

"The road to hell is paved with good intentions"

Teacher education discourse in Finnish committee reports from 1922 to 1991

Hannu Simola
University of Helsinki

Paper presented at the 1992 AARE/NZARE Joint Conference
Educational Reform Symposium
Deakin University, Geelong, Australia
22-26 November, 1992

Contents

1. Conditions of discourse
2. Outlining Foucauldian approach
3. What do I mean by "discourse analysis"
4. Transformations and continuities in discursive themes
5. A proposal for some principles of discourse
6. Discussion and conclusion

Abstract

The topic of the paper is the "professionalization" of the popular teacher in the light of certain politico-administrative texts. The analysis is inspired by Michel Foucault, but some other theoretical approaches (especially those of Randall Collins, Pierre Bourdieu, David Labaree and John Meyer) are also introduced. Five transformations and one continuity in discursive themes are traced and, based on these, two discursive principles are formulated: the pastoralization of teaching and the professionalization of teacher educators. In relation to these principles, certain specific forms of power, knowledge and subjectivity are analysed in the field of education.

Correspondence: Faculty of Education, University of Helsinki, Bulevardi 18, SF-00120 Helsinki, FINLAND. Phone: +358-0-191 8059; telefax: +358-0-191 8073; e-mail: HSIMOLA@FINUH or hsimola@cc.helsinki.fi

* * *

This paper is part of my dissertation project entitled "Educational reform as a social field: Structuration of discourse in Finnish teacher education". Therefore, I shall not present here any final results, any finished conclusions or definitive formulations, but rather a sketch - a somehow systematic treatment of some questions and preliminary findings of my study.

The topic of the paper is the discursive change in popular teaching at the politico-administrative level. The term popular refers here to the teachers who teach the whole age group of pupils: before the comprehensive school reform in the '70s, they were primary school teachers and, after the reform, both primary and lower secondary school teachers. The question of the study could be formulated as follows: How has the serious and authoritative conception of teaching changed in government committee

reports during the years of educational reforms? Or in other words: How the "truth" of teaching in one period changes to another "truth" in the next period? And as important as what has changed, is the question of what has not changed.

First, I shall describe some conditions of those discursive formations analysed here: three Finnish educational reforms are briefly introduced. Certain peculiarities of committee reports as text material are also presented. The second section outlines a theory of discursive practices developed by Michel Foucault. The busy reader who is not very interested in Foucault, might well skip this section to the next one where the concepts and the strategy of this study shall be presented. In the fourth section, five transformations and one continuity in discursive themes are displayed. In the final section, two discursive principles are put forward and, based on them, certain specific forms of power/knowledge/subjectivity are introduced.

1. Conditions of committee discourse

The reports of government committees on teacher education¹ cover the period examined here well: since 1922 there have been 16 committees and during the most interesting years, from 1950 to 1979, there has been one committee (or a corresponding working group) convening and making proposals for teacher education reform almost continuously. The committee reports also have a certain continuity, for traditionally every report relates its work to its predecessors. Besides these, other official texts are also utilized: especially curriculum documents from 1916 to 1992 and committee reports on comprehensive school reform from 1948 to 1976.

While covering practically the whole 20th century, my study, however, focuses on the years since World War II. The twenty years since the late 1960s are sometimes called "The Golden Era" of educational reforms. Those constitute, naturally, an important context for this study². Firstly, a process of rationalization, centralization and systematization was realized through the comprehensive school reform (1972-77). The eight-year compulsory school and the parallel grammar school were replaced by the modern comprehensive school, consisting of nine years of compulsory education. It is fair to claim that only then could the Finnish system of basic education lasting several years reach such an extent as to be considered "a natural part of the normal individual development of every citizen". The state school system became institutionalized into "a definitive part of the modern system of government" and has also legitimated itself "as an irreplaceable social institution from the point of view of the interest of both the state and the individual" (Kivinen 1988, 331-335).

Secondly, the teacher education reform (1973-79) was concerned with the training of teachers for comprehensive and upper secondary schools. The change, however, was most radical in primary school teacher training. Their training was moved from teachers' colleges and small-town "seminaries" to the brand-new university faculties of education. At the same time, the career of the primary school teacher was finally limited for

those who had proved their ability and willingness in the ever-lengthening schooling apparatus: for the graduates of upper secondary school. Within a twelve year period, the length of occupational preparation for primary school teaching was doubled and it was finally raised to the Master's degree level.

This meant a dramatic change in the role of educational studies. Until the 1960s, educational studies are seen as just one subject among others, for example, handicrafts or mathematics. Between 1965 and 1975, the proposed number of studies in education leaps from 11 credits to 52 credits³. Among other consequences, education as an academic discipline expanded strongly. The number of professorships in education increased between 1960 and 1990 from 6 to 104 while, in the other Nordic countries there are only 10 to 30 comparable academic posts. Compared to other disciplines in the Finnish academic field, the number of professorships in education is double the number of posts in history and sociology combined. This increase is comparable only with that of the economic sciences (Antikainen 1987).

This was, at least partly, due to the third reform, the general syllabus and degree reform of higher education (1977-80) that abolished the bachelor degree. From then on, the basic academic degree was to be a higher university degree comparable to an M.A. The pursuit of teacher education reform was extremely compatible with the ideas of general higher education reform. The three catchwords for it, formulated by the government in 1974, were "vocational orientation, extensiveness, and polytechnicity". The general goal was to integrate professional and scientific education, and, through introducing the credit system, to increase the effectiveness and flexibility of higher education. The studies were now organized as "degree programs" directed always toward a certain vocation. As good examples of this "vocationalization" of the university, new faculties of education were established as "teacher education units", and in their original plans they had no degree program for researchers - only those for teaching and educational planning.

As mentioned above, the material in this study consists of reports of government committees on education. What are these texts like? Pierre

Bourdieu (1990, 136) characterizes the official view expressed in an official text through their three functions. Firstly, "it performs a diagnostic, that is, an act of cognition which enforces recognition and which, quite often, tends to affirm what a person or a thing is and what it is universal, for every possible person, and thus objectively." Secondly, the administrative text "via directives, orders, prescriptions etc., says what people have to do, given what they are." Thirdly, "it says what people really have done, as in autized accounts such as police reports." While the Finnish government committee reports do not possess any formal legislative power, their prescriptive character is reflected, e.g., in the way some of them have been taken as administrative orders⁴. The most of the committees have had among their tasks to formulate legislative proposals for teacher education⁵. The institution of a government committee is one of the basic forms of activity whereby the work of public administration is carried out

in Finland.⁶ According to a Finnish study, education ". . . has traditionally been an area in which government committees have played a particularly central role in the planning and preparation of government action and in drafting government policy for the sector as a whole. It is through the institution of the committee that education has been brought under strict governmental control, and the committee has become a vital instrument of educational policy as practiced by the state." (Hovi, et al 1989, 243)

The authority of committees is not limited to the politico-administrative domain. Nearly every committee also contains experts of educational science and teacher education. The reports are curriculum documents, both in the strict and broad meaning of the term. Many of them contain exact plans where the schedules, goals and contents of studies are explicitly stated⁷. In the broader meaning of the concept of curriculum, the reports deal with a whole scale of prescriptions, proposals and instructions for organization and procedures of teacher training.⁸

But a curriculum document also has more than just pedagogical functions. Let me just mention briefly three functions that often go without reflection in curriculum studies. Firstly, a curriculum has to convince certain key groups of the value of its vision, utopia or scenario. In the case of teacher education, those groups, besides political decision makers, are the teachers' unions. (see, e.g., Rinne 1987b, Ziehe 1991, Simola, forthcoming). Secondly, although teachers very often take a sceptical view of curriculum documents, seeing them just as utopian rhetoric without connection to the reality of schooling, they tend to form their professional identity on it⁹. It is reasonable to assume that there exist similar tendencies among teacher educators, too. Thirdly, as an authoritative text, the curriculum makes certain things important, meaningful and worth imitating. At issue is the question of producing a serious, reasonable, and respected way to speak about teaching and teacher education. Simultaneously, however, choosing the right way to speak about it implies rejecting of some alternatives. As important as what and how teaching and teacher education are spoken about is what remains silent. Curriculum thus participates in building something Bourdieu calls borders of doxa or "the universe of possible discourse" (Bourdieu 1977, 159-171) .

The committee reports seek to form a compromise and, as such, to appear as the "general will". However, the consensus is only apparent because the leading role in committees on teacher education has always been in the hands of state school officials and representatives of educational science/teacher education, while teachers and politicians (as representatives of parents) have rarely been members of those committees (see Table 1 in the appendix). Teacher education has been seen as a matter of specialists: those from administration and science. It is thus fair to conclude that the texts of the committees are also serious verbal acts of experts who speak as experts. Thus it seemed sound to conclude that - quoting Foucault - committee texts are exactly those discursive "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault 1969/1972, 49).

2. Outlining a Foucauldian approach

I capitalize here on the ideas of analysing the discursive practices

developed by Michel Foucault, especially in his work *Archaeology of Knowledge*. One basic task of the book is to argue for the legitimacy and reasonableness of such an analysis, which though far from being a strict theory could offer a new vision, a fresh possibility for historical studies. 10

". . . not that I have constructed a rigorous theoretical model but that I have freed a coherent domain of description, that I have, if not established the model, at least opened up and arranged the possibility of one, if I have been able to 'loop the loop', and show that the analysis of discursive formations really is centred on a description of a statement in its specificity. In short, if I have been able to show that they really are the proper dimensions of the statement that are at work in the mapping of discursive formations. Rather than founding a theory . . . my present concern is to establish a possibility." (AK, 114-115)

Although the proposal is characterized by an admirable pursuit of systematic and exact formulations, Foucault himself seems to doubt the finality of his work. Near the end of the book, he finds it possible that the archaeology outlined there would be taken up "later elsewhere, in a different way, at the higher level, or using different methods" since ". . . archeology is doing nothing more than playing the role of an instrument that makes it possible to articulate, in a less imprecise way than in the past, the analysis of social formations and epistemological descriptions; or which make it possible to relate an analysis of the positions of the subject to a theory of the history of the sciences; or which make it possible to situate the place of intersection between a general theory of production and a generative analysis of statements." 11(AK, 208)

In the next few pages I shall seek to outline that possibility with regard to my study. Thus, my approach to the Foucauldian archaeology could be characterized "happy instrumentalist": I see it as a sketch of a new domain and approach that might be useful for my actual purposes. 12 At first I shall dwell briefly in the "twilight zone", in the concept of discursive formations. Then I shall sketch three methodical principles - relationality, multiplicity and immanence - that seem to be essential through all his works. 13

A basic intellectual task of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* 14 is to challenge the myth of unity and continuity in history of ideas. Foucault's thesis is that it is not a common object, a style, concepts, or a thematic which account for unity but rather the presence of a systematic dispersion of those elements. He characterizes his aim as follows:

"My aim was to analyse this history in the discontinuity that no teleology would reduce in advance; to map it in a dispersion that no pre-established horizon would embrace; to allow it to be deployed in an anonymity on which no transcendental constitution would impose the form of the subject; to open it up to a temporality that would not promise the return of any dawn."

(AK, 203)

The regularities in history, if there are some, could be found, according to Foucault's proposal, at the level of discursive formations rather than in the intentions of the actors or in the transcendental reason of man; in the dispersion of elements rather than in their continuity and unity. Thus one might not be surprised while, instead of looking for the unities and continuities of objects, styles, themes, strategies, concepts etc. in human history, Foucault seeks to trace the dispersion itself with its "gaps, discontinuities, its entanglements, its incompatibilities" (AK, 72), with its "ruptures, breaks, thresholds and limits" (AK, 31), and tries to find regularities there:

"Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, . . . that we are dealing with a discursive formation." (AK, 38)

A system of formation -or "a complex group of relations that function as a rule"- conceptualized by Foucault is literally located at the "prediscursive"¹⁵ level, for they constitute conditions in and under which it is possible for a discourse to exist. They lay down "what must be

related, in a particular discursive practice, for such and such an enunciation to be made, for such and such a concept to be used, for such and such a strategy to be organized".¹⁶ (AK, 74; see also Smart 1985, 39) As examples of the rules that on the "preconceptual level" are formulating a discursive practice, Foucault gives four "theoretical schemata" studied in his earlier book *The Order of Things* (1966/1991) and which characterized General Grammar in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Those concepts (attribution, articulation, designation, and derivation) were not in fact used by the Classical grammarians, but they helped to reveal "the profound compatibility of these different, apparently opposed systems" (AT, 60-61). Those rules of formation

". . . operate not only in the mind or consciousness of individuals, but in discourse itself; they operate therefore, according to a sort of uniform anonymity, on all individuals who undertake to speak in this discursive field. . . . [O]ne does not suppose them to be universally valid for every domain; one always describes them in particular discursive field, and one does not accord them at the outset indefinite possibilities of extension." (AK, 63)¹⁷

The basic element of discursive formation is a statement, which is defined as different from the sentence, the proposition, or the speech act, by which Foucault refers to grammar, logics and linguistics as an insufficient definition base for statements. The statement is not a structure but "a function of existence that properly belongs to signs . . . it is not in self a unit, but a function that cuts across a domain of

structures and possible unities, and which reveals them with concrete contents, in time and space" (AK, 86-87; see also Smart 1985, 40)¹⁸ And later: a statement is an "enunciative function that involved various units . . . relates them to a field of objects . . . opens up for them a number of positive subjective positions. . . places them in a space in which they are used and repeated."¹⁹ (AK, 106)

Thus, for Foucault, "the discourse is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is, in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence. . . . [T]he term discourse can be defined as the group of statements that belong to a single system of formation".²⁰ (AK, 107) The particular object studied by the archaeologist, in the Foucauldian sense, is thus a discursive practice that

". . . must not be confused with expressive operation by which an individual formulates an idea, desire, an image; nor with the rational activity that may operate in a system of inference; nor with the 'competence' at a speaking subject when he constructs grammatical sentences; it is a body of anonymous, historical rules, always determined in the time and space that have defined a given period, and for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic area, the conditions of operation of enunciative function." (AK, 116-7)

Maybe partly because of being always clearly a "marginal man" in his intellectual development, maybe partly because of evading always the sort of labelling which would place him firmly under one or another of the established compartments, Foucault is often described as an antisystematic, escaping thinker. No description could, I think, be more wrong. Nevertheless, he was always moving in relation to the domains he was working on, he moved within the same basic theme which can be characterized as that of technologies of truth. Apart from the continuity of the theme, it is also possible to find a clear methodological continuity in his work. Here I shall outline briefly three methodological principles that seem to be valuable in this study: those principles of relationality, multiplicity, and immanence.

Firstly, Foucault emphasizes strict relationality in his analysis. To talk of relationships is, of course, nothing new but very often the relationships are treated as things. The relations are one of the most important concepts of an archaeological analysis of the formation of discourse. The relations shall be studied as a concrete and practical process. In a particular period in the history of our society, Foucault gives an example, as the delinquent was psychologized and pathologized and criminal behaviour gave rise to a whole series of objects of knowledge. This was because a group of particular and concrete relations - relations established between authorities of emergence, delimitation and specification- were adopted for use in psychiatric discourse. And not because of various "discoveries" like that of a resemblance between criminal and pathological behaviour, nor that of the presence in certain delinquents of the classical signs of alienation, nor mental derangement. Only certain concrete relations made possible the formation of a whole group of various objects of discourse. (AK, 43)

As another example, the appearance of the clinical discourse must not be regarded as the result of new technique of observation, nor as the result of the search for pathogenic causes in the depths of the organism, nor as the effect of a new institution, nor as the result of the introduction of a new concept of tissue, but
". . . as the establishment of a relation, in medical discourse, between a number of distinct elements, some of which concerned the status of doctors, others the institutional and technical site from which they spoke, others they position as subjects perceiving, observing, describing, teaching etc.

It can be said that this relation between different elements (some of which are new, while others were already in existence) us effected by clinical discourse: it is this, as a practice, that establishes between them all a system of relations that is not given or constituted a priori ; and if there is a unity, if the modalities of enunciation that it uses, or to which it gives place, are not simply juxtaposed by a series of historical contingencies, it is because it makes constant use of this group of relations." (AT, 53-54) 21

Hence, one should not be surprised that when he was asked about his use of the concept of "power", Foucault requested in one of his last interviews:

"I hardly ever use the word "power" and if I do sometimes, it is always a short cut to the expression I always use: the relationships of power. . . . [I]n human relations, what ever they are - whether it be a question of communication verbally . . . or a question of a love relationship, an institutional or economic relationship - power is always present: I mean the relationships in which one wishes to direct the behaviour of another. these are relationships that one can find at different levels, under different forms: these relationships of power are changeable relations, i.e., they can modify themselves, they are not given once and for all. . . . In order to exercise a relation of power, there must be on both sides at least a certain form of liberty. . . . [I]f there are relations of power throughout every social field it is because there is freedom everywhere." (Foucault 1984/1988, 11-12)

The second methodological principle could be characterized as multiplicity²². Foucault always talks of relationships in the plural. When he was asked in an interview about his relation to the political "system", he started by criticizing the use the word system in the singular, and characterized himself as a pluralist who had set himself the task of "the individualization of discourse". One should seek to describe, as the episteme of a period, not a totalizing sum of its knowledge, but
". . . the divergences, the distances, the oppositions, the differences, the relations of its various scientific discourses: the episteme is not a sort of underlying theory, it is a space of dispersion, it is an open and doubtless indefinitely describable field of relationships. . . . [T]he episteme is not a slice of history common to all the sciences: it is a simultaneous play of specific remanences. . . . The episteme is not a general developmental stage of reason, it is a complex relationship of

successive displacements." (Foucault 1968/1991, 53-54)

He was never interested in finding totalizing hard cores or truths but rather in tracing regularities of their dispersion. It is important to note that the emphasis should be put on both words: both regularities and dispersion. Otherwise, the concept of dispersion might lead one to label Foucault as an antisystematic, diffuse thinker. The concept of regularity, which he repeats over and over e.g., in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, reminds us of his pursuit to strict systematicness. Besides, we should not forget that the Chair Foucault held in the Collège de France was that of "History of Systems of Thought".

Finally, the third methodological principle could be named the principle of immanence. It is fair to say that Foucault always approached this theme through three domains: through analysis of power, knowledge and subject. Although the emphasis and focus shifted in his different works, a methodological principle can be seen: he never treated knowledge, power/subjectivity as relationships that are separable from each other, but as relationships that are immanent in each other. This might be seen, e.g., as a point in his notion of the positivity of power: the relation of power/knowledge unavoidably contains the dimension of formation of subjectivity. "My problem has always been . . . the problem of the relationship between subject and truth", Foucault said in one of his last interviews (Foucault 1984/1988, 9). It will be this principle of immanence in particular that is applied in the last section of this paper.

3. What do I mean by "discourse analysis"?

Because I'm going to analyze texts here, the approach might be characterized as discourse analysis. There are two simple reasons for using

that notorious concept of discourse here: its everyday meaning in Latin and in English. In Latin, the noun "discursus" means bustling about, running off in several directions.²³ In English, "[a] discourse is a serious talk or piece of writing which is intended to teach or explain something. (...) If someone discourses on a subject, they talk in an authoritative way about it."²⁴ These two very conventional meanings are enough to motivate the use of the concept of discourse here: discourse as a specific active and material, serious and authoritative way of using language. And even more specifically here, referring to Foucault, discourse is not whatever text or talk but that of aiming to produce "truths."

Foucault always studied phenomena with an immense time span. Here I shall scrutinize texts that mostly derive from just some thirty-twenty years back. Thus the layers as well as instruments for their archeological excavation must be from a different tool-kit. I am making use of Foucault's ideas on archaeology of discourse in a fairly eclectic and vigorous way: they are used here as heuristic tools for attacking certain historical text material, and the criteria for assessment will be rather the results of that work than any faithful correspondence to his model.

The subject of scrutinizing here are those discursive practices of a specific discursive formation - a committee discourse on teacher education, defined in time and space. The reason for utilizing here the concept of

discourse and not, e.g., rhetorics or just the contents of a text, is that what constitutes and rules that verbal production is not completely reducible to the conscious ideas nor intentions of speakers; nor to the history of ideas or to the history of interests; nor to linguistics or to psychology. There might be some rules or discursive principles, which could explain certain changes in that discourse. And to outline those tacit discursive principles - neither conscious nor unconscious, neither visible nor hidden maybe because they are so self-evident, maybe over-familiar - that is the main task of this study.

The discursive formation is constituted by statements or elements of discourse which can be characterized simply as serious and authoritative verbal, "true" manifestations. An example is the sentence "the society defines the goals for comprehensive school"; or the idea that the teacher has to take in account the social and cultural background of every pupil and construct his/her teaching on that fact; or the thought that there are no limits in learning in a school context. The focus of the study is not, however, on single discursive elements but on the discursive themes they form, and finally, transformations and continuities in certain aspects of those discursive themes. Examples of discursive themes here are the definition of goals for schooling, the range of responsibility of the teacher, and the demands put on the teacher. The basic question, after being able to point out certain discursive themes, is to analyse what has happened to them over the years, especially during the established educational reforms. Hence, I am asking if certain aspects of the conception of goal definition have changed and in what sense; if some of the things demanded of the teacher have changed; what about the conception of the teaching profession - is it still the same as earlier and in what relations etc.

The course of analysis is articulated here as a two-step process. In the first phase, the interpretation is focused on the elements of discourse. It seeks to trace the discursive themes, and the transformations and continuities in them (section 4). The second step could be characterized as an "interpretative detection" of discursive principles of those changes (section 5).

The aim of the first phase is to map or to describe statements, discursive themes, and their transformations and continuities in the text material focused in this study. Two issues seem to be vital here: the idea of distancing and the the problem of argumentation.

An essential part of Foucault's archaeological method is to try to distance oneself from conventional models of thinking when approaching the research material. 25 A group of statements shall be analysed ". . . not as the closed, plethoric totality of a meaning, but as an incomplete, fragmented figure; to describe a group of statements not with reference to the interiority of an intention, a thought, or a subject, but in accordance with the dispersion of an exteriority; to describe a group of

statements, in order to rediscover not the moment or the trace of their origin, but the specific forms of an accumulation". It is "certainly not to to uncover an interpretation, to discover a foundation, or to free

constituent acts; nor is it to decide on a rationality, or to embrace a teleology. It is to establish what I am quite willing to call positivity. To analyze a discursive formation therefore is to deal with a group of verbal performances at the level of the statements and of the form of the positivity of a discourse." (AK, 125)

The analysis of statements shall be
". . . a description of things said, precisely as they were said. The analysis of statements . . . is a historical analysis, but one that avoids all interpretation: it does not question things said as to what they are hiding, what they were 'really' saying, in spite of themselves, the unspoken element that they contain, the proliferation of thoughts, images or fantasies that inhabit them; but on the contrary; it questions them as to their mode of existence, what it means to them to have come into existence, to have left traces, and perhaps to remain there, awaiting the moment when they might be of use once more; what it means to them to have appeared when and where they did - they and no others." (AK, 109)

Foucault immediately admits that this task is a difficult one, but I think one can argue at least partly for it while working with concrete text material. It simply means that every continuity, rupture, transformation etc. in a theme traced in description shall be clearly and exactly argued with citations and explanations so that the reader is able to follow and question the logic of every single conclusion made in this phase of analysis. The main source of bias will thus be in the "density of discourse" - the fact that every collection of statements can always be nothing more than just a slight and pale sample of the all possible statements in the concrete text material.

In the second phase - in an interpretative detection - I will examine the concrete transformations and continuities found in description of discursive themes as facts of discursive practices in a certain historically, geographically and linguistically defined politico-administrative discourse. They are treated as facts of Finnish government committee discourse on teacher education from 1922 to 1991 in need of explanation. Thus, I attempt to outline rules for discursive formation, or - as I will put it: a "principle of discourse" - that would be able to explain the changes in the discursive themes in question. Their dispersion is interpreted here as incompatibility or inconsistency of the changes with the conventional explanations.

In this phase I shall introduce to the discussion other elements - scientific theories, non-discursive practices, statistical facts, related discourses, interest of agents, experiences of other countries etc. - because their role is to help in bringing out the possible principles of discourse. Thus the basic task of the phase is to bring the discursive facts found in descriptive analysis in contact with the "outside world". The principles of discourse that I might be able to outline should be seen as highly hypothetical, "non-totalizing", or "optional" in their nature. At their best, they could form well-grounded hypothesis; carefully argued alternatives for the idea of historical "development" of teacher education. My basic responsibility in the limits of this study is to assess whether principle(s) are able to explain the discursive facts found here from a text material that consists just of a fragment of something which might be

called the discourse of education or schooling.

4. Transformations and continuities in discursive themes

I will introduce in the following section certain discursive themes as well as certain transformations and continuities in them. In this paper, I am not able to argue for them with empirical material - e.g., with concrete citations, strict descriptions, exact documentation - because of the limits of space and time. That description will not be by any means a small task. Every transformation and continuity in each discursive theme is to be verified at the statement level one by one. It should be done with such accuracy that the reader will be able to assess the validity of induction from statements to the discursive themes and their changes. The only thing I can say at this stage is that it seems to be possible to verify the

existence of the following transformations and continuities in themes from the text material. This conviction is based on the careful and systematic notes made during two close-readings of teacher education committee texts, consisting of 2,000 pages. In the following, those transformations and continuities in discursive themes are briefly displayed.

(1) Transformation from ethics as aims to goal rationalization: In the texts until the middle of the 1960s, the goals are seen as etatist moral philosophical characterizations and considerations of the ideal citizen. It is these goals which are the basis for the aim and justification for schooling rather than being concrete objectives for the planning and everyday work in schools. In short, the goals function as a rhetoric introduction to other proposals. In the 1970s, the goals crop up as the basis for both contents, methods and evaluation of teaching. They become the most important tools for an effective and efficient educational reform. The comprehensive school reform is seen - as much as a reform of the school system - as a reform of the curriculum and the goals. Therefore it is fair to say that it is a discursive reform in a very essential sense. At the general level, the proposed goals are very abstract and ambitious. They are self-evident and well-intentioned in a manner which does not allow dissenting opinions. But at the level of objectives, they are strictly defined, rationalized and hierarchized. In the middle of the 1980s, the extreme goal centrism gives way to a more moderate view, but the planning is still clearly based on the goals.

(2) Continuity in the decontextualization of goals: Nevertheless, there is a certain continuity through all these transformations in relation to the goals. Learning in the school context is seen as a general human learning but not as a very specific type of learning framed by certain socio-historical and cultural conditions; not as learning in school. This "decontextualization of goals" appears in various forms. First, the goals seem to be something from the "outside", from the "above" that have to be taken-for-granted in self-evident consensus. The formulations like "the society needs", "the international integration calls", "the school legislations require" are typical. Secondly, the texts abandon the analysis of the school as well as teacher education as a historically formed, socio-cultural institutions framing the possibilities of learning. I put it

simply, the goal setting is based on the analysis of hopes rather than on that of the reality.

Maybe one of the most striking examples of neglecting the reality-analysis is that goals and demands are posed on the abstract "comprehensive school teacher", although the working conditions of primary school teachers differ radically from those of lower secondary school teachers. This might not be so unexpected until the early 1970s, but since the concepts like the "hidden curriculum", frame factors, reproduction or symbolic violence of schooling were introduced in the academic discourse of education, it is rather surprising. Thirdly, the expressions of the educational optimism appear more and more as confessions of faith in the ability of the schooling institution to meet the requirements, needs and hopes of the "society" and its other "clients". In short, the texts might be characterized more and more as institutional promises.

(3) Transformation of the teacher's responsibility from classroom teaching to individual pupil-learning: Up to the 1960s, the main task of the teacher is seen in teaching a classroom full of pupils. In all texts since 1922, pupils are treated as individuals but the teacher is not responsible for the learning results of individual pupils. A committee report from 1946 puts it clearly: "The main task of the teacher is to guide the studies of the pupil and not to check their results." If the teacher does his/her best, in an adequate way, it is out of his/her responsibility if somebody does not learn. In the 1970s, the responsibility of the teacher reaches to the learning results of an individual pupil. While before the reform the goals aim to determine what the teacher should teach, since the 1970s, they determine what the pupil should learn. The rationalized and hierarchized goals impose certain level that shall be reached by every pupil.

Therefore, the school commits itself officially to promises and assurances of "overcoming the learning difficulties", of the "well-balanced development of the whole personality", and of reaching "the capacity for upper secondary level education" in the case of every pupil. As one

culmination of this discourse, we might see the abolition of the relative assessment of pupils' in 1985: their achievements are no more to be related to their peers nor the goals of the subject but to the capacities of individual pupils, evaluated by the teacher. At the same time, the goals in teacher education, logically, become strictly defined, hierarchized and very ambitious. The teacher for the comprehensive school really shall be an "expert who is specialized in the full guidance of the pupil" as worded in a report from 1972.

(4) Transformation from model behaviour to model intention: Up to the late 1960s, the conception of primary school teaching is clearly formed on the ideal of the teacher as a model citizen. In the same way, it is now formed on ideals rather than on reality: on goals, intentions and visions opened by educational reforms. Thus, there is a continuity in the idealistic base of the occupational image. This combination, of reality and intentions to ameliorate it, is curious. The conception of primary school teaching as a profession seems essentially based on the hope of how the school ought to be - i.e. on reform plans and especially on their aims. The come-back of

certain moralizing emphases in the 1989 report still strengthens this impression. The teacher is still clearly a model citizen, but there seems to be a shift from demands of external to internal behaviour. The basic distinction is made by formulating that the earlier teacher "has to be", "has to do" or "has to behave her/himself" in certain way to be accepted as a real teacher, while the later teacher is required rather "to know", "to have an attitude", "to struggle for", "to internalize". This could be characterized also as a shift in the qualifier of the model citizen from behaviour to intentions. Or, it could be seen as a certain psychologization of demands on the teacher.

(5) Transformation of the primary school teacher from the well-educated handyman to the science-legitimated expert: The transformation in occupational justification from moral devotion to science legitimated education appears to reflect a clear professionalization in the conception of primary school teaching. Until the late 1960s, their training is seen as a general preparation for a mission - with a strong patriotic and Christian emphasis - rather than as a training in any specialized knowledge and skills. The transformation from well-educated handyman to science legitimated expert is a two-stage process. Until the 1960s, educational studies are seen as just one subject among others, for example handicrafts or music. In the 1970s, the primary school teacher is seen as a specialist both in some school subjects and in educational sciences. Although the emphasis is on didactics, there are also references to sociology, philosophy and history of education. Only in the texts of the 1980s, the expertise is based purely on educational science, and now - what is remarkable - on a specialized knowledge base limited nearly completely to didactics and educational psychology. At the same time, the position of didactics as the core of that scientific basis is furthered in comparison with other educational sciences, e.g., by proposing the establishment of a "didactic alternative" in postgraduate studies and through the pursuit for expansion in different teacher training sectors.

(6) Transformation from necessity of psychology, ethics and pedagogics to didactics and educational psychology as the theoretical core for teacher education: Until the middle 1960s, educational studies comprise psychology, ethics and pedagogics, in that order. They are seen necessary for the teacher, but as an "all-round vocational education" rather than any knowledge base for professional activity. The basic elements of primary school teacher training are, in short, a certain subject knowledge (which is emphasized as "specialization" from 1950s until the late 1980s) and practice teaching. The number of educational studies remains the same in concrete proposals between 1922-66. All the time, there are worries for "too much theory" at the cost of "practice". Since the 1970s, educational studies form "the theoretical core" of teacher training. The teacher shall be able "to use theory in resolving practical dilemmas", be "researcher-like" because "that way teaching could become rather a rational than a haphazard activity". A formulation, in relation to the utility of educational theories for schooling practice, is often tirelessly optimistic: "there is not yet one theory but ..." or "research does not yet give answers but ..." or "teacher education shall be based on such as

educational philosophy and theory that ...".

As a conclusion, it seems fair to say that, during the educational reforms in Finland in the '70s, the comprehensive school as a social institution committed itself to the very ambitious but at the same time controversial, not say impossible goals. In a mass education system, it was promised, on the one hand, to individualize teaching in relation to personality and talents of every pupils. But on the other hand, it was promised to provide every pupil with the capacity for upper secondary studies. While posing these goals, the analysis of the school as a sociocultural, historically formed institution was displaced by the analysis of the ideal needs of the society and of the individual. The reform was based on two ideas: first, the planning and management by goals (and later by results), and second, the scientification of teacher training.

5. A proposal for some principles of discourse

In the following section, I will make two suggestions for discursive principles that might explain changes in discursive themes outlined in the previous section. I have named those principles the pastoralization of teaching and the professionalization of teacher educators. This last section could be characterized as a thought experiment where the two discursive principles are, first, introduced and then interpreted in relation to Foucauldian power/knowledge/subject -triangle.

Pastoralization of teaching

In one of his latest texts, Foucault (1983, 213-216) writes of the "pastoral power", characterized by him as a historically unique, "tricky combination in the same political structures of individualization techniques and of totalization procedures". The pastoral power was born with Christianity and its modernized form could be seen as a basic technique of the Western "governmentalized" state²⁶. According to Foucault, the Christianity was the only religion that organized itself as a Church where certain individuals can serve others as pastors: working for the salvation of parishioners, sacrificing themselves for them, treating them individually, having a special knowledge of their souls. Foucault sees the modern "governmentalized" state as "a very sophisticated structure, in which individuals can be integrated, under one condition: that this individuality would be shaped in a new form, and submitted to a set of very specific patterns." Thus, he concludes, "we can see the state as a modern matrix of individualization, or a new form of pastoral power." (ibid, 214)

There are three characteristics in this new pastoral power which distinguish it from its ecclesiastical precursor. First, the promised salvation concerns this world rather than the next one: i.e. health, well-being, security, protection against accidents etc. Second, the officials of the pastoral power have changed. Sometimes the pastoral power is exercised by public institutions, sometimes by private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors and generally by philanthropists; sometimes its individualizing "tactics" are exercised through the family, medicine, psychiatry, education and employers. Third, "the multiplication of the aims and agents of pastoral power focuses the development of knowledge of man around two roles: one, globalizing and quantitative, concerning the population; the

other, analytical, concerning the individual." (ibid, 215)

The idea of the pastoralization of teaching seems to explain the changes in discursive themes mentioned above.²⁷ But it also opens a tempting allegoric vision to the modern popular teacher profession: For example, what about seeing teaching as pastoral self-sacrificion because of the ambitious individual learning goals? And why not analyze the teacher as the Director of Souls because of the ambitious goals for individual personality development? Or what if we trace the faith in omnipotence of schooling as the substance of good intentions of a "true" teacher or teacher student? And why not interpret pupil-centered teaching as the Dogma, and Didactics or the Science of teaching as the Theology of this religion of schooling?

Here we come close to insightful ideas of mass education as "a religious foundation of modern society" presented by John Meyer and his colleagues (see, e.g., Boli, 1989 and Boli & Ramirez, 1986). Meyer claims that most of the sociologists of education are also trapped in the educational theory and ideology built into the educational system itself.

The core of that institutionalized theory is the deeply functionalist "principle of the rational and purposive character of education" (Meyer, 1986, 345): rational in its pursuit of progress and purposive in its fight against inequality. These functionalist blinders, according to Meyer, impotize the sociology of education to sceptical commentary on educational theory.

The alternative explanation line, according to Meyer, might be to view a mass educational system as "a response to (and a part of) an emergent MODEL of society, not to a society existing and functioning." (Meyer, 1989, xvi). Mass education is thus in a very essential and specific way idealistic; it is based on the modern dream of progress and justice, rather than on everyday reality. Thus, as a societal phenomenon, mass education contains deeply "cultural and quasi-religious character" and it should be analyzed, according to Meyer, "as a modern religious system held together by faith, but not the organizational structure, of rationality." (Meyer, 1986, 354, 352)

Professionalization of teacher educators

Donald Broady deliberates (see fn 27) on the illusion of the family tutor only from the point of view of a progressive educational movement. However, there might be another direction too where that illusion could be welcomed: the project for the professionalization of teaching - i.e. a science legitimated and research based training, higher social status and professional autonomy combined with full responsibility for the whole process of schooling.

An American scholar, David Labaree (1992)²⁸ has noted that those most eager in that project of professionalization of teaching in the USA are not the teachers themselves nor even their unions but the teacher educators. He argues that teacher professionalization is an extension of the effort by teacher educators to raise their professional status and the closely related effort by the same group to develop a science of teaching based on a formal rationalist model. Labaree warns that this pursuit "may promote

the rationalization of classroom instruction by generating momentum toward an authoritative, research-driven, and standardized vision of teaching practice". This might enhance the professional position of teacher educators and their influence within schools but, as another side of the coin, it might reinforce the vision of teaching as a technical activity and increase the political distance between teachers and parents.²⁹ Referring to Foucault, Labaree sees the American professionalization movement as a symptom and agency of the "rise of disciplinary power".

In relation to this "professionalization of the professionalizers", Randall Collins some years ago wrote something very essential: "Some of the skills of 'professionals', however, are answers to self-created problems; the skill is intrinsic to the professional structure itself, and does not exist without it. (...)

Hence I would suggest that the model of 'self-created' problems - and the 'professional' knowledge which is a solution to them - may be the most important component for a theory of idealized occupational status groups." (Collins 1990, 20-21)

He then gives lawyers, priests and scientists as examples. What if we apply his idea to the case of Finnish primary school teachers, teacher educators and educational scientists? It immediately becomes clear that it is not the teachers, in the first place, who create the problems for which they then present professional solutions. Of course, without teachers those problems would not exist and, thus, they are, indeed, part of the structure. They, however, seem to be a quite passive element in the field, at least on the grounds of this study. Besides that, they will be faced with many negative effects of "development": certain deprofessionalization, bureaucratization, hierarchization, expanding expectations etc. (cf. McNeil, 1986; Densmore 1987, Murphy 1990). Nevertheless, it is rather easy to see how the home tutor-like picture of the teacher fits well both to the myth of professionalism and to mainstream educational studies: the basis of the Anglo-American archetype profession is a doctor vis-a-vis his patient³⁰, and decontextualized rationalization might be characterized as a very basic paradigmatic approach in behavioural sciences³¹.

In sociological literature on professions, there are often characterizations of "semi-", "quasi-" or "would-be" professions when referring to many new occupations willing to be considered as professions (see, e.g., Collins 1990, 16-17). On the basis of the text material used in this study, I would characterize the primary school teacher occupation as an ought-to-be profession. There is one simple reason for not using terms like "semi", "quasi" and "would-be" in the case of primary teachers here. Those terms refer to the tendency of the representatives of certain occupations to pose as professionals; to their efforts to be accepted as such. The material of this study does not say as much about the pursuits of primary school teachers in this sense: among the 140 members of the committees in question there were only four teachers in this century and just one since the 1960s! Conversely, there is a lot of evidence that

others - i.e. administrators, educational scientists and teacher educators - are very willing to conceptualize primary teachers as professionals. However, this conception seems to be based on an "ought-to-be" rather than a "to-be" reality.

The web of decontextualized goals, woven in close cooperation by specialists in administration and educational science, could be seen functioning for their own interests more than for that of teachers. It is true that that the academization and scientification of teacher training fits the professionalization project of teachers 32 but the "real winners" could be found - besides the modern welfare state - among educational scientists and teacher educators 33. Their position in both the educational and academic-scientific field has altered dramatically. 34 But what is even more important, the educational scientists - and teacher educators among them - have reached a position of scientific expertise, guaranteed by the state and recognized by teachers. Taken as authoritative and serious speakers, they are able, through discursive practices "systematically to form the objects of which they speak"(AK, 49), and, due to their position as protectors of doxa, they are able to strengthen the borders of the universe of possible discourse (Bourdieu 1977, 59-170). The capital possessed by them has become symbolic, and as such, it forms one key-element of power in (post)modern societies.35

Immanence of power/knowledge/subject

Finally, I would like to outline what it means to apply this material to the methodological principle of immanence. What might be the consequences of the discursive principles of the pastoralization of teaching and of the professionalization of teacher educators in relation to power, knowledge and subject? What new forms of power relations, knowledge and subjectivity might they constitute while intersecting with other discourses? I limit myself here to just some features.

In relation to the new forms of power relations, we could see a curious correspondences between the principle of the pastoralization of

teaching and the discourse of management: the Tylerian planning by goals in Finland in the 1970s, and the fashionable model of management by results in the 1990s. One might presume that decontextualized goal rationalization - an essential contribution of educational sciences in the reports of the 1970s - might need now as its successor a serious investment in the development of educational indicators. That is the knowledge the "governmentalized state" needs now for the promotion of the pastoralization of teaching. To an astonishing extent, the tendencies in school management and administration in Finland are following that of the U.K. - albeit in a more sophisticated and smooth way (cf. Ball 1990).

A very interesting new form of exercising power in Finland seems to be school experiments. These experiments may have an important role in bringing the official discourse or the "regime of truth" into the level of practice of schooling. Earlier, it was possible, to a certain extent, to work in class rooms without caring too much about "papers of authorities" and just go on with one's work as it has always been done. It is no more possible, at least in those "good" schools with experimental activity,

because the "gaze of power" 36 - i.e. control, steering and regulation - is inside the school (the principal, the experiment-oriented teachers, researchers) and no more far away in a municipal, regional or state office. Another important potential of those experiments is that the official reform discourse "become[s] a language that teachers use[d] to express their hopes and aspirations ..." (Popkewitz 1991, 208). It will thus also give promises of professionalism for teachers in the field as a profit of investment into experiment and reform. Finally, it may promote the polarization of the teaching staff to the active elite who capitalize on experiment by receiving training, participating conferences, sharing publicity and sometimes even getting a post in administration, and to the "proletariat" who do not get inspired to experiment although their only fault might be scepticism on the official discourse³⁷.

Another new form of power might be seen in the function that brings the reasons for the failure of the school down to the operational level. Donald Broady (1986, 9) opens his book about the hidden curriculum by saying that the occupational disease of the teacher is to individualize and psychologize the problems in school and to search for reasons in her/his own personality, or in that of the pupil or the principal. In various studies, it has been found that the teachers really take the quilt of the failures of the school system on their shoulders (see, e.g., Broadfoot and Osborn 1988). This might be seen as clearly reproducing the power structures and the doxa of the field. The reasons for failures of schooling are seen as shortcomings "down there": in inconsistency with the official and real curriculum.

What about the new forms of knowledge created through the official discourse of schooling? It is fair to say that the comprehensive school reform meant the birth of a new type of educational knowledge, a new didactic knowledge.³⁸ The position of the official curriculum documents in the Finnish educational discourse is a curious matter. A Finnish specialist of didactics (Kansanen 1987) has noticed that the ever-broadening formal and official, statute-defined curriculum of the comprehensive school has, in practice, veered toward didactics itself, and both the textbooks and lectures in didactics are bound to explain and justify it.³⁹ Thus he characterizes didactics as normative ethics or justification of the official curriculum. It is linked to the nationwide curriculum in such a manner that it cannot be understood as a descriptive science or as a theory of teaching. It is entirely normative. ⁴⁰ Another vital and valued new form of knowledge is the educational planning which, as a term in early versions of the higher education reform in the 1970s, was seen to cover all academic research concerning education.

But maybe the most interesting question is: what are the new forms of subjectivity this official discourse of schooling, while intersecting with other discursive formations - e.g. those of classroom teachers, educational science, or administration - has been able to produce? Following the logic of this treatment, we could name them as the Pastor and the Academic Didactician.

Basically the Pastors are classroom teachers who have internalized the core of the official discourse of schooling, i.e. that the teacher is

responsible for learning results and for the personal development of the individual pupil. As a cruel irony, they are often the most human, most well-intentioned and work-oriented teachers who during the years fight for their ideals but mostly in vain. But what is already much more functional, is that especially among them, both school administration and educational science recruit the new professionals for production and reproduction the official discourse of schooling. Therefore, a good many of the teacher educators, educational scientists and school officials come from those Teacher-Pastors frustrated by the reality of schooling and convinced that their mission make that reality better compatible with the ambitious reform discourse. Pastors of the new school are also the school psychologists, school welfare officers and career counsellors - all created in the 1970s when the school become a kind of "centre of the social universe"⁴¹. The important modern pastors might be, in a way, also the school officials from the municipal level up to the ministry of education because they reproduce the whole apparatus, the whole pastorate.⁴²

6. Discussion and conclusion

In place of a conclusion, and as a thought experiment, let me bring the religious metaphor mentioned above to its logical end. Education might be seen as the post-Christian, modern world religion where the State and the Academia comprise the Church, where school officials and educational scientist belong to the upper clergy, and teachers work as lower pastors. God consists of the Trinity of the Individual, the State, and the Markets. Progress, Justice and Qualification form the Dogma, and the Educational Theory is its Theology.

After the so called linguistic turn in social theory, it would be naive to claim that any metaphor, allegory or analogy would have a direct counterpart in reality; they only are discursive formations without direct referent in the non-discursive world. But exactly the same argument fits to all discursive constructions, no matter if they are models, theories or concepts: they never represent any universal truth. At their best, those concepts function in a certain way optically: they help us to make the reality intelligible.

However odd and limited this metaphor of religion may finally appear to be, some central conceptualizations of this study seem to find their place in there with astonishing ease: the Foucauldian idea of "regime of truth" created by immanence of power/knowledge/subjectivity; the insight of Collins on arbitrary character of professional skills; the claim of Labaree on professionalization of professionalizers; the theory of Bourdieu about the social field and symbolic capital. And, in the same spirit, we might crystallize the change in the official conception, or if you wish, the Reformation of the Dogma of popular teacherhood: it is a transformation from missionary vocation for civilization to pastoral profession for governmentalization.

In the Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education from 1986, John Meyer gave reasons for need of broader and multiple perspectives in research on education. He finishes the chapter by concluding: "In particular, it would be useful to add to the range of

models routinely employed [in the sociology of education], conceptions of education as a religious foundation of modern society". I think, it is necessary to take that proposal seriously.

References

- Alapuro, R. & Stenius, H. (1987). *Kansanliikkeet loivat kansakunnan*. (Civic movements created the nation). In R. Alapuro, I. Liikanen, K. Smeds & H. Stenius (Eds.) *Kansa liikkeessä* (pp. 5-49). Vaasa: Kirjayhtymä.
- Antikainen, A. (1987) *Kasvatustiede, kasvatussosiologia ja koulutuksen kehittäminen*. (Educational science, sociology of education and development of education). *The Finnish Journal of Education Kasvatus* 18 (4), 265-269.
- Ball, S., J. (1990) *Management as moral technology: A Luddite analysis*. In Ball, S., J (ed.) *Foucault and Education. Disciplines and Knowledge* (pp. 153-166). London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1990) *The structuring of pedagogic discourse. Volume IV. Class, codes and control*. London: Routledge.
- Boli, J. & Ramirez, F. O. (1986). *World culture and institutional development of mass education*. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 341-359). Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Boli, J. (1989). *New citizens for a new society : The institutional origins of mass schooling in Sweden*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *In other words. Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Broadfoot, P. & Osborn, M. (1988) *What Professional Responsibility Means to teachers: national contexts and classroom constants*. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 9 (3), 165-188.
- Broady, D. (1986) *Piilo-opetusuunnitelma. (The Hidden Curriculum)*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Cocks, C. & Jaraush, K. H. (ed.) (1990) *German professions 1800-1950*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, R. (1990) *Changing Conceptions in the Sociology of the Professions*. In Torstendahl, R. & Burrage, M. (ed.) *The Formation of professions. Knowledge, State, and Strategy* (pp. 11-23). London: SAGE Publications.
- Densmore, K. (1987) *Professionalism, proletarianization and teachers work*. In Popkewitz, T.S. (ed.) *Critical studies in teacher education. Its folklore, theory and practice* (pp. 130-160). London & New York: The Falmer Press.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (1983) *Michel Foucault. Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1966/1991) *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1968/1991) *Politics and the Study of Discourse*. In Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Effect. Studies in*

- Governmentality (pp. 53–72). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M. (1969/1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978/1991) *Governmentality*. In Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Effect* (pp. 87–104). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M. (1983) *The Subject and Power*. An appendix in Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (pp. 208–226). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984/1988) *The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom*. An interview. In Bernauer, J. & Rasmussen, D. (ed.) *The Final Foucault* (pp. 1–20). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Ginsburg, M. B. (1988) *Contradictions in Teacher Education and Society*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Heikkinen, S., Silvonen, J. & Simola, H. (forthcoming) *Technology of Truth: Peeling Foucault's Triangular Onion*. Manuscript.
- Herbart, J. F. (1917). *Konturer till föreläsningar in pedagogik*. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag.
- Hovi, R., Kivinen, O. & Rinne, R. (1989) *Komitealaitos, koulutusmietinnöt ja koulutuspolitiikan oikeutus*. (The Institution of the Government Committee and the Justification of Educational Policy in Committee Reports). Turku: Turun yliopisto. *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis ser. C*, tom. 73.
- Jauhainen, A. (1988). *Terveesta ruumiista terveeseen sieluun: peruskoulutuksen uusintamisjärjestelmien muotoutuminen*. (From a sound body to a sound mind: the formation of reproduction systems in basic education). *The Finnish Journal of Education Kasvatus*, 19 (6), 463–474.
- Jóhannesson, I., A. (1991) *The Formation of Educational Reform as a Social Field in Iceland and the Social Strategies of Educationist, 1966–1991*. Dissertation thesis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Jóhannesson, I., A. (1992a) *Professionalization of Progress and Expertise Among Teacher Educators in Iceland in the 1980s*. Paper presented at The AERA Conference, San Francisco, Ca. April 20–24, 1992.
- Jóhannesson, I., A. (1992b) *Principles of Legitimation in Educational Discourse in Iceland*. Paper presented at The annual AERA Conference. San Francisco, Ca. April 20–24, 1992.
- Kansanen, P. (1987) *The curriculum as a factor directing teaching*. In Malinen, P. & Kansanen, P. (ed.) *Research of the Finnish curriculum* (pp. 47–68). Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Department of Teacher Education. Research Report 53.
- Kivinen, O. & Rinne, R. (1990) *Yliopisto ja valtiousko*. (University and the state belief). *Tiedepolitiikka* 15 (3), 35–42.
- Kivinen, O. (1988) *Koulutuksen järjestelmäkehitys. Peruskoulutus ja valtiollinen kouludoktriini Suomessa 1800- ja 1900-luvuilla*. (The Systematisation of Education. Basic education and the state school doctrine in Finland in the 19th and 20th century). Turku: *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis C* 67.
- Kocka, J. (ed.) (1989) *Das Bildungsbürgertum in Gesellschaft und Politik*.

Stuttgart.

Labaree, D. F. (1992). Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 123-154.

Labaree, D. F. (1991) Doing good, doing science: The Holmes Group reports and the rhetorics of educational reform. Paper presented at the annual conference of the AERA. Chicago. March, 1991.

Lahdes, E. (1986) *Peruskoulun didaktiika*. (Didactics for the comprehensive school). Helsinki: Otava.

Lander, R. (1991) Decentralization - the case of Sweden. Paper presented at The Conference of American Educational Research Association (AERA). Chicago. March 3-7, 1991.

Lundgren, U.P. (1984) *Between hope and happening: Text and context in curriculum*. Geelong: Deakin University.

Marková, I. & Foppa, K. (eds.) (1990) *The dynamics of dialogue*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

McNeil, L.M. (1986) *Contradictions of Control. School structure and school knowledge*. New York and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Meyer, J. W. (1986). Types of explanation in the sociology of education. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 341-359). Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Meyer, J. W. (1989). Foreword. In Boli, J. (1989). *New citizens for a new society : The institutional origins of mass schooling in Sweden*. Pp. xv-xviii. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Murphy, R. (1990) Proletarianization of bureaucratization: the fall of the professional? In R. Torstendahl & M. Burrage (eds.) *The formation of professions*. Pp. 71-96.

Numminen, J. (1987) *Yliopistokysymys*. (The university question). Helsinki: Otava.

Popkewitz, T, S. (1988) Educational reform: Rhetoric, ritual and social interest. *Educational Theory* 38(1), 77-93.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991) *A political sociology of educational reform. Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T.S. & Lind, K. (1989) Teacher incentives as reform: Teachers' work and changing control mechanization in education. *Teachers College Record* 90(4), 575-94.

Rinne, R. (1987a) Has somebody hidden the curriculum? The curriculum as a point of intersection between the utopia of civic society and the state control. In P. Malinen & P. Kansanen (Eds.) *Research frames of the Finnish curriculum*. (pp. 95-116). Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education. Research Report 53.

Rinne, R. (1987b). Onko opetussuunnitelma ideologiaa - Opetussuunnitelma aikautensa sosiaalisten ehtojen raamittamana skenaariona. (Curriculum as ideology). In P. Malinen & P. Kansanen (Eds.), *Opetussuunnitelman tutkimukselliset kehukset* (pp. 95-130). Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston opettajankoulutuslaitos. Tutkimuksia 48.

- Rinne, R. (1988) From ethos to habitus: the changing curriculum codes in Finnish schooling, 1881-1985. In *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 20(5), 423-435.
- Siegrist, H. (ed.) (1988) *Bürgerliche Berufe. Zur Sozialgeschichte der freien und akademischen Berufe im internationalen Vergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Simola, H. (forthcoming). *Educational Science, the State and Teachers. Forming the corporate regulation of teacher education in Finland*. In Popkewitz, T.S. (ed.) *Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher education reform in eight countries*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Smart, B. (1985) *Michel Foucault*. Chichester & London: Ellis Horwood Limited & Tavistoc Publications.
- Somerkivi, U. (1982) *Peruskoulu. Synty, kehittyminen ja tulevaisuus*. (The comprehensive school. Its birth, development and future). Vantaa: Kunnallispaino.
- St Maurice, H. (1987) *Clinical supervision and power: Regimes of instructional management*. In Popkewitz, T.S. (ed.) *Critical studies in teacher education. Its folklore, theory and practice* (pp. 242-264). London & New York: The Falmer Press.
- Svingby, G. (1979) *Från läroplanspoesi till klassrumverklighet*. Malmö: Liber.
- Wagner, P., Weiss, H. C., Wittrock, B. & Wollmann, H. (1991) *The policy orientation: legacy and promise*. In Wagner, P., Weiss, H.C., Wittrock, B. & Wollmann, H. (ed.) *Social science and modern state. National experiences and theoretical crossroads* (pp. 2-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1990) *The voice of rationality in a sociocultural approach to mind*. In L.C. Moll (ed.) *Vygotsky and education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 111-126.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991) *Voices of the mind. A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Ziehe, T. (1991) *Uusi nuoriso. Epätavanomaisen oppimisen puolustus*. (The New Youth - A defence of the unusual learning). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Appendix

| | ME | NBGE | RegA | MunA | EdSci | TEd | TU | Pri | Teach | Others |
|------------|----|------|------|------|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|--------|
| '22 a/b | | 2xs | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| '45/47 a | | 4x | | 1 | 2s | | | 2 | 2 | |
| '52/60 a/b | | | 7xs | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| '63 b | | | 1 | 1s | 1x | 2 | | | 1 | |
| '65 a/b | | 1x | | | 4s | | | | | |
| '67 a | | 1 | 1s | 2 | 3x | | | 1 | | |
| '68 b | | 1x | 1 | | | 6s | | | | |
| '69 a | | 4xs | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 7 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|
| '73 c | 1x | 3s | 1 | | 1 | 2s | 3 | | | 4 |
| '74/75 a/b | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2s | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| '89 a | 1 | 2x | | | | 4s | | 1 | | 3 |
| '91 d | 4s | | | | 1x | 1 | | | | 1 |
| total | 14 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 26 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 26 |

Table 1: The division of the members, chairmen and secretars in the teacher education commitees between 1922 and 1991

(Legend: The character of the task of the commitee: a= teacher education reform in generally, b= curriculum and syllabus reform of teacher education, c= continuing education of teachers.

Leadership: x= chairman, s= secretary (main, or if its not clear, all/both).

Representatives from: ME = Ministry of Education, NBGE = National Board of General Education, RegA = Regional School Administration, MunA = Municipal School Administration, EdSci = Educational Sciences (not included teacher education), TEd = Teacher Education (seminaries, colleges, university college, university departments of teacher education), TU = Teachers' Unions, Pri = principals, Teach = classroom teachers, Others = members of the Parliament, other state officials, representatives of students etc.)

Notes

1 The committee reports on teacher education are the follows:

The Report of the Committee (RC)1922:3. Seminaarikomitean mietintö (The Seminary Committee)

RC 1945:5. Kansakoulunopettajain valmistus- ja jatkokoulutuskomitea I: Laki perusteluineen (The Committee for Preparation and Continuing Education of Primary School Teachers)

RC 1947:1. Kansakoulunopettajain valmistus- ja jatkokoulutuskomitean mietintö. II Asetukset perusteluineen (The Committee for Preparation and Continuing Education of Primary School Teachers)

RC1952:21. Seminaarilainsäädännön uudistamiskomitean mietintö I. Perussäännökset (The Committee for the Reform of the Seminary Legislation)

RC 1960:7. Seminaarilainsäädännön uudistamiskomitean mietintö.

Kansakoulunopettajaseminaarien opetussuunnitelmat (The Committee for the Reform of the Seminary Legislation)

RC 1963:9. Opettajakorkeakoulukomitean mietintö (The Teachers' College Committee)

RC 1965:B 11. Korkeakouluissa tapahtuvan kansakoulunopettajanvalmistuksen työsuunnitelmatoimikunnan mietintö (The Committee for the Syllabus for Teachers' Colleges)

RC 1967: A2. Opettajanvalmistustoimikunnan mietintö (The Teacher Preparation Committee)

RC 1968:A6. Opettajanvalmistuksen opetussuunnitelmatomikunnan mietintö (The Committee for the Syllabus for Teacher Preparation)

RC 1969:A5. Peruskoulunopettajakomitean mietintö (The Comprehensive School Teacher Committee)

RC 1972:A12. Harjoittelukoulukomitean mietintö (The Practicing School Committee)

RC1973:51. Opettajien jatkokoulutustoimikunnan mietintö (The Committee on the Continuing Education for Teachers)

RC 1974:101. Vuoden 1973 opettajankoulutuskomitean välimietintö (The 1973 Committee on Teacher Education –the preliminary report)

RC 1975: 75. Vuoden 1973 opettajankoulutustoimikunnan mietintö (The 1973 Committee on Teacher Education)

RC 1989: 26. Opettajankoulutuksen kehittämistoimikunnan mietintö (The Committee on the Development of Teacher Education)

RC 1991:46. Opettajankoulutuksen säädöstyöryhmän muistio (The Working-Group on Regulations for Teacher Education)

2 For a more broad and detailed context, see, e.g. Simola, forthcoming.

3 The university studies today in Finland consist of study weeks which are basic units of studies and teaching. They are roughly equivalent to credits in the U.S. academic degree system. One study week is defined as 40 hours' full-time work by a student including all the lectures, seminars, demonstrations and individual work. Thus the full time studies of one year consist of 35–40 study weeks in all. The major level is about 65–80 study weeks (laudatur in traditional academic vocabulary), the minor level about 35–40 study weeks (cum laude approbatur) or 15–20 study weeks (approbatur)

4 The following reports are taken later as administrative proposals or recommendations: RC 1922, RC 1960, RC 1965, and RC 1968.

5 Legislative proposals are included in RC 1922, RC 1945, RC 1947, RC 1952, RC 1963, RC 1969, RC 1972, RC 1973, RC 1975, and RC 1991.

6 Without doubt, a certain centralized tradition strengthens this function. It is a peculiarity of Finnish culture and history that tradition has its roots in the tight intertwining of the nation- and state-building processes which have left relatively limited space for the "free" civic society. From the 19th century onwards, civic movements and the state have evolved, working towards common aims rather than as rivals or in contradictory positions (see, e.g., Alapuro & Stenius 1987). Social reforms were, and still are, carried out via centralized authority, planned by state employees, and sanctioned through state legislation.

7 The following reports include strict curriculum orders: RC 1922, RC 1952, RC 1960, RC 1965, RC 1968, and RC 1975.

8 In fact, taking these committee texts on teacher education as curriculum documents could be seen as an fruitful approach in relation to my study. The task would be then to reveal the changes in the "curricular code" of teacher education. (see, e.g., Lundgren 1984, Rinne 1988, Bernstein 1990). Actually, that might be the next direction and not at all exclusive but rather complementary to the approach outlined here.

9 This comes from the potential of reform rhetoric "to organize and shape individual identity", Popkewitz, 1991, 17, 218-219), conceptions of self. Popkewitz writes (ibid 216): "The epistemologies of reform were embodied in and are a dynamic element in the on-going relations and formation of identity in schooling." (see also Popkewitz & Lind 1989 and Broadfoot & Osborn 1988)

10 This does not mean - as often seems to be understood - that Foucault would deny the legitimacy of other, e.g., traditional approaches: "I do not

wish to deny the validity of intellectual biographies, or the possibility

of a history of theories, concepts, or themes. It is simply that I wonder whether such descriptions are themselves enough, whether they do justice to the immense density of scientific discourse, whether there do not exist, outside their customary boundaries, systems of regularities that have a decisive role in the history of the sciences." (Foucault, 1966/1991, xiii-xiv)

11 "The word archaeology . . . simply indicates a possible attack for the analysis of verbal performances: the specification of a level - that of the statement and archive; the determination and illumination of a domain - the enunciative regularities, the positivities; the application of such concepts as rules of formation, archaeological derivation, and historical a priori . (AK, 206)

12 E.g., Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983) characterize the method of Foucault as an "interpretative analytics" where the archaeology serves genealogy. They argue for the untenability of Foucault's theory of discursive practises developed mainly in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. But that might be true concerning archaeology as a theoretical model rather than a possibility or heuristic tool for insightful approach to an empirical material, which is my use of it here.

13 This subsection is based on a forthcoming text "Technologies of Truth. Peeling Foucault's Triangular Onion" (see Heikkinen, Silvonen & Simola, forthcoming)

14 Henceforth, I will use AK in references for *The Archaeology of Knowledge*

15 It is a question analysis in the "'preconceptual' level" (AK, 60, 62). "Behind the visible façade of the system, one posits the rich uncertainty of disorder; and beneath the thin surface of discourse, the whole mass of largely silent development (devenir): a 'presystematic' that is not the order of the system; a 'prediscursive' that belongs to an essential silence" (AK, 76). "Analysis remains anterior to this manifest level, which is that of the completed construction . . . it leaves the final placing of the text in dotted outline." (AK, 75)

16 "This dispersion itself - with its gaps, discontinuities, its entanglements, its incompatibilities, its replacements, and its substitutions - can be described in its uniqueness if one is able to determine the specific rules in accordance with which its objects, statements, concepts and theoretical options have been formed: if there really is a unity, it does not lie in the visible, horizontal coherence of the elements formed; it resides, well anterior to the formation, in the system that makes possible and covers that formation." (AK, 72)

17 In *The Order of Things* Foucault outlines his task as "to explore scientific discourse not from the point of view of the individuals who are speaking, nor from the point of view of the formal structures of what they are saying, but from the point of view of the rules that come into the play in the very existence of such discourse: what conditions Linnaeus (or Petty, or Arnold) have to fulfil, not to make his discourse coherent and true in general, but to give it, at the time it was written and accepted,

value and practical application as scientific discourse - or, more exactly, as naturalist, economic, or grammatical discourse." (Foucault, 1966/1991, xiv)

18 "We must not seek in the statement a unit that is either long or short, strongly and weakly structured, but one that is caught up, like the others, in a logical, grammatical, locutory nexus. (...) The statement (...) is a function of existence that properly belongs to signs and on the basis of which one may then decide, through analysis or intuition, where or not they "make sense", according to what rule they follow one another or are juxtaposed, of what they are the sign, and what sort of act is carried out by their formulations (oral or written). One should not be surprised, then, if one has failed to find structural criteria of unity for the statement; this is because it is not in itself a unit, but a function that cuts across a domain of structures and possible unities, and which reveals them, with concrete contents, in time and place.

It is this function that we must now describe as such, that is, in its actual practice, its conditions, the rules that govern it, and the field in which it operates." (AK, 86-87)

19 Foucault then calls the statement "the modality of existence proper to

that group of signs: a modality that allows it to be something more than a series of traces, something more than a succession of marks on a substance, something more than a mere object made by a human being; a modality that allows it to be in relation with a domain of objects, to prescribe a definite position to any possible subject, to be situated among other verbal performances, and to be endowed with a repeatable materiality." (AK 107) See also AK 104 where Foucault gives an example of a affirmation "species evolve" which contains two different statements: one in Darwin, another in Simpson (a modified translation in Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983, 45), and a comparison related to John Austins' and John Searles' concept "speech act" which, according to Dreyfus & Rabinow, is very much analogous to a statement (AK, 82, 83; Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983, 46).

"Statements are not , like the air we breathe, an infinite transparency; but things that are transmitted and preserved, that have value, and which one tries to appropriate; . . . things that are duplicated not only by copy or translation, but by exegesis, commentary, and the internal proliferation of meaning" (AK, 120) Finally, Dreyfus & Rabinow (1983, 49) conclude that a statement for Foucault could be characterized as "a serious speech act" and discursive formation thus a "relatively autonomous system of serious speech acts".

20 "We shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation; . . . its is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. . . . [I]t is . . . historical - a fragment of history, a unity and discontinuity in history itself, posing the problem its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality rather than its sudden irruption in the midst of the complicities of time." (AK, 117)

"To describe a statement is . . . a matter . . . of defining

conditions in which the function that gave a series of signs . . . an existence . . . can operate. An existence that reveals such a series as . . . a relation to a domain of objects; as . . . a set of possible positions for a subject; as . . . an element in a field of coexistence; as . . . a repeatable materiality." (AK, 109)

21 The appearance of a psychiatric discourse at the beginning of the nineteenth century is the third example given by Foucault. What made the new discourse possible was a "whole set of relations between hospitalization, internment, the conditions and procedures of social exclusion, the rules of jurisprudence, the norms of industrial labour and bourgeois morality, in short, a whole group of relations that characterized for this discursive practice the formation of its statements, but this practice is not only manifested in a discipline possessing a scientific status and scientific pretensions; it is also found in operation of in legal texts, in literature, in philosophy, in political decisions, and in the statements made and the opinions expressed in daily life." (AK, 179)

22 See Foucault 1978/1991, 91.

23 According to the Oxford Latin Dictionary 1982.

24 According to the Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary 1992.

25 He describes this rather concretely: ". . . I shall take my starting point what ever unities are already given (such as psychopathology, medicine, or political economy); but I shall not place myself inside these dubious unities in order to study their internal configurations or their secret contradictions. I shall make use of them just long enough to ask myself what unities they form; by what right they can claim a field that specifies them in a space and continuity that individualizes them in time; against the background of which discursive events they stand out; whether they are not, in their accepted and quasi-institutional individuality, ultimately the surface effect or more firmly grounded unities. I shall accept groupings that history suggests only to subject them at once to interrogation; to break them up and then to see whether they can be legitimately reformed; or whether other groupings should be made; to replace them in a more general space which, while dissipating their apparent familiarity, makes it possible to construct a theory of them." (AK, 26)

To describe a statement is a matter of defining conditions in which the function that gave a series of signs an existence can operate (AK,

109). A statement is neither visible nor hidden says Foucault and, still emphasizing the distancing of researcher from conventionalities, he continues: ". . . it requires a certain change of viewpoint and attitude to be recognized and examined as itself. Perhaps it is like the over-familiar that constantly eludes one; those familiar transparencies, which, although they conceal nothing in their density, are nevertheless not entirely clear." (AK, 111)

When Foucault characterizes the description of statements as "a project of a pure description of discursive events" (AK, 27), he really is what he calls with a certain irony a "happy positivist"²⁵ (AK, 125).

26 In a series of lectures termed by him as "The history of

governmentality", Foucault seeks to reconstruct the changes of "great forms and economics of power in the West" (Foucault 1978/1991). In a "very global, rough and inexact fashion" he concludes that those forms are: first, the state of justice which is "born in feudal type of territorial regime which corresponds to a society of laws"; second, the administrative state, "born in the territoriality of national boundaries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and corresponding to a society of regulation and discipline"; and finally, the governmental state "essentially defined no longer in terms of territoriality, of its surface area, but in terms of the mass of its population with its volume and density, and indeed also with the territory over which it is distributed. . . corresponding to a type of society controlled by apparatuses of security". (Foucault 1978/1991, 104).

What is characteristic of the modern form of the state is the emergence of the family "as an element internal to population, and as fundamental instrument in its government". This phenomenon has, according to Foucault, three points. Firstly, the family becomes a privileged instrument for government rather than just a model of good government. Secondly, the population is seen above all else as the ultimate end of government. "Population is the subject of needs, of aspirations, but it is also the object in the hands of the government, aware, vis-à-vis the government, of what it wants, but ignorant of what is being done to it." And finally, the population becomes the object that the government must take into account in order to be able to govern effectively in a rational and conscious manner. This means the birth of new type of knowledge, political economy, as a basis for the techniques of government. (Foucault 1978/1991, 99-101)

27 There is another idea closely linked to that of pastoralization of teaching presented by Donald Broady (1986, 102-115). As far as I know, he is the only scholar who has called attention to the "family tutor illusion" built-in to the progressive, or so called child-centred pedagogy. He reminds us, while speaking about the hidden curriculum, that not very long time ago it was not at all hidden but the very task of the general schooling. Here he mentions especially the writings of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Johan Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841). In terms of Herbart, who was a prominent figure of German pedagogics and vital in Finnish didactics until the 1950s, the primitive will of the child must become subordinated. According to him, "[t]he state demands from the pupils only that what is possible to demand, i.e. the external side of education and learning. It does not demand internalized learning". The teacher could only distribute knowledge and education, and hope that the proportion of those who learned is large enough. (Herbart 1917, 193 §332) Internalized and individual learning is basically the task of the home and the family tutor (ibid § 333). Broady notes that while speaking about the teaching of the family tutor or the governess, Herbart make use of expressions which remind those of Dewey or other child-centred educationalists (Broady 1986, 107).

It is curious that the basic dilemma of learning in the school context - the contradiction between the individual character of learning and the mass form or model of teaching - has not received any serious attention in recent educational literature, at least not in Finland. It seems that neither the failure of mastery-learning strategies, nor the constant

scepticism delivered by the research reports on learning results, has been directed to questioning what is really possible to learn in the school context.

28 See also Labaree 1991 and Jóhannesson, 1990 and 1991a.

29 Labaree also refers (1992) to the liberalist domination in the feminist

discourse in the U.S.A. and notes that - compatible with that discourse - "teaching professionalization movement runs the risk of abandoning the distinctive and desirable characteristics of the female teacher (nurturing, emotionally supportive, person-centered, context-focused) in order to take on the frequently undesirable characteristics of the dominant male professional (competitive, rationalistic, task-centered, and abstracter from context)"

30 Just imagine how a doctor would survive in a situation where 25 patient with their individual problems should be attended in the same room, or a lawyer if he should sentence or plead at the same time a group consisting of rapists, pick-pockets, drunken-drivers and tax dodgers.

31 The sociocultural approach developed e.g. by James V. Wertsch (1991 and 1990; see also Marková & Foppa 1990) -the concept of decontextualized rationalization is borrowed from him- offers an interesting psychological perspective in this issue.

32 The Finnish teacher union (OAJ) was formed into a powerful actor in the educational field at the earliest in the late 1970s, while the process for reform in teacher education was at that time already well under way. In some Finnish studies (e.g. Rinne & Jauhiainen 1988) there seems to be "tendencies to certain over-estimation of the role of teachers. This might be because of using the Anglo-American model of professionalization instead of those "continental" ones developed in societies with the centralist state tradition (cf. Collins 1991; Cocks & Jaraush 1990; Kocka 1989, Siegerst 1988).

33 One could even imagine a certain division of labour between "the society" and "the science": the former - represented by the officials of the National Board of General Education and the Ministry of Education - impose the goals for teacher education deriving them from the more general goals for societal policy, and the later - represented by educational scientists and teacher educators - technically and systematically derive, from those political and value-bound goals, the behaviour-level objectives, the contents, the methods and the organization for teacher education. This is, of course, a pure fiction but what seems to be clear is that in planning by goals, administration and educational science find a common subject for intensive cooperation. (cf. Jóhannesson 1992a)

34 The transfer of teacher education to the universities meant a clear social and economic rise for Finnish teacher educators. Before the reforms of the '70s, the teacher educators in seminars and teacher's colleges had basically the same qualification requirements as teachers in upper secondary schools. The only exception was the University College of Education at Jyväskylä where, besides the professors, some lecturers also had to have PhD. The state policy was to move virtually all the seminar and college staff to the university faculty. It is reasonable to think that

this fact tended to deaden the criticism of reform and sceptical expressions toward academic educational science as the basis for teacher training. Actually, the shift from the traditional, missionary-ethos legitimated trainee to the science legitimated expert happened without any remarkable public controversies. One can get some idea of the quantitative increase of teacher educators from the fact that the 1975 report proposed establishment of 500 new posts more while the number of teacher educators at that moment was 375 (RC 1975, 183, 185)

The following table (Kivinen & Rinne 1990, 39) describes the development of the number of professorships in education (including associate professors) in Nordic countries.

| | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1989 |
|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Finland | 3.5 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 80 | 106 |
| Sweden | 4 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 29 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|---|---|---|----|----|----|
| Norway | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 23 |
| Denmark | - | - | 2 | 4 | 9 | 11 |

35 For an interesting application of Bourdieuan theory where the certain elements of discourse as such can be interpreted as a transformation to symbolic capital, see Jóhannesson 1991.

36 See, e.g., St Maurice 1987.

37 See e.g. Ginsburg 1988; Popkewitz 1988.

38 The theory of discourse structuration in the social sciences, introduced by Björn Wittrock and Peter Wagner (Wagner et al 1991) seems to fit the case of Finnish educational science curiously well (see Simola, forthcoming).

39 Erkki Lahdes, sometimes mentioned as "the leading representative of educational scientists" (Numminen 1987, 257), also emphasizes the close intertwining of didactics and the official, written curriculum. He writes (1986, 87; my translation): "Didactics are a general presentation of those means by which the precedent curriculum is struggled to realize While the curriculum is rather a strategical means, the didactics are more tactical ones. . . . In itself, there are nothing in principle to prevent the merger of curriculum and didactics together and to see them only as different levels of curriculum or didactics."

40 It is interesting to compare this concept of curriculum/didactics to one offered by sociology of education. In the critical tradition (e.g. Rinne, 1987a), the curriculum can be characterized as an ideological scenario putting emphasis on the double character of the curriculum: it reflects, at the same time, a utopia of civic society and an educational state ideology. There is also a paradoxical double character in the school praxis where this utopian-ideological curriculum meets with the hidden curriculum effects of the frame factors and traditions of the school. Today, the official curriculum is even characterized as a "poetry of curriculum" (Svingby 1979) because there is so little equivalence between the "ought-to-be world" of curriculum and the "to-be world" of the school reality. It seems reasonable to claim, then, that the didactics in Finnish

teacher education –while being rigidly involved itself to explain and justify the existing official curriculum as a self-evident, unquestionable, and taken for granted base for teacher training– are ignoring the double character of curriculum. (a bit more detailed analysis, see Simola, forthcoming)

It also brings into the mind what Popkewitz (1991, 245) says: "When we adopt a belief that scientific knowledge is about the future, we have left science and its relation to the empirical world to move into the realm of ideology and social regulation. The rituals of science become a rhetorical form intended to convince others that what is being done to them is in their own interests. "

41 The school as a part of the reproduction apparatus of the modern state expanded to become a kind of "centre of the social universe" as Jauhiainen (1988) puts it: "The modern student welfare system with its support organization represents professional service systems typical of a welfare state, which through the expert–customer relationship fix the citizen as a member of society. Through its own systems of guidance and help the school is considered to contribute to the socialization of pupils into consumers of social services while at the same time reproducing their customer structures."

42 During the comprehensive school reform, the school boards, which especially in rural areas essentially controlled and regulated the life of individual schools, e.g., the recruitment of teachers, were abolished and their power was shifted to municipal boards. From the 1960s to the 1980s, the number of staff in municipal school administration increased a hundredfold; in the Ministry of Education, 25-fold; in the National Board of General Education, 2.5 -fold; and in regional administration 10-fold (Somerkivi 1982, 127-128). The post of principal was established in place of the former headmaster or mistress who was elected for a certain period by the teachers.