8-9)	Standard #1: Learner Development Standard #2: Learning Differences Standard #4: Content Knowledge Standard #5: Application of Content	Standard #7: Planning for Instruction Standard #8: Instructional Strategies Standard #3: Learning Environments Standard #6: Assessment	Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration

Table 1. Comparison of APST and MTCS.

Similar to MTCS, teacher effectiveness seemed to be employed by APST as a measure of

quality, with the term appearing 48 times in the document in conjunction directly with teaching

practice (39 times), along with nine mentions similarly associated with teacher effectiveness, but

more indirectly, such as 'processes to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching programs' (10).

Effectiveness was typically not defined but assumed given its consistent application as a criterion

for other behaviours or actions. For example, 'Select from a flexible and effective repertoire of

teaching strategies' (10) or 'Understand strategies for working effectively, sensitively and

confidentially with parents/carers' (22), without a clear indication of what is meant by an

effective repertoire or *effective* strategies. APST also placed a great deal of emphasis on teacher

knowledge, with 18 mentions of content knowledge specifically, and 60 instances of professional

knowledge linked to a wide range of teacher actions or areas, such as learner development,

teaching strategies, curriculum, culture of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, etc.

Noticeably, professional knowledge was also defined as 'using research-based knowledge and student data' (13) and 'using effective, research-based learning and teaching programs' (12), which was sometimes, but not always, coupled with 'workplace knowledge', suggesting that quality teaching relies more so on expert over practitioner knowledge.

Knowledge, primarily teacher knowledge, emerged overwhelmingly as a feature of quality teachers in APST. 'Emotion' or 'emotional' do not appear at all in APST; social only appears nine times, usually in tandem with intellectual development. 'Values' appear only three times, in the context of teachers demonstrating that 'learning is valued' (6); cultivating values does not seem to be part of the standards. 'Equity' is only mentioned once; 'ethics' or 'ethical' appear 16 times, with most mentions, as with MCTS, in relation to teacher actions: either teachers 'behav[ing' ethically at all times' (8), or engaging in ethical practice, such as the 'us[ing] ICT safely, responsibly and ethically' (17), language very similar to that used in MCTS. 'Global' was also not found in these standards, although the influence of globalisation as a driver of competition was apparent in several references to 'high performing school systems' (2), 'the world's best-performing school systems' (26), because 'internationally and locally, education systems are developing professional standards for teachers' (2). In keeping with this, these standards are positioned as 'part of Australia's efforts to improve student attainment and ensure it has a world class system of education' (2), such that 'with their development and implementation, Australian education systems are well placed to be among the best in the world' (8). It seems then that the APST aim to be best depends on measurement, and is intended to 'be used as the basis for a professional accountability model… to ensure that teachers can demonstrate appropriate levels of professional knowledge, professional practice and professional engagement' (3).

Hong Kong Teacher Standards. *T-standard*, which includes 'The Professional Standards for Teachers of Hong Kong' (PST) (https://www.cotap.hk/index.php/en/t-excel-hk/t-standard-pst) was rolled out in 2018. As with the U.S. and Australia, Hong Kong (HK) is also invested in standards 'to build a quality teaching profession in pursuit of continuous improvement and excellence'[1], and '[provide] a clear reference and goal for continuing professional development, teacher preparation and development of school leadership'. Thus T-standard is designed to address the professional continuum, similar to the U.S. and Australian standards. Unlike the U.S. and Australia, HK lacks natural resources and so 'is committed to nurturing talents' with 'students' developmental and learning needs', as 'the key to maintaining the competitive edge of Hong Kong and sustaining its development' (Education Bureau 2019, 1).

The 'Guiding Principles' for PST include: 'Adopting a student-centred approach; Moving towards a core competences orientation; Embedment of core values; Alignment with local and international educational policies and practices; Ensuring adaptability and flexibility for professional autonomy.' Thus, we see the influence of globalisation in the development of PST, where 'research was conducted with regard to teacher competency frameworks of other countries and policies…and latest international educational trends.' But what also comes through is commitments to home-grown policies, such as maintaining 'schools [as] the loci of change, where good practices flourish with diversity and innovation,' and a reaffirmation of the core values undergirding the ACTEQ Teacher Competency Framework (Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications 2003), the first set of teacher standards developed by HK educators: (1) belief that all students can learn; (2) love and care for students; (3) respect for

---

[1] Unattributed quotes for the Hong Kong section are taken from the websites indicated in the article, thus page numbers do not apply.

diversity; (4) commitment and dedication to the profession; (5) collaboration, sharing and team spirit; and (6) passion for continuous learning and excellence.

A particular vision of teacher professionalism is implied by the PST, given 'the nurturing of…three essential attributes of students': 'whole-person wellness; key competences for adulthood; change agility for tomorrow' 'at the very centre of T-Standard.' What comes through are intentions to teach the whole child and attend to socio-emotional development and dispositions. The inclusion in the guiding principles and core beliefs of terms such as 'values,' 'flexibility,' 'wellness,' and 'love'—with no mention of effectiveness—conjure up images of professionalism that seem to depart from those implied by the U.S. and Australia. Instead of accountability and measurement, autonomy or choice emerges as a theme, apparent in T-standard introductory statements from the co-chairs of the Committee of Professional Development of Teachers and Principals (COTAP), which oversaw the development of PST:

When teachers grow, so do learners.

Dr. Carrie Willis, Former Chairperson, COTAP

They have been developed with the teaching profession for the growth of the profession. With full respect to professional autonomy, T-standard serves as a reference tool for the profession and its supporting partners, ensuring flexibility in it use.

Professor HAU Kit-tai, Convenor of T-standard Consortium

Framed by the guiding principles and core beliefs, the PST are laid out as the intersection between the essential student attributes described earlier, with the 'Professional Roles of

Teachers,' broad, holistic statements depicting teachers as: 'Caring Cultivators of All-round Growth; Inspirational Co-constructors of Knowledge; Committed Role Models of Professionalism.' An analysis of the language describing these professional roles reveals no use of 'effective,' 'content', 'disciplines,' 'standards,' or 'academic.' There is also no mention of social or emotional learning, although a closer examination reveals numerous descriptions of social-emotional learning such as: 'potential to stand up to changes and challenges…rapport-building with peers…mutually affirm and respect each other in a pluralistic society.' Additionally, the standards see teachers helping students with 'personal development,' including 'understanding of self… positive values and attitudes…self-management.' Finally, integrated into PST are phrases such as 'moral virtues,' 'collegial harmony,' 'deep learning.' There is also a focus on knowledge (mentioned four times), technology (2 times) alongside mastery, competitiveness and global awareness.

For the most part, these terms were used only once; however, it is important to bear in mind that the PST description is about 300 words long, compared to MCTS at 47 pages and ASPT at 22. Thus, the words selected for inclusion in a very brief narrative offers insight into what is considered essential in terms of HK standards for teachers and underscores the refrain that the standards are 'a reference tool for teachers to reflect on their professional development needs.' Evidence of teacher choice and decision-making is further reiterated by the provision of a 'Self-Reflection Tool' for teachers to self-assess where they are on the 'Professional Growth' continuum of 'Threshold, Competent, Distinguished,' with the understanding that a teacher might be at the threshold in one standard but be distinguished in another. The tool is designed to encourage teachers' agency in deciding where they are, for example: 'where an accurate/appropriate descriptor is not available, you can choose the stage you belong to and edit

the descriptors to substantiate your choice,' plus it is made clear that the tool is not evaluative and that 'data and results generated by the tool should **ONLY be used** as reference for professional development planning for teachers and schools' (emphasis in original). Moreover, perhaps one of the most unique aspects of PST is that 'three touching stories of teachers and students' are offered as the 'best illustrations of the professional standards.' Each story presents a scenario replete with embedded dilemmas and questions, designed to engage teachers in contemplating their roles, and imagining different ways of being, for instance, a Caring Cultivator.

Final Thoughts

This study began with two questions:

1) What conceptions of teacher professionalism do the standards convey?

2) In what ways do the standards reflect globalisation influences?

Three different sets of teaching standards were analysed resulting in two images of teacher as professional. The U.S. and Australian standards depicted teachers as deliverers of content, knowledge brokers; effectiveness, stated without definition but used as an adjective for all teacher actions, seemed to be the primary indicator of quality. Both countries seem to place a premium on measurement, accountability, and research-based practices. This observation is supported by the explicitness of the standards, in each case spelling out what teachers should know and do at different levels of their career. Such detail in standards suggests a 'low trust' relationship between society and its teachers' (Whitty 2000, 291) with teachers afforded 'restricted autonomy' (Wermke and Höstfält 2014, 670) under conditions of 'contractual accountability…concerned with the degree to which educators are fulfilling the expectations…in terms of standards, outcomes and results' (Sachs 2016, 416). It comes as no surprise that in the

U.S. and Australia, the teaching profession has been harshly criticised and more tightly

regulated, even as fewer are choosing to enter teaching as its status and working conditions

deteriorate (Cochran-Smith et al. 2017; Kosnik et al. 2016; White 2019). In contrast, HK teacher

standards seem to follow a 'responsive accountability' model, which embraces 'decision-making

by educators…more concerned with process than outcomes' (Sachs 2016, 4160). In the context

of 'extended autonomy' (Wermke and Höstfält 2014, 67), the PST 'will continue to be generic

and open to adaptation' because 'teaching is multi-dimensional and dynamic, the broad spectrum

of teachers'…work cannot always be clearly defined' (https://www.cotap.hk/index.php/en/t-

excel-hk/t-standard-guiding-principles). The HK standards seem to define teachers as

autonomous, with generous leeway to interpret the standards that are holistically outlined

without much in terms of specific directions or behaviours. It is interesting to note that teaching

is considered a well-paid, attractive profession in HK, teachers are positively regarded, and HK

has been a consistent top performer on PISA, unlike the U.S. and Australia. This does beg the

question about how standards are used to professionalise teaching.

In terms of globalisation, there was evidence that all three systems feel the effects of

international competition, but differently. Australia seems to use high-performing systems as a

benchmark for its own aspiration to be world class. HK conducted international research in order

to inform its own conceptions of teacher quality, and the MCTS were 'benchmarked to

international standards' (4). Each also reflected at some level, globalisation that utilises 'a

predominant lens of human capital theory' (Engel, Rutkowski, and Thompson 2019, 120). The

U.S. wants youth to be ready to 'enter the workforce in today's world' (3); HK is preparing

students for 'increased competitiveness in the knowledge-based society'; Australia pinpoints

teachers as a critical resource who 'account for the vast majority of expenditure in school

education' (2). Overall, the impact of globalisation seems to be minimal, weighted in the direction of economic imperatives, which should cause us to be concerned about 'political agendas colonizing professionalism' (Bourke, Lidstone, and Ryan 2015, 88), when we are experiencing a world crisis that cries out for us to push aside politics and embrace our humanity.

References

ACTEQ. 2013. *Towards a learning profession.* Hong Kong: HKSAR Government.

AITSL. 2011. *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers.* Australia: Education Services.

Angus, L. 2017. "Neoliberalism, Teacher Education, and Restricted Teacher Professionalism." *Teacher Education and Practice 30* (2): 339-341.

Appel, M. 2020. "Performativity and the demise of the teaching profession: the need for rebalancing in Australia." *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education 48* (3): 301-315. DOI: 10.1080/1359866X.2019.1644611

Ball, S. J. 2003. "The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity." *Journal of Education Policy 18* (2): 215-228, DOI: 10.1080/0268093022000043065

Beauchamp, G., L. Clarke, M. Hulme, and J. Murray. 2015. "Teacher education in the United Kingdom post devolution: Convergences and divergences." *Oxford Review of Education 41* (2): 154–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2015.1017403

Berg, B. L. 2004. *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th *ed*). Boston: Pearson.

Bourke, T., J. Lidstone, and M. Ryan. 2015. "Schooling teachers: Professionalism or disciplinary power?" *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 47 (1): 84-100.

Brisard, E., I. Menter, and I. Smith. 2007. "Researching trends in initial teacher education policy and practice in an era of globalization and evolution: a rationale and a methodology for an Anglo-Scottish 'home international' study." *Comparative Education 43* (2): 207-229.

CCSSO. 2016. "Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)." Accessed May 31 2020. http://programs.ccsso.org/projects/interstate_new_teacher_assessment_and_support_consortium/

CCSSO. 2013, April. *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A Resource for Ongoing Teacher Development*. Washington, DC: Author.

Chee, W-C. 2012. "Negotiating teacher professionalism: governmentality and education reform in Hong Kong." *Ethnography and Education 7* (3): 327-344. DOI: 10.1080/17457823.2012.717201

Chiang, T-H., and D. Trezise. 2020. "How teacher competence functions as an institutionalised discourse in the epoch of globalisation." *Cambridge Journal of Education* (online first). DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2020.1782352

Cochran-Smith, M., M. Baker, S. Burton, W-C. Chang, M.C. Carney, B. Fernández, … J.G. Sánchez. 2017. "The accountability era in US teacher education: Looking back, looking forward." *European Journal of Teacher Education 40* (5): 572–588. doi:10.1080/02619768.2017.1385061

Codd, J. 2005. "Teachers as 'managed professionals' in the global education industry: The New Zealand experience." *Educational Review 57* (2): 193-206.

Creswell, J. W. 2013. *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods approaches* (*4ᵗʰ ed)*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Darling-Hammond, L., and Goodwin, A. L. 1993. 'Progress toward professionalism in teaching." In *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1993 Yearbook* edited by G. Cawelti, 19-52. Alexandria VA: ASCD.

Dinham, S. 2016. "The worst of both worlds: How the U.S. and the U.K. are influencing education in Australia." *Journal of Professional Learning*. Accessed May 31 2020. https://cpl.asn.au/sites/default/files/journal/Steve%20Dinham.pdf

Education Bureau. 2019. *Report of the Task Force of Professional Development of Teachers.* Hong Kong: HKSAR Government. Accessed March 20 2020. https://www.edb.gov.hk/en/teacher/report-tftpd/index.html

Engel, L.C, D. Rutkowski, and G. Thompson. 2019. "Toward an international measure of global competence? A critical look at the PISA 2018 framework." *Globalisation, Societies and Education 17* (2): 117-131. DOI: 10.1080/14767724.2019.1642183

Etzioni, A. 1969. *The Semi-Professions and Their Organisation: Teachers, Nurses, and Social Workers*. New York: The Free Press.

Evans, D., and F. Yuan. 2018. "The working conditions of teachers in low and middle income countries." *World Bank 2018 World Report*. Accessed May 24 2020. https://www.riseprogramme.org/sites/www.riseprogramme.org/files/inline-files/Yuan.pdf

Evetts, J. 2011. "A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities." *Current Sociology 59* (4): 406–422.

Fu, G., and A. Clarke. (2019). "Teachers' moral agency under neo-liberal influences: what is educationally desirable in China's curriculum reform?" *Educational Review 71* (1): 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1524205

Fullan, M., S. Rincon-Gallardo, and A. Hargreaves. 2015. "Professional capital as accountability." *Education Policy Analysis Archives 23* (15): 1–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1998

Furlong, J. 2019. "The universities and initial teacher education. Challenging the discourse of derision: The case of Wales." *Teachers and Teaching 25* (5): 574–588. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2019.1652160

Glazer, J. L. 2007. "Educational Professionalism: An Inside-out View." *American Journal of Education 114* 169–89.

Goepel, J. 2012. "Upholding public trust: an examination of teacher professionalism and the use of Teachers' Standards in England." *Teacher Development 16* (4): 489-505. DOI: 10.1080/13664530.2012.729784

Goldhaber, D., and A. Liu. 2003. "Occupational choices and the academic proficiency of the teacher workforce." In *Development in school finance 2001-02* edited by W. J. Fowler, 53-75. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics

Goldhaber, D., and J. Walch. May 2014. *Education Digest* 79 (9): 23-31.

Goodwin, A. L. 2020. "Globalization, Global Mindsets and Teacher Education." *Action in Teacher Education 42* (1): 6-18.

Goodwin, A. L. 2012. "Teaching as a profession: Are we there yet?" In *The Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by C. Day, 44-56. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Graneheim, U. H., and B. Lundman. 2004. "Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness" *Nurse Education Today 24* 105–112.

Hajisoteriou, C., and P. Angelides. 2020. Efficiency versus social justice: Teachers' roles in the epoch of globalisation. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice 15* (3): 274–289.

Hargreaves, A. 2000. "Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning." *Teachers and Teaching 6* (2): 151-182, DOI: 10.1080/713698714

Hilton, G., M. A. Flores, and L. Niklasson. 2013. "Teacher quality, professionalism and professional development: findings from a European project" *Teacher Development* 17 (4): 431-447, DOI: 10.1080/13664530.2013.800743

Hsieh, H-F., and S. E. Shannon. 2005. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis" *Qualitative Health Research 15* (9): 1277-1288, DOI: 10.1177/1049732305276687

Ingersoll, R., L. Merrill, and M. Henry. 2016. "Do accountability policies push teachers out?"
The Working Lives of Educators,] 73 (8): 44–49

Ingersoll, R. M., and E. Mitchell. 2011. "The status of teaching as a profession." In *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education (4th ed.)* edited by J. Ballantine, and J. Spade, 185-189. Los Angeles: Pine Forge Press/Sage

Jackson, L. 2016. "Globalization and education. Oxford Research Encyclopedias". Accessed May 23 2020.
https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-52?print=pdf

Kosnik, C., Beck, C., and Goodwin, A. L. 2016. "Reform efforts in teacher education." In *The International Handbook of Teacher Education Vol. 1* edited by J. Loughran, and M. L. Hamilton, 267-308. Singapore: Springer.

Labaree, D. 1992. "Power, Knowledge, and the Rationalization of Teaching: A Genealogy of the Movement to Professionalize Teaching." *Harvard Educational Review 62* (2): 123–54.

Lankford, H., S. Loeb, A. McEachin, L. C. Miller, and J. Wyckoff. 2014. "Who enters teaching? Encouraging evidence that the status of teaching is improving." *Educational Researcher 43* (9): 444-453.

Ledger, S., M. Thier, L. Bailey, and C. Pitts. 2019. "OECD's approach to measuring global competency: Powerful voices shaping education." *Teachers College Record 121* (8): 1–40.

Livingston, K., and M. A. Flores. 2017. "Trends in teacher education: A review of papers published in the *European Journal of Teacher Education* over 40 years." *European Journal of Teacher Education 40* (5): 551–560. doi:10.1080/02619768.2017.1387970

Mausethagen, S., and L. Granlund. 2012. "Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: current tensions between education policy and teachers' union." *Journal of Education Policy 27* (6): 815-833. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2012.672656

McLaren, P., and R. Farahmandpur. 2001. "Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy." *Journal of Teacher Education* 52 (2): 136–150. doi:10.1177/0022487101052002005

Mulcahy, D. 2011. "Assembling the 'Accomplished' Teacher: The performativity and politics of professional teaching standards." *Educational Philosophy and Theory 43* (1): 94-113, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00617.x

Nairz-Wirth, E., and K. Feldmann. 2019. "Teacher professionalism in a double field structure." *British Journal of Sociology of Education 40* (6): 795-808.

DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2019.1597681

Pauwels, L. 2019. "Exposing globalization: Visual approaches to researching global interconnectivity in the urban everyday." *International Sociology* 34 (3): 256–280. doi:10.1177/0268580919835154

Ravitch, D. 2003. "A brief history of teacher professionalism." Accessed May 31 2020. https://www2.ed.gov/admins/tchrqual/learn/preparingteachersconference/ravitch.html

Rizvi, F., and B. Lingard. 2000. "Globalization and education: complexities and contingencies" *Educational Theory 50* (4): 419-426.

Sachs, J. 2016. "Teacher professionalism: why are we still talking about it?' *Teachers and Teaching* 22 (4): 413-425. DOI: 10.1080/13540602.2015.1082732

Sahlberg, P. (2012). Global education reform movement is here! Accessed Oct 1 2020. https://pasisahlberg.com/globaleducational-reform-movement-is-here/
Schleicher, A. 2018. *World class: How to build a 21st century school system*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Schleicher, A. (Ed.). 2012. *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Standish, A. 2014. "What is global education and where is it taking us?" *The Curriculum Journal* 25 (2): 166–186. doi:10.1080/09585176.2013.870081

Vanham, N. 2019. "A brief history of globalization." *World Economic Forum Annual Meeting*. Accessed May 24 2020. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/01/how-globalization-4-0-fits-into-the-history-of-globalization/

Torres, A.C., and J.M. Weiner. 2018. "The new professionalism? Charter teachers' experiences and qualities of the teaching profession." *Education Policy Analysis Archives 26* (19). http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3049

Werler, T. 2015. "Commodification of teacher professionalism." *Policy Futures in Education 14* (1): 60-76.

Wermke, W. and G. Höstfält. 2014. "Contextualizing Teacher Autonomy in time and space: a model for comparing various forms of governing the teaching profession." *Journal of Curriculum Studies 46* (1): 58-80. DOI: 10.1080/00220272.2013.812681

White, S. 2019. "Once were teachers? Australian teacher education policy and shifting boundaries for teacher educators." European Journal of Teacher Education, 42 (4): 447-458. DOI: 10.1080/02619768.2019.1628214

White, S. 2016. "Teacher education research and education policymakers: An Australian perspective." *Journal of Education for Teaching 42* (2): 252–264. doi:10.1080/02607476.2016.1145369

Whitty, G. 2008. "Changing modes of teacher professionalism: traditional, managerial, collaborative and democratic." In *Exploring Professionalism* edited by B. Cunningham, 28–49. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Whitty, G. 2000. "Teacher professionalism in new times." *Journal of In-service Education 26* (2): 281-295.

Wilson, S. and E. Tamir. 2008. "The Evolving Field of Teacher Education." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts* (*3rd ed*), edited by M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, and J. McIntyre, 908-935. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Yang, R. 2003. "Globalisation and Higher Education Development: A Critical Analysis." *International Review of Education 49* (3/4): 269-291.

Zhao, Y. 2010. "Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 61 (5): 422–431. doi:10.1177/0022487110375802