


INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION AND SOCIETY



THE TEACHER AND THE STATE

A Comparative Analysis of Nordic
and East Asian Nations

By

**GERALD K. LETENDRE, JO B. HELGETUN
HANSOL WOO & SAKIKO IKOMA**

THE TEACHER AND THE STATE

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

Series Editor: Alexander W. Wiseman

Recent Volumes:

Series Editor from Volume 11: Alexander W. Wiseman

- Volume 22: Out of the Shadows: The Global Intensification of Supplementary Education
- Volume 23: International Education Innovation and Public Sector Entrepreneurship
- Volume 24: Education for a Knowledge Society in Arabian Gulf Countries
- Volume 25: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2014
- Volume 26: Comparative Sciences: Interdisciplinary Approaches
- Volume 27: Promoting and Sustaining a Quality Teacher Workforce Worldwide
- Volume 28: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2015
- Volume 29: Post-Education-For-All and Sustainable Development Paradigm: Structural Changes with Diversifying Actors and Norms

- Volume 30: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2016
- Volume 31: The Impact of the OECD on Education Worldwide
- Volume 32: Work-integrated Learning in the 21st Century: Global Perspectives on the Future

- Volume 33: The Century of Science: The Global Triumph of the Research University
- Volume 34: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2017
- Volume 35: Cross-nationally Comparative, Evidence-based Educational Policymaking and Reform 2018

- Volume 36: Comparative and International Education: Survey of an Infinite Field 2019
- Volume 37: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2018
- Volume 38: The Educational Intelligent Economy: Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and the Internet of Things in Education

- Volume 39: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2019
- Volume 40: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2020
- Volume 41: Building Teacher Quality in India: Examining Policy Frameworks and Implementation Outcomes

- Volume 42A: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2021
- Volume 42B: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2021
- Volume 43A: World Education Patterns in the Global North: The Ebb of Global Forces and the Flow of Contextual Imperatives
- Volume 43B: World Education Patterns in the Global South: The Ebb of Global Forces and the Flow of Contextual Imperatives

- Volume 44: Internationalization and Imprints of the Pandemic on Higher Education Worldwide

- Volume 45: Education for Refugees and Forced (Im)Migrants Across Time and Context
- Volume 46A: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2022
- Volume 46B: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2022
- Volume 47: How Universities Transform Occupations and Work in the 21st Century: The Academization of German and American Economies

- Volume 48: Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2023
- Volume 49: Higher Education in Southeast Asia

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION
AND SOCIETY VOLUME 50

**THE TEACHER AND THE
STATE: A COMPARATIVE
ANALYSIS OF NORDIC AND
EAST ASIAN NATIONS**

BY

GERALD K. LETENDRE

The Pennsylvania State University, USA

JO B. HELGETUN

University of Louvain, Belgium

HANSOL WOO

The Pennsylvania State University, USA

AND

SAKIKO IKOMA

American Institutes for Research, USA



United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Emerald Publishing, Floor 5, Northspring, 21-23 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 4DL.

First edition 2026

Copyright © 2026 Gerald K. LeTendre, Jo B. Helgetun, Hansol Woo, and Sakiko Ikoma.
Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 The respective authors.
Published under exclusive licence by Emerald Publishing Limited.

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: www.copyright.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-83662-993-1 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-83662-992-4 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-83662-994-8 (Epub)

ISSN: 1479-3679 (Series)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

<i>About the Authors</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xiv</i>
Chapter 1 Teachers and Nations	1
Chapter 2 Teaching as a Profession: National Cultural Logics	17
Chapter 3 The State Control of Teacher Education and Professional Development with <i>Yuan Chih Fu and Anonymous</i>	35
Chapter 4 Teacher Leadership: National Organizational Patterns and Cultures with <i>Anonymous</i>	59
Chapter 5 Teacher Collectives and the State: Conflict, Cooperation, and Cooptation with <i>Meredith Bouvier, Yuran Emma Zhang and Arkar Kyaw</i>	79
Chapter 6 New Public Management, Neoliberal Reforms, and Privatization with <i>Yuran Emma Zhang</i>	101
Chapter 7 Clarifying Regions as “Models”: Cultural Similarities and Regional Conflict	121
Chapter 8 National Policies, Regional Dynamics, and the Global Dynamic	135

Chapter 9 Conclusion	<i>151</i>
<i>Appendix: Teacher Collectives</i>	<i>161</i>
<i>References</i>	<i>173</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>193</i>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Arkar Kyaw is an educational leader and researcher with extensive hands-on experience in teacher education and higher education development in Myanmar. Since returning from a Fulbright scholarship in the United States, he has led numerous collaborative projects with universities across Myanmar, designing and implementing tailor-made solutions to leadership, teacher education, and institutional operational challenges. He is currently pursuing a dual-title Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Comparative & International Education at *The Pennsylvania State University*. His research focuses on community-based and culturally grounded leadership theories, as well as the experiences of teachers and scholars from the Global South. In addition to his research, Arkar actively advocates for equitable AI policies and the democratization of knowledge production and dissemination, striving to amplify the voices of educators and scholars working in marginalized and conflict-affected contexts.

Gerald K. LeTendre is the Harry L. Batschelet II Professor of Educational Administration at the Penn State University, where he also served as Chair of the Education Policy Studies Department and was Editor of the *American Journal of Education*. He received his BA from Harvard University, his Master's and PhD from Stanford University. He was a Spencer Postdoctoral Fellow, as well as a Fulbright Senior Scholar (University of Bremen, Germany) and Fulbright Research Fellow (Sophia University, Japan). His works on teachers include *Improving Teacher Quality* (co-authored with Motoko Akiba), *Promoting and Sustaining a Quality Teacher Workforce* (co-edited with Alex Wiseman), and *The International Handbook of Teacher Quality and Policy* (co-edited with Motoko Akiba). His current research focuses on the impact of globalization on the teaching profession and the state, with a particular focus on information and communications technology, social robots, and generative artificial intelligence.

Hansol Woo received a Dual Title PhD in 2021 from the Educational Leadership program & the Comparative and International Education program at the Pennsylvania State University. He uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to understand teacher leadership as an equitable leadership practice that improves student learning outcomes in high-poverty schools. He is joining the Samsung Global Research as a Research Fellow, initiating corporate social responsibility programs in education sector to support socioeconomically disadvantaged students and schools in Korea as well as those in developing countries.

Jo B. Helgetun has a PhD in Sciences of Psychology and Education from the University of Louvain in Belgium. His research focuses on understanding

education policy and policymaking through a comparative lens. He has published multiple works on how new digital tools may alter education in England and Flanders, on teacher education policymaking in England and France, on grade retention policies in Belgium, and on the effects of educational research policy in Norway. He currently works on training artificial intelligence and is an external member of the Groupe Interdisciplinaire de Recherche sur la Socialisation, l'Éducation et la Formation at the University of Louvain. He is a former F.R.S. – FNRS chargé de recherches, former Visiting Research Fellow at the University of Oxford's Department of Education and Internet Institute, and a former Visiting Researcher at KU Leuven's Methodologies of Educational Research Group.

Sakiko Ikoma, PhD, is an interdisciplinary quantitative researcher with expertise in the sociology of education, teacher professionalization, school climate, and academic resilience. She has delivered over 50 academic presentations and authored more than 10 publications. She leads research projects that analyze large-scale assessment data, applying her expertise in K–12 teaching to framework development, assessment design, and data interpretation. She contributed a chapter to the *International Handbook of Teacher Quality and Policy*, examining sociological theories and the historical contexts of the teaching profession in the USA. She is a certified Project Management Professional and holds a dual-title PhD in Educational Theory and Policy and Comparative and International Education, with a minor in Sociology, from the Pennsylvania State University. Prior to her graduate study in the USA, she taught mathematics, science, and English for eight years in middle and high schools in Tokyo, Japan.

Yuan Chih Fu serves as an Associate Professor at the Graduate Institute of Technical and Vocational Education within the esteemed National Taipei University of Technology, commonly known as Taipei Tech. He received his Ph.D. degree in Higher Education from the Pennsylvania State University (2017). Before making his transition to academia, He worked in Taiwan's Ministry of Education as a policymaker in higher education, dedicating his professional work to the construction of national data infrastructure and its application in higher education governance. His academic focus centers on exploring the profound impact of educational policy on individuals, higher education institutions, and broader society, specializing in policy evaluation and quantitative research methodologies. His papers have been published in leading international journals (ex. *Studies in higher education*, *Scientometrics*, *Higher Education*, *Higher education policy*, *Minerva*, *International Journal of Educational Development* and *Asia Pacific Education Review*). Since autumn 2023, he has held the role of Deputy Dean for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at National Taipei University of Technology. As of autumn 2024, he has assumed the position of Secretary-General for the Taiwan Association for Institutional Research (Taiwan-AIR).

Yuran Emma Zhang is an independent scholar with a Bachelor's degree in Early Childhood Education and Exceptional Needs from Purdue University, where she obtained a teaching license for Pre-K to Grade 3. She went on to pursue a Master's degree in Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University. Upon graduation, she began working as a teacher under the Ministry of Education in Singapore. With experience in both U.S. and Singaporean classrooms, Emma brings a cross-cultural perspective to teaching and curriculum development.

This page intentionally left blank

FOREWORD

Ian Menter

Emeritus Professor of Teacher Education, University of Oxford, UK

In 2011, the Scottish Government published a report entitled “Teaching Scotland’s Future.” The report was written by the former Chief Inspector of Education in Scotland, Graham Donaldson. In the report, he suggested that teachers should be seen as: “reflective, accomplished and enquiring professionals who have the capacity to engage fully with the complexities of education and to be key actors in shaping and leading educational change” (Donaldson, 2011, p. 4).

This is a conception of the teacher and teaching that is very closely aligned to that espoused by the authors of the current volume. While they examine the close relationship between teachers and the state throughout the work, they are clearly of the view that teachers can and indeed should contribute to the development of the nation, not least in relation to the creation of national identity. Such a relationship between schools and society was demonstrated sociologically in the USA as early as the mid-20th century in the work of Talcott Parsons, for example, but had also been explored earlier on within a European context by Emile Durkheim. The current authors clearly view teachers as having agency (although this is not a word they actually use very often), that is, as having responsibility for the shaping and nurturing of those young people in their society as they enter into national citizenship. The links to the development of national identity are all too apparent. Indeed, as the authors point out:

In times of regime change, the educational system and the national teaching force have been essential in forming new patterns of national identity, particularly when the goal was to reject the fascism, militarism or imperialism of previous national governments or imperial regimes.

This relationship between education and society is, of course, why the work and the education of teachers themselves can become such hot political issues, as we have seen in so many contexts over the past 25 years or so upon which this book primarily focuses. Within the UK, but especially in England, the “culture wars,” which these authors refer to in their opening chapter, broke out very early on, indeed during the 1980s, when pressure groups and “think tanks” – mainly on the right of politics – first started to lambast teachers and teacher education for alleged bias in their promotion of social justice, for example, through anti-racism. But similar struggles over the formation of teachers and over the contribution they might make to social and cultural development may be traced way back into the 19th century, indeed to the times when mass universal schooling first

emerged in many parts of the world. The cultural theorist Raymond Williams (1961) encapsulated some of these struggles for control over teaching and indeed over the whole process of state education in his chapter on education in Britain in *The Long Revolution*. He drew attention to the tensions between the cultural, economic, and political aims of education through his depiction of three powerful social forces, which he called respectively “old humanists,” “industrial trainers,” and “public educators.” The overt contestation between teachers and the state in England has been examined by scholars using the lens of political economy (e.g., Grace, 1987) in ways that are closely related to the revelations in the current text, albeit with the present book emphasizing the “cultural and institutional logics” that underlie development in the eight national contexts that are the focus here.

What is distinctive about the current text, however, and which leads to it providing highly original and important insights are three particular factors. First is the recognition of the importance of historical development; that is, we cannot understand the present educational “settlement” without taking account of how today’s manifestations of teacher professionalism were shaped over time in each particular context. Second, the book is imbued with a deep sense of the increasing influence of “globalization” on education systems around the world – not least how politicians and policymakers are looking over each other’s shoulders – and also how teachers’ organizations and their channels of communication have become internationalized. And third, the power of comparative education study is truly demonstrated in this text. We have eight nations in two global regions, an ambitious palette that is addressed with great thoroughness. All of the countries, as indicated from the outset, are “democracies,” and all of them are relatively prosperous. Through the chapters, we begin to see the distinction between regional influences (the Nordic and the East Asian) and the global. Furthermore, each nation under consideration here is not a recognized “superpower,” so we are not thinking about China, the USA, or Russia, but rather about medium and small nations. These three factors underpin the great originality of this work. Indeed, it is to be hoped that the present book may inspire further work to be undertaken of a similar kind – that is, adopting a similar methodology – to explore the changes that are underway in teaching both in comparing developments in those superpower nations but also in comparing what is happening in less prosperous or “developing” nations.

At the time of writing, we are not only experiencing the challenges to the teaching profession referred to in this book, such as the rapid emergence and growing influence of artificial intelligence, environmental degradation, and continuing conflicts in Europe and the Middle East, but we are having to come to terms with the economic chaos unleashed in early 2025 by the USA President’s efforts to “Make America Great Again” through imposing unprecedented trade tariffs on nations across the globe. This has led some politicians in the UK to suggest that “This is the end of globalisation.” How such developments will shape nations, national identity, and the teaching workforces of those nations is difficult to predict at present, such is the instability that is being experienced, but we may be certain that there will be further challenges to teachers and their “professionalism,” wherever they are. It may well be that the important insights provided in

the analyses in this volume will become a key record, an historic account of the relationships between teachers and their respective states during the last phases of globalization – at least as we have come to know it. Whether or not that is the case, what we have here is an outstanding contribution to our understanding of the significance of teachers and teaching in national education systems in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. However, whatever developments we see in relation to the future of economic aspects of globalization, the author's assertion of the significance of the relationships between states and their teachers is likely to become more important than ever. As they put it: "The shifting power dynamics between teachers and the state is critical to understanding how nations respond to globally diffusing educational reforms and how national policymakers participate in and make sense of world culture."

We await the second volume of this work with eager anticipation and with the expectation of gaining yet further insights into what we can learn from such an intensive comparative study of teachers and their work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book originated in a graduate seminar at Penn State over a decade ago when a group of doctoral students began to consider why nations that were doing comparatively well on international tests would engage in massive reforms of their teaching workforce, sometimes with clear deleterious effects on teachers. These original members – Sakiko Ikoma, Haram Jeon, Kristina Brezicha, Emily Anderson, Pablo Fraser, and Renata Hortavek, along with Ulrika Bergmark, who was doing a research sabbatical at Penn State – significantly contributed to shaping the initial interest in and focus on Nordic and East Asian nations.

Our work has been heavily influenced by the groundbreaking work on mass schooling and nation-states carried out by Francisco Ramirez, whose continued mentorship has shaped the theoretical development of our work. We are indebted to Motoko Akiba first for her insights into the global nature of teacher-focused reforms and second for her application of sense-making at multiple levels of policy formation. We would like to thank Patricia Bromley and Rie Kijima for developing the World Education Reform Database, which we utilized in our transnational policy analysis. Finally, we would like to thank Xavier Dumay, Thibault Coppe, and the rest of the Teachers Careers project for their groundbreaking work on teacher policy and invaluable advice along the way.

CHAPTER 1

TEACHERS AND NATIONS

INTRODUCTION

We live in a world where education has become central to the economic and military interests of the state and to the very stability of nations themselves. In our “schooled society,” mass schooling (e.g., primary and secondary education) has powerful effects on both national identity and individual outcomes (Baker, 2014). Since World War II, a “world society” (Meyer et al., 1997) of nations has developed where countries vie for educational excellence, routinely participate in international testing programs, compare their student achievement scores, and adjust educational policy. Internationally, we have seen the rise of complex networks of organizations that try to influence national educational policy and practice. Multilateral agencies like the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) attempt to promote global educational reforms. Globalization, particularly the interchange of ideas via dramatic innovations in technology and communication (Castells, 2004), has allowed the development of a global cultural dynamic. In this dynamic mix of local, national, and transnational cultures, “global institutions can traverse and shape local, regional, or national versions of particular areas of human life such as education” (Baker & LeTendre, 2005, p. 10).

Transnational diffusion of educational ideas has been reshaping schools in many corners of the world for a long time – witness the impact of John Dewey’s lectures in China in the early 1900s. More recently, national debates have tended to draw heavily on international comparisons. In France, national debates on the nature of education (pedagogy vs subject knowledge) can be traced back to before World War II (Bon, 2014; Prost, 2013). In the USA, the seminal “A Nation at Risk” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) made extensive use of international comparisons. During England’s “Great Debate” of the 1970s and 1980s, critics of the school system drew on international comparisons to criticize the “secret garden” of the curriculum (Furlong, 2001; Phillips, 2001).

In France, the perception of the impact of American “New Math” made French policymakers fear for their dominant position in winning Fields Medal (Helgetun, 2021).

These international comparisons are now part of many national policy planning processes. Since the first IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) tests in 1959–1961, nations have had access to increasingly detailed data about how their national educational systems compare to others. This has shaped national and global discourses on education’s role. The OECD’s 1961 paper “Education and economic growth” (OECD, 1961) continues to impact national educational policies (Tröhler, 2013; Zapp, 2021). Beginning in the 1990s, many nations around the world began to engage in widespread reforms of their teaching workforce (Akiba, 2013). Nations like Norway not only began reforming their education and teacher policies (Helgetun et al., 2018), but also teacher education (Karlsen, 2006) as part of larger reforms of higher education. Similar reforms occurred in Denmark (Rasmussen & Rasmussen, 2018) and many countries in both the Nordic and East Asian regions (Woo et al., 2024).

The landmark OECD (2005) paper “Teachers Matter” marked a sea change in international discussions which accentuated the role that teachers play in student achievement and the success of educational reforms. This document highlighted the critical work of teachers and its importance to national levels of educational achievement. Subsequently, teachers, rather than national curricula, came to dominate the attention of transnational organizations (OECD, 2005, 2006), national governments (Akiba, 2013) and academics alike (Paine & Zeichner, 2012). This globalized debate moved well beyond the national and international debates that dominated the preceding decades, for example, the Great Debate in England, specifically targeting teachers and promoting models of teacher professionalism and professional development (Mezza, 2022). However, as Akiba (2013, p. xxiii) summarized: “Despite these global models of teacher reforms created by influential international reports and the global neo-liberal trend on teacher accountability, each country interpreted these models differently.”

Why did this occur? In order to begin unraveling the complexities of the interaction of global dynamics, national histories, and the evolution of the teaching profession, we draw on a study of eight nations – Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden in the Nordic group and Japan, Singapore, Korea, and Taiwan in East Asia – that we and our colleagues have engaged with over the last decade. We have divided the analysis into two books. In this volume, we analyze the relationship of teachers to the nation-state in Nordic and East Asian nations as a way to better understand how global cultural dynamics influence teachers and national educational policy. In this regard, the Nordic and East Asian regions are ideal areas to examine, as many papers have been written on “Nordic” and “East Asian” models of economic and social development, including explicit comparisons of educational systems (see Hu & Huang, 2019; Kim, 2019). Although we will critique the logic of regionalism underlying these models, the prevalence of such comparisons makes for a good starting point in thinking about issues of globalization, regionalism, and the dynamic nature of the relationship between teachers and the state.

As we analyzed the interactions between the nation-state and its teachers in these two regions over time (e.g., from the 1800s to the present), we became critically aware of the need to develop a theory of how teachers influenced the development of the nation-state. Considerable attention has been given to the role that education (Green, 2013), mass schooling (Paglayan, 2024), the curriculum (Apple, 2004; Tröhler, 2023b), and unions (Causarano, 2012) play in nation-building, but in the Anglophone literature, we find scant attention given to the roles that teachers have played in shaping the nation-state. In French, Ozouf and Ozouf (1992) provide a compelling analysis of the role of teachers in the Third Republic (1870–1940) – see also Singer (1977), for similar arguments – but this work has received little attention in the literature on mass education systems.

Part of the problem lies in the way theories about mass schooling and the nation-state were formed. As LeTendre (2021, p. 752) wrote:

Teachers were absent from the earliest neo-institutionalist work on schools and educational systems. Early work on NI (Boli & Thomas, 1997) developed with little or no reference to sociological work on teachers as either a “mass” (Lortie, 1975) or “semi-” (Etzioni, 1969) profession.

Although world society and world culture theories (Drori & Krucken, 2009) share the view that mass schooling was essential to the establishment of a world order based on nation-states with citizens who had legitimate rights (John et al., 1985), teachers were hardly mentioned. Our growing awareness of the critical role that teachers played in the development of the state in Korea, Taiwan, Finland, and other nations also provided insight into how problematic our theories of “teacher” and “profession” are when we attempt to understand nations as diverse as Norway and Japan.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

The original idea for the book emerged in a graduate seminar at Penn State on the role of teachers in developing the nation-state. The process of data collection and analysis which informs these two volumes has spanned more than a decade and involved a dozen researchers. Ulrika Bergmark, Kristina Brezicha, Haram Jeon, Andy Fu, Anonymous, Sakiko Ikoma, Pablo Fraser, Meredith Bouvier, Thibault Coppe, Hansol Woo, Gerald LeTendre, and Jo Bjørkli Helgetun all provided insights, though not all were actively engaged in the writing of these volumes. Some members of this group collected material and created historical case studies for the eight nations. These case studies summarize educational reforms from the end of World War II to the present. In these case studies we identified major national reforms and paid close attention to any reforms that specifically targeted teachers.

While compiling these case studies, we were surprised to find few studies that considered the role of teachers in the development of the nation-state. Some, such as Bottery and Wright (2002), have carefully analyzed how the state has attempted to structure the teaching profession in a specific nation (e.g., England) and formulated theories of the impact of state policies on teacher professionalization. Yet we could find no work that comparatively assessed the impact that

national teaching forces (see [LeTendre & Wiseman, 2015](#) for a discussion of the concept of a national teaching force), have had on the development of public education and the nation-state itself. Yet, when we reviewed the history of individual nations, the national teaching force and its relationship to the evolving mass profession of teaching appeared to play a prominent role not only in terms of affecting curricular reforms (i.e., [Duke, 1973](#); [Schoppa, 1991](#)), but the development of national identity ([Tan, 1997](#)). Like [Ozouf and Ozouf \(1992\)](#) or [Singer \(1977\)](#), we observe that teachers in these nations have had a critical role in shaping national identity and the educational system, including teacher education, teacher professionalism, and more recently, the impact of neo-liberal ideologies on teachers.

This led us to investigate more specific topics such as unions, professionalization, and teacher leadership, which we presented in different papers at international conferences. These papers required more in-depth historical and policy analysis on each topic, adding to our data and literature reviews. While relying primarily on English sources, we also utilized original language sources when members of the research team were fluent in the languages of one of the eight nations. Through discussions within the team and our analysis of national and global policies, we discovered that language is a central and often neglected factor affecting the theoretical context applied to understanding teachers. Central terms, such as “pedagogy” or even the word “teacher,” had different meanings depending on where, when, and by whom they were used ([Helgetun et al., 2025](#)).

Subsequently, a second group of researchers (see [Woo et al., 2024](#)) set out to create a more systematic analysis of national policies focused on teachers that would supplement our national case studies. Each person on this team was assigned one or more nations and attempted to identify any teacher-focused reforms between 1995 and 2020. We selected the period 1995–2020 for more detailed analysis of cross-national educational research and policy formation during this time because more and more nations began to participate in cross-national testing programs (see [Meyer & Benavot, 2013](#)). This period begins with the release of the first Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) data and spans a period that saw the increasing frequency of cross-national testing (e.g., Teaching and Learning International Survey, TALIS; Program for International Student Assessment, PISA; Progress in International Reading Literacy Study, PIRLS). It also corresponds to what some have described as the rise of “global governance” ([Martens et al., 2007](#)). In the case of Europe, this period covers the formation of a new transnational “policy sphere,” the European Union (EU; [Lawn & Grek, 2012](#)). Inaugurated in 1993, under the EU, national educational ministries and universities were required to meet standards set transnationally under specific accords, such as the Bologna Process (1999).

Our research suggests that there are important linguistic or national elements involved in how we analyze and view teachers. Even though a national educational system that provides mass schooling is now a *sine qua non* of a well-functioning nation, few Anglophone theorists appear to have considered how teachers, as a

profession or a unionized workforce, have played a role in shaping national policy and development. We also saw that a burgeoning academic and policy literature (primarily in English) identifies Finland and Singapore as educational “models” given their disproportionate attention in global policy discourses. We thus wanted to critically assess the basis for “Nordic,” or “East Asian” models used in the literature and provide contrasts with how each nation has approached the reform of its teaching workforce. Finally, we seek to understand how changes in the nature of the global cultural dynamic have influenced the ways in which teachers and the nation-state interact.

THE VOLUMES

In this volume, then, we will pay close attention to the way that national cultural logics (LeTendre, 2023) have interacted with globally diffusing logics, and how we can more clearly see the inherent differences in the conceptualization of teachers in these eight nations. As we will show, teachers in Nordic and East Asian nations played a critical role in promoting national identity during periods of state formation. They were also critical actors in increasing the human capital potential of nations both during periods of national formation and in subsequent periods of global economic competition. Finally, within the current global dynamic, teachers continue to play a major role in these nations, affecting the types of national educational policies that are adopted or implemented.

In Volume II, we begin with the idea of the global cultural dynamic, that is, globalization itself is neither static nor a linear process. The impact and very nature of globalization varies over time and across geographic locations. While many will immediately associate globalization with increased trade and the interlinking of national economies, we highlight the increase in communication and the role of information and communication technologies in supporting an ongoing global cultural dynamic. This dynamic is not generated solely by transnational organizations but is incessantly elaborated and altered within national and transnational cultural contexts.

We also address the topic of shocks to the global dynamic, considering disparate events such as COVID-19 and the realignment of NATO in the wake of the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the subsequent election of Trump. Such events highlight the fact that globalization impacts nations at different speeds and forces. We spend more time analyzing how the rapid development of information and communications technology, from the advent of the internet through social media to the explosion of generative artificial intelligence (AI), has reshaped how we think about globalization and cultural production. Cultural production, in the post-COVID-19 world, occurs at multiple levels or within multiple spheres, and is transmitted almost instantaneously around the world.

Volume II moves beyond earlier formulations of a “world culture”¹ that posited production and dissemination of elements of a world culture as primarily transmitted by transnational organizations (e.g., the theories of global governance or diffusion via INGOs in neo-institutional theory), to one that recognizes

that the basic rationales or “cultural logics” of institutions are continually being elaborated, renewed, and revised. Within this cultural dynamic, national administrations, political parties, and even teacher organizations have become self-aware “actors” on a “global stage” that pursue their own agendas and react to one another. The advent of generative AI means that multiple non-state actors now have the ability to influence large swaths of the world population, opening the potential to inundate national administrators and policymakers with computer-assisted political advocacy and even outright misinformation campaigns. Having become inexpensive and virtually indistinguishable from human-generated materials, computer-generated images, text, and interactive programs are reshaping educational politics, reform efforts, and influencing public opinion in ways that were hard to imagine just a few years ago.

Focus and Intent of Volume I

This volume is organized around three major themes or findings that emerged from our work. The first is the importance of the relationship between teachers and the nation-state in shaping national educational policy and the functions of the public school system. The second is the reconceptualization of teaching as a mass profession. The third is a reconceptualization of regionality, particularly in regard to our understandings of local, national, and regional interactions with a global cultural dynamic. What we have uncovered is that despite considerable national differences in events and timing, there are identifiable patterns in how teachers interacted with the state over time. Additionally, we could also discern identifiable patterns in how regionality is manifested and how this affects teacher–state relations.

Relationships between teachers and the state were not static in any of the nations we analyzed, and the dynamics of the relationship have had significant repercussions for both the status of teachers within the nation and the nation’s ability to carry out educational reforms. Teachers in some nations, early on, mobilized as an independent group (either as a profession or a unionized workforce) and aligned themselves with state goals (e.g., Finland; see [Furuhagen & Holmén, 2021](#)). In other cases, teachers as a group were in open conflict with the government (e.g., Japan), often bringing policy reforms to a standstill ([Schoppa, 1991](#)). Within some nations, the state has sought to accommodate and formally include representatives of teachers’ groups, as in Norway, as part of the larger role given to unions in policy consideration. In other countries, like Korea or Taiwan, teachers’ attempts to organize as unions were initially banned, as the state tried to control teacher organization. The shifting power dynamics between teachers and the state are critical to understanding how nations respond to globally diffusing educational reforms and how national policymakers participate in and make sense of world culture.

In this regard, it is also important to consider the nature of teaching as a profession within each nation’s historical context. As a mass profession, teachers have a profound impact on socialization, making them essential to any state administration concerned with national identity. In states like Korea, Taiwan,

and Singapore, national unity and identity had to be achieved in a much shorter timeframe than for Nordic nations. If we re-conceptualize teaching as a “mass” profession, that is, one that draws its legitimacy from both cultural logics around the idea of “teacher” and the logic of the institution of mass schooling, we can reconcile national differences in how the profession developed in each nation with broader patterns of teacher–state interactions.

Taking a long historical approach allows us to see how teachers and the state shaped each other in a path dependent processes which has been increasingly affected by global flows of information and transnational actors who strategically position themselves as moderators who provide impartial measures of educational standards (Sorensen & Robertson, 2020), policy advocates (Meyer & Benavot, 2013a), and promoters of innovation in educational reform (Mezza, 2022). The repercussions of these historical processes can be vividly seen in how national administrations and teacher collectives respond to globally diffusing norms of teacher professional development and teacher leadership (which we take up in Chapters 2 and 3).

While there are undeniable regional similarities, models of regionality employed in comparative education often draw on broad cultural assumptions – for example, a commitment to social egalitarianism versus neo-Confucian value of education – and typically fail to consider the impact of a global cultural dynamic that influences how teacher unions, national administrations and a plethora of national organizations position themselves as stakeholders in debates about what is affecting teachers and schools, and what to do about it. Analysis of regional interactions between nation-states shows the complex turns that globalization has taken over time, as well as how long globalization has impacted education. Here, the concept of a profession appears to not only have differential meaning in the two regional contexts, but how teachers attained a professional standing appears to depend on their relationship with the state. Both Japanese colonial rule (Tsurumi, 1977) and the conflict with the People’s Republic of China significantly shaped social perceptions of Taiwanese teachers and how teachers could mobilize as a collective. A comprehensive theoretical model must account for both global and regional environments in which national actors work toward different, sometimes aligning, sometimes conflicting, goals.

We also wish to draw particular attention to the fact that the global cultural dynamic creates both the opportunity and the need for national actors to appeal to global audiences (and adopt global themes) to further their own ends. Our thinking here has been influenced by the theories of “two level” games in political science (see Moravcsik, 1993; Putnam, 1988). While referencing global audiences is not a new idea in comparative education, little attention has been paid to differences in the degree of reflexivity or skill that different nations or national actors display in leveraging global attention. Such attention can be used by actors to promote their views (or political agendas) on educational reform. For countries like Singapore or Finland, being a “league table leader” results in opportunities for national actors to portray their own reform agendas as consistent with a global movement. Thus, actors seek to use the culturally constructed logics available in the broader world to advance their own goals

(e.g., [Sahlberg & Walker, 2021](#)), and in doing so may create new cultural “products” or logics ([LeTendre, 2023](#)).

Recognition of the greater role that national actors have in the production of a global cultural dynamic also reveals that more theoretical work needs to be done in comparative education to conceptualize how regions, regional networks or regional effects interact with world culture dynamics in order to fully understand how the effect of globalization on nation-states varies over time and across place. This third major idea draws on world systems theory, where scholars had early on posited impacts “of economic and cultural dependency, center and periphery, convergence and divergence in the international order” ([Arnové, 1980](#)). Such works are often singularly focused on a political economy perspective and fail to account for regional dynamic interactions within a world culture ([Sorensen & Dumay, 2021](#)). Similar theories of “regimes” of teacher beliefs ([Fraser & Ikoma, 2015](#); [Tahirşylaj et al., 2015](#)) or “cultural spheres” ([Windzio & Martens, 2022a](#)) have explored how similar cultural values can promote the faster spread of certain reforms, but have not explored how such cultural interaction can produce new forms that then influence the broader global cultural dynamic.

TEACHERS, SCHOOLS, AND THE NATION-STATE

Much of the work in these two volumes looks at events that take place from the 1950s on, that is, after the period that [Meyer \(1977a\)](#) termed the “world educational revolution.” Yet, a post-World War II framework is insufficient to capture critical events in earlier periods of national history, when teachers shaped the course of national development. The existence of teachers and national school systems pre-dates the rise of mass schooling ([Meyer et al., 1992](#); [Ramirez & Boli, 1987a](#)) in some nations (see [Dore, 1965](#) for a discussion of schools in Tokugawa Japan). Following [Anderson \(1983\)](#), we realized we needed to understand the evolution of the concept of nation and teacher as theoretical and political constructs that have developed over time. This meant analyzing how the role of schools and teachers shifted as modes of government transitioned from imperial to national systems. Because the development of imperial systems of education pre-date the global spread of mass schooling in some states, teachers’ roles in these systems affected the early development of mass schooling and national identity.

There is a considerable literature on the role that educational systems (e.g., mass schooling) play in the development of the nation-state. Education has been associated with positive development among low-income nations, post-colonial states, and post-conflict societies ([Colclough, 1982](#); [Heyneman & Loxley, 1983](#); [Psacharopoulos, 1988](#)). This positive association between school quality and economic competitiveness is also assumed to occur within developed nations, although the empirical evidence on this point is thinner ([Ramirez et al., 2006](#)). Others, drawing on [Esping-Andersen \(1990\)](#), argue that educational policies are the outcome of national political conflicts within industrialized nations ([Hega & Hokenmaier, 2002](#); [Torres, 1989](#)). Still others see a convergence of ideological