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The Finnish notion of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education has become a frequently referred to idea within the Finnish educational discourses of research, policy, curriculum and practice. This study examines the current discourse of research based teacher education since its emergence during the 1970s reform that ‘scientized’ teacher education. Drawing on Foucauldian approaches of genealogy and governmentality studies, the purpose of this study is to explore the current presence of ‘research’ in Finnish teacher education and consider the effects of the ways in which the notion of research is mobilised in the discourse.

The research questions are: 1. How are teacher subjectivities and notions of research constructed, assembled and mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland? 2. What social ideals circumscribe the aspirations for teachers as researchers and research-based teacher education in Finland? The analysis is carried out on academic publications that have been published on Finnish research-based teacher education.

The findings, first, point to the discursive insertion of research into Finnish teacher education as a strategy through which to fabricate the teacher as autonomous and as emancipated from tradition. Secondly, the analysis addresses how an array of different significations of research are mobilised in the governing of the teacher as researcher. Thirdly, the analysis draws attention to the Lutheran Protestant legacy of the tradition of Bildung that has influenced the weak incentive for social and political orientations in Finnish teacher education.

The effects of a scientific approach to teacher education are visible in the ways research-based teacher education comes to evoke specific teacher inner qualities and dispositions that are aligned with humanist aspirations and ideals for education and social progress. The study provides an alternative way for perceiving of and problematizing research-based teacher education as well as of the often uneasy relationship between teacher training and the university. In this way, the study attempts to complicate conversations and open up alternative ways of engaging with academic knowledge and practices in teacher education curriculum and research.

**Keywords:** academic teacher education, discourse, Foucault, genealogy, governmentality, research-based teacher education, teacher as researcher, teacher education


Tutkimustulokset osoittavat "tutkimuksen" ilmentymisen suomalaisessa opettajankoulutuksessa strategian, jonka kautta tuotetaan autonomisia opettajasubjekteja ja emanssiooidaan opettajanaa tradition vallasta. Toiseksi analyysi tuo näkyviin, millä tavoin "tutkimuksen" eri merkitykset tulevat valjastetuiksi tutkimajan opettajanaa hallinnassa. Kolmanneksi analyysi kiinnittää huomiota luterilaisen protestantismiin vaikutuksiin sivistysajattelussa, mikä selittää suomalaisen opettajankoulutuksen heikkoa yhteiskunnallista ja poliittista orientaatiota.
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Preface

Teaching and learning have multiple and conflicting meanings that shift with our lived lives, with the theories produced and encountered, with the deep convictions and desires brought to and created in education, with the practices we negotiate, and with the identities we construct. This is not the problem. Rather, when such multiplicity is suppressed, so too is our power to imagine how things could be otherwise. (Britzman 2003: 32).

This doctoral research project is (yet another) study on teaching and teacher education. The quote above has been chosen with the intention of conveying the undercurrent of this study: In this study, teaching and teacher education are examined as being historically and continuously constructed through and permeated by a multiplicity of ideas, theories, experiences, aspirations, and rationalities. The aim of this study is not to define what teaching and teacher education should ultimately be about and in such a way to advocate for a correct way forward. Rather, the interest lies in interrupting the everyday sensibilities and common sense notions that oftentimes come to ‘suppress multiplicity’ and narrow down our possibilities for thinking and action:

The strategy is of an optimism that to unthink what seems natural is to open other possibilities of schooling, teaching, and teacher education. To make the naturalness of the present as strange and contingent is a political strategy of change; to make visible the internments and enclosures of the common sense of schooling is to make them contestable. (Popkewitz 2008: xv).

The particular common sense of teacher education that is focused on in this study relates, first, to the issue of educational reform and the optimism that is attached to such endeavours – an optimism that holds that reform will naturally lead to (material, moral, intellectual or other) advancement for the individual and for society. What is further embedded in this optimism, most often, is the belief that through reform, decisive steps towards the future can be taken that separate and dissociate ‘the new’ from ‘the old’ (that is, tradition), and the accompanying belief that the new is, in fact, new. Such a belief rests on the assumptions that consciousness frees us from reproducing the past in our thinking and action, and that what is no longer recognizable as the past in our thinking and action has ceased to exist and be effective.
Secondly, the common sense that invites itself to be defamiliarised also relates to the entwined assumptions that social progress will present itself through education, and that educational progress will present itself through science. In an “age of reform,” Popkewitz (2008: 1–2) argues, the hopes for a brighter future, and the accompanying “fears of degeneration and decay,” propose a programme of “finding the right mixtures of reforms and science to produce progress.” The scientific approach to education – that is, the scientizing of educational research and practice – entails a faith in the ‘true knowledge’ of education that is to be revealed through scientific research and that is to ensure progress.

Thirdly, the common sense interrogated in this study relates to how the teacher is positioned as a central agent in the aspirations for progress and change. This taken-for-granted idea of the teacher as change agent works from the assumption that teachers, as individuals as well as a collective, are key actors in improving schools and thus in improving society. The definitions of ‘improvement’ vary in different contexts and times, and may concern one or several aspects related to, for example, efficiency, effectiveness, social inclusion, or well-being. Regardless of such variation, educational reform rhetoric most often suggests that teachers – as for example, inquirers, problem-solvers, critical and reflective thinkers, or lifelong learners – will bring about change if they are trained, equipped and instructed in the right ways.

This study focuses on the specific case of Finnish teacher education and the particular narrative of progress that it is a part of. What will be examined and discussed is the case of what is currently most often referred to as research-based teacher education in Finland: the discourse produced around it, the teacher it aims to construct, the notions of research and science it is entangled in, the aspirations for progress that it is attached to and grounded in. By attending to such questions, the study aims to contribute to ‘complicating conversations’ (Phelan 2011, Pinar 2009) in and on teacher education curriculum, teacher education research, as well as teacher research in Finland and elsewhere.
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1 Introduction

Student teachers of academic teacher education in Finland would seem to be of a specific kind: During their training, they are, among other things, to “practice argumentation, decision-making, and justification when inquiring about and solving pedagogical problems” (Byman et al. 2009: 81); to practice “pedagogic thinking” (Silander & Välijärvi 2013: 82); to develop their ability to reflect on “the theory and practice of teaching and learning” (Silander & Välijärvi 2013: 82); to learn to both consume and carry out research (Toom et al. 2010: 338); and to take up an orientation towards professional development that is to continue “throughout their teaching career” (Silander & Välijärvi 2013: 82). In these ways, student teachers of Finnish teacher education are “educated to become autonomous actors” who are “able to meet the challenges of the future” (Toom et al. 2010: 339).

This study examines the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland with a concern and interest in the conditions that make possible the construction of the teacher as described above. The study draws on poststructural, Foucauldian tools for analysis, and, as such, could be characterised as an excavation into the terrain of Finnish teacher education in its cultural and historical specificity. While many of the ideas presented in the opening paragraph can be identified in teacher education and other educational contexts around the world, the intention here is to consider the conditions, configurations and effects of these ideas and notions in the particular cultural context of Finland. In other words, the aim is to suggest possible ways of perceiving of a particular cultural and historical space of education in which the teacher subject is produced. Therefore, while several of the above mentioned ideas and ideals concerning the teacher have been critically analysed, questioned and interrogated in other contexts or at a more generalized level – idea(l)s such as reflective practice (e.g. Atkinson 2012, Devas 2004, Ecclestone 1996, Fejes 2011, Fendler 2003, Hultqvist 2006), the teacher as researcher (e.g. Hammersley 1993, Plum 2012), the active learner (e.g. Klein 1998, 2012, Phan 2014, Valero 2002) and the lifelong learner (e.g. Fejes & Nicoll 2008, Fejes & Dahlstedt 2013, Popkewitz 2008) – this study aims to pay attention to the specific Finnish educational landscape in which these notions are assembled and mobilised.

Drawing on Foucauldian approaches – namely, genealogy and the concept of governmentality – this study analyses the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland as produced in academic publications and asks how the teacher subject is fabricated in this discourse, and who that teacher is to be.
Fabrication, here, refers to the making of the teacher through discursive, cultural practices; to the ways in which the teacher is discursively woven into the social fabric; and to the fictive element of such a fabrication (Foucault 1975/1991: 217, MacLure 2003: 176, Popkewitz et al. 2001c: 29). Fabrication, therefore, is used here to denote both production (as in the making of a product in a factory), on the one hand, and fabulation (as in the composition of a fairy-tale), on the other hand. “Fictions,” Popkewitz and Lindblad (2004: 244) argue, “produce realities.”

In particular, what is focused on in the study is how notions of research are inscribed and mobilised in the discourse, as well as the effects of such an assemblage of research and its related notions of inquiry, critical thinking and reflection on the governing of the teacher. Specifically, two trajectories of the notion of the teacher as researcher will be analysed in terms of what they ‘do’ in the discourse and how it is possible for both of them to exist in the discourse despite the inherent tensions.1

The study connects the fabrication of the teacher and the mobilisation of research in the governing of the teacher to the ‘educational language’ (Tröhler 2011) of research-based teacher education in Finland. In doing so, the study attempts to relate the discourse of research-based teacher education to the social ideals that Finnish educational thinking is embedded in; that is, to the notions of individual and national progress that circumscribe the aspirations for teacher autonomy, educational equality and quality in Finnish teacher education. Particularly, what is considered is the Lutheran Protestant heritage and the educational language of Bildung attached to it.

This research project initially began with an interest in the present conditions of Finnish teacher education, its curriculum and pedagogy. However, the theoretical-methodological orientation that was engaged with led to an examination that generated an interest in the past. It gradually became evident that what was to be studied would entail the examination of a problem in the present in its historicity. As will be discussed in chapter 2, the history of Finnish teacher education that is written in the pages to follow is of a specific kind. Rather than tracing origins or providing a linear account of the passing of time, this study provides a historical – or, more precisely, a historicizing (see Popkewitz 2013b) – account of Finnish

---

1 For the purpose of linguistic smoothness, the ‘teacher as researcher’ will occasionally also be referred to as the ‘researching teacher’ in the text. In the literature, a distinction is sometimes made between these two expressions, but in terms of the argument being made in this study, the distinction is of minor consequence, and the terms will therefore be used interchangeably.
teacher education as characterised by Foucault’s notion of a ‘history of the present’ (Foucault 1975/1991). This approach is described by Dean (1994) as follows:

The ‘history of the present’ may be loosely characterised by its use of historical resources to reflect upon the contingency, singularity, interconnections, and potentialities of the diverse trajectories of those elements which compose present social arrangements and experience. (Dean 1994: 21).

What is made possible through such an approach to the studying of Finnish research-based teacher education in the present, as well as its history, is a problematisation and defamiliarisation of the self-evident presence of research and science in teacher education through which Finnish teachers are produced – teachers who are to become autonomous experts and empowered agents of change.2

The following subchapters will introduce the current notion of research-based teacher education in Finland (Subchapter 1.1) and the 1970s reform through which teacher education was ‘scientized’ (Subchapter 1.2). The final subchapter of this introductory chapter will conclude by elaborating on the aim and purpose of the study. It will also provide an outline of the structural organisation of the thesis.

1.1 The Finnish miracle: Research-based teacher education

Due to its successful PISA results in recent years, the Finnish education system has been feted both nationally and internationally. In the wake of this success, publications for academic and other audiences have proliferated on the ‘Finnish miracle’ of education. These include, for example, Finnish Lessons: What Can the World Learn from Educational Change in Finland? by Sahlberg (2011), and Miracle of Education: The Principles and Practices of Teaching and Learning in Finnish Schools, edited by Niemi et al. (2012).3 The titles of such publications, in themselves, may be perceived as attesting to the Finnish assurance in education as a pathway to change, as well as to a Finnish exceptionalism that is emphatically

---


3 My reference to the work of Sahlberg (2011) and Niemi et al. (2012) is to intentionally draw attention to a specific discourse in which Finland’s educational success is taken as a ‘fact’ and a starting point for discussing the beneficial features of Finnish teacher education (its principles, practices, pedagogies) that have contributed to this success. There are, of course, other accounts provided by Finnish researchers in the field of education who seek to examine the ‘Finnish miracle’ of education in alternative ways (see e.g. Simola 2005, Simola & Rinne 2011, Varjo et al. 2013).
related to its cultural history that emphasises the value of schooling (see Simola & Rinne 2011: 230). In this story of educational and national success, particular attention has been drawn to the role of Finnish teachers and teacher education. Sahlberg (2011: 70), for example, suggests that the factors contributing to the success of Finnish education include the “9-year comprehensive school (peruskoulu) for all children, modern learning-focused curricula, systematic care for students with diverse special needs, and local autonomy and shared responsibility.” However, he continues by arguing that “research and experience suggest that one factor trumps all others: the daily contributions of excellent teachers” (Sahlberg 2011: 70). This perception of the “Finnish advantage” (Sahlberg 2011: 70) – that is, the quality of Finnish teachers – is shared, for example, by Silander and Välijärvi (2013: 94), who assert that:

An evident strength of the Finnish basic education system is attributable to teachers’ high professional competence and their strong ethical commitment to their work.

What is most prominently suggested as one of the central factors contributing to the quality of Finnish teachers, in the literature for both Finnish and international audiences, is the specific and unique academic, scientific and research-based nature of teacher education (see e.g. Kallioniemi et al. 2010a, Sahlberg 2011, Silander & Välijärvi 2013). These characteristics of Finnish teacher education are associated with the teacher education reform that took place in the 1970s through which the training of primary and secondary school teachers began to be provided solely by the universities.4 In a book celebrating the 30th anniversary of Finnish academic teacher education, Niemi (2010), for example, perceives the correlation between the PISA success and the teacher education reform as follows:

Now that Finland is at the top in the international measurements on school achievement, the roots of success can be found [in the teacher education reform that took place] over thirty years ago. The decisions that were made at that time are now bearing fruit. (Niemi 2010: 30–31*).5

---

4 University degrees for kindergarten teachers were to follow in the 1980s. Although only a Bachelor’s degree is currently required for kindergarten teacher qualifications, Master’s level studies are also offered in this professional field.

5 The asterisk (*) is used to indicate that the original text appears in Finnish and has been translated by the author for the purpose of this study.
The Finnish notion of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education – with these attributes most often being used interchangeably – has indeed become a popular, frequently referenced idea across the country at the levels of research, policy, curriculum and practice. Research-based teacher education has become a theme and idea that engenders research projects and publications;\(^6\) provides itself as a topic for academic discussions in seminars and conference panels;\(^7\) is mobilised in teacher education curriculum\(^8\) and teacher education policy;\(^9\) and is incorporated into university research strategies.\(^{10}\)

What is of particular significance in this study is, furthermore, that research-based teacher education would also seem to have become a generally accepted and recognised curricular and pedagogical model or principle for teacher education to the extent that teacher educators themselves have referred to it as a mantra or cliché (see e.g. Krokfors et al. 2011). It could be argued that there is a general consensus on the benefits and suitability of research-based teacher education as a curricular and pedagogical principle for Finnish teacher education. While the notion of research-based teacher education may be signified, understood and interpreted in a variety of ways among teacher educators, there would also appear to be a discourse that simultaneously suggests a collectively shared common sense, self-evident appropriation of the term.

The Finnish notion of research-based teacher education, at a general level, refers to at least two different dimensions of teacher training. The first could be perceived as administrative and organisational: In this respect, research-based teacher education refers to the university context in which it takes place and to the Master’s degrees that teacher graduates are to obtain through their studies. In the administrative and organisational sense, research-based teacher education also implies that teacher education programmes follow the same principles as other


\(^7\) For example, the panel discussion organised as part of the main programme of the Finnish Educational Research Association Annual Meeting 2014 was ‘Research-based Teacher Education – Bold Visions and New Openings?’ (Tutkimusperustainen opettajankoulutus – rohkeita visioita ja uusia avauksia?). URI: http://www.oulu.fi/ktk/kasvatustieteen-paivat-2014/ki/ohjelma. For another example, see Lavonen (2007).

\(^8\) For example, the class teacher education programme at the University of Eastern Finland states that the “aim of the studies in educational sciences is to direct the student towards scientific thinking and developing an inquiry-based approach to one’s work.” URI: https://www2.uef.fi.*

\(^9\) See e.g. Ministry of Education (2007: 15, 17).

\(^{10}\) For example, at the time of writing this thesis, one of the multidisciplinary development areas of the University of Oulu is ‘Research-Based Teacher Education.’ URI: http://www.oulu.fi/english/about-us/research.
programmes offered at universities: Students carry out Master’s thesis projects (that enable them to apply for doctoral studies) and are taught by academics who are research active themselves.

The second dimension relates to issues that could be perceived of as pedagogical and professional: In the academic literature as well as curricular texts, research-based teacher education refers to a research-based or inquiry-based approach to both teacher education curriculum and pedagogy as well as to the acquiring of such a professional orientation towards teaching. Research-based teacher education implies that student teachers are trained to be researchers and inquirers, to reflect pedagogically, and to connect or merge theory and practice, and that upon graduation they will continue to do so in their everyday work as teachers.¹¹

The Finnish model, or principle, of research-based teacher education is most often suggested as an internationally unique case in terms of how it trains its students in specific ways as educational professionals. These comparative accounts would seem to evoke not only a sense of uniqueness but also of exceptionalism and advancement. For example, it is pointed out that the Master’s level class teacher education programme is of a kind that “has yet to be found” in other European countries (Asunta et al. 2005: 231*, emphasis added). It is further argued that while teacher education may be university-based elsewhere as well, it is nevertheless different in Finland:

In almost all Western countries, teacher education is university-based, but in spite of this, its status is of an extraordinary kind and varies from one country to another. The Finnish model is rare; as a whole, the status of educational sciences is rare. Even if teacher education is university-based, it cannot easily be called academic. (Kansanen 2002: 47*).

Several historical accounts of academic teacher education in Finland provide a narrative through which the unique, exceptional nature of current Finnish teacher education is emphasized as having been established long ago. In these accounts, the academisation of teacher education in the 1970s is thus suggested as a

¹¹ Characterisations of Finnish research-based teacher education include other aspects in addition to those discussed in this subchapter, such as the principles according to which the teaching carried out in research-based teacher education is based on research and that research-based teacher education is itself an object of research. For various definitions and characterisations of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education in Finland, see e.g. Kansanen (2007: 144), Niemi (2012: 33), and Sahi & Manning (1981: 396).
culmination of a process that began in the 19th century. For example, Asunta et al. (2005) point out that the idea of scientizing teacher education can be found as early as the 1840s. They also suggest that:

The idea of teachers as... researchers of their work is not new in Finland, for already 140 years ago, the goals set by Uno Cygnaeus for our country’s teacher education were higher than those set in the “model countries” of Switzerland and Germany. In these countries, teacher training lasted three years, while in Finland, it lasted four years. (Asunta et al. 2005: 232*, emphasis added).

In this historical narrative, the ‘indigeneity’ of the notion of the teacher as researcher is further evoked by pointing out that those teaching in teacher seminars of Cygnaeus’ time were erudite and well versed in (Continental) educational sciences (Asunta et al. 2005: 232). What is claimed by advocates of academic, research-based teacher education in its exceptional Finnish form is that long before the rest of the world began to “talk about teachers as researchers,” the Finnish teacher education system had already been implementing such an idea (Kansanen 1993: 40*).

The unique ways in which Finnish research-based teacher education trains its teachers, it is suggested, is grounded in the Finnish perception of teaching as a highly demanding profession that requires advanced training (e.g. Asunta et al. 2005: 234). In particular, what is claimed as indicating the demanding nature of Finnish teacher education is the requirement for student teachers to carry out research by themselves during their studies. What is thus emphasised is that Finnish teacher training is also research training (see e.g. Malinen 1974b). In this way, it is suggested that this research-based approach to inquiry sets the Finnish model apart from (other) inquiry-oriented teacher education models in that student teachers must have first-hand experience of carrying out research, which promotes “independent thinking and the ability to be receptive to change” (Niemi 1990: 47*). It is argued that since student teachers in Finnish teacher education are required to work on research projects of their own, they are distinguished from their counterparts in inquiry-oriented teacher education programmes elsewhere where “autonomously thinking teachers” are trained through other inquiry-oriented strategies, such as “reflective practices that include observation, discussion, and journals that describe personal growth” (Niemi 1990: 47*). Therefore, what

---

12 This is not to say that these ‘other’ inquiry-oriented approaches are not prevalent in Finnish teacher education alongside formal Master’s thesis research projects. Considering the sustained popularity of reflective practices in teacher education and elsewhere, as well as the influence of a multitude of
would seem to be suggested is that teacher autonomy, in Finnish research-based teacher education, is produced in a specific and exceptional way. The next subchapter will discuss the ‘scientizing’ of Finnish teacher education as a space in which the conditions for the fabrication of the autonomous teacher as researcher have emerged.

1.2 The scientizing of Finnish teacher education

The Finnish teacher education reform of the 1970s saw the transfer of primary school teacher training from vocational teacher seminars to universities into the company of secondary school teacher training. The reform had two stages. First, in 1974, after a brief transition phase, the vocational teacher seminars were abolished and the training of primary school teachers began as Bachelor’s degree programmes in teacher education units within universities. In 1979, the three year Bachelor’s degree was transformed into a five year Master’s degree, a change that was greatly influenced by the general degree reform in higher education that abolished Bachelor’s degrees in Finnish higher education. (Simola 1993).

The reforms that took place in the 1970s were preceded by many years of discussion on the re-organisation of teacher education. The concerns around the promotion of a more academic teacher education were multiple. For example, it was perceived that teachers, after their basic training, should have the qualifications that would entitle them to pursue further academic studies (see e.g. Koskenniemi 1962: 50). Also, the grounds for the existence of different kinds of teacher training programmes no longer seemed plausible. For example, the concern was raised about the widening quality gap between urban and rural schools. Kyöstö (1965), for example, stated that teachers with ‘richer’ cultural and educational backgrounds were pursuing teacher training that was leading them to teach in cities, while international teacher research movements (to be discussed in Chapter 4), it comes as no surprise that reflective journals and portfolios, for example, are extremely common place in Finnish teacher education programmes across the country.

Simola and Rinne (2010) have pointed to the contingency of this transformation from Bachelor’s to Master’s degrees and have suggested that without the general degree reform, the training of primary school teachers through Master’s degrees may not necessarily have commenced. Due to the European Bologna Process concerning higher education degrees, the two-tier system with Bachelor’s degrees has been re-introduced to Finnish teacher education (and other) programmes in universities. Prospective teachers, nevertheless, continue to complete teacher education programmes that lead to Master’s degrees (see Jakku-Sihvonen & Niemi 2006a).

This claim was not new. For example, Simola (1993: 172) points out that “as early as 1890, elementary teachers had claimed that their extension training should be organized at university level.”
schools in the countryside were having to settle for ‘less talented’ and less trained teachers. In this way, the unification of teacher education was presented as the solution to the perceived problem of the uneven distribution of teacher quality in Finnish schools.

What is also of significance is how the unification of teacher education was – and still is – entangled in the rise of the empirical research in educational sciences that strengthened its position in Finnish educational thinking after the Second World War (see Saari 2011, Saari et al. 2014). That is, the endeavour to reform teacher education was greatly affected by the view held by empirical educational researchers on teaching as a practice to be informed by and inquired into through (positivist and later on, interpretive) scientific method. Koskenniemi (1962), for example, purported that teacher training curricula should be based on scientific knowledge: Preparing prospective teachers to teach implied preparing them to understand and work in accordance with the ‘natural laws’ of teaching. Therefore, regardless of the kind of school that teachers were being trained to teach in, what prospective teachers had in common was the need for a scientific education that would prepare them to teach. Following from this argument, Koskenniemi was also of the opinion that a unified teacher education would benefit more from a location in a university faculty than from being placed in a separate institution of its own and thus detached from the university. That is, if teacher training took place in pedagogical faculties within universities, it:

... would be scientifically qualified in every aspect and under scientific supervision. ... The teaching in teacher education programmes would be accompanied, supported and continually developed by extensive scientific research. (Koskenniemi 1962: 51*).

In agreement with Koskenniemi, Kyöstiö (1965) was also of the opinion that the training of teachers should be not only of pedagogical but also of scientific nature:16

---

15 Until the 1970s, the Finnish education system was based on a two-tier model (that was based on the Finnish social structure of the 19th century) with kansakoulu (initially meant for the commoners and referring to primary school; literally translating as ‘folk school’) and oppikoulu (a kind of grammar school or lower secondary school through which access was gained to higher education). This parallel school system was abolished through the Comprehensive School System that was implemented during the 1970s and which introduced a compulsory nine year comprehensive school system for all pupils (see Simola 1993).  

16 It is worth noting that both Koskenniemi and Kyöstiö were both involved in drafting at least one of the State Committee Reports on the upcoming teacher education reform (see Ruutu 1967).
What is implied ... by teacher preparation ... is supervision in teaching competence, or, in other words, pedagogical training. It is perceived that teachers need such training in order to effectively guide the teaching process within the areas of knowledge and skills that they are responsible for. ... Professional training, understood in this way, involves familiarising oneself with educational theory, educational preconditions, and educational reality. (Kyöstiö 1965: 5*).

The project of scientizing Finnish teacher education through the insertion of scientific knowledge into the curriculum, as described above, can be perceived as a counter-reaction to two projects of the past – that is, of tradition. These are: tradition as embodied in the vocational teacher seminars, and tradition as embodied in the speculative, philosophical tradition of (German-influenced) educational thinking.

The emphasis on empirical scientific knowledge as the main source of knowledge to inform teachers’ work is to distinguish academic teacher education from its non-academic seminar traditions that are based on ‘dilettantism’ and the speculative. For example, Kyöstiö writes:

The biggest weakness of the current teacher polytechnics is the general amateurism, dilettantism, which has been defended on the grounds of the multifaceted nature of schools. (Kyöstiö 1965: 9*).17

Teacher training is to be reformed and ‘upgraded’ through a more scientific curriculum, and it is perceived that only a ‘truly’ academic degree will provide teachers with the autonomy (as opposed to technicism) and competence (as opposed to ignorance) required in modern society:

What distinguishes [the teacher] from the level of a technician is that his/her education is based on science. (Kyöstiö 1965: 8*).

It is useless to mull over whether the old seminar education was better than the current academic class teacher education. With all due respect to the fine seminar tradition, the historical point in time is now different: The world is also a different place now. Teacher education should be able to orient itself well into

17 Over twenty years later, this criticism is echoed in the arguments voiced by Kivinen and Rinne (1989), who state: “What has been collected into teacher education is a multitude of bric-a-brac; the useless rehearsal of general knowledge; the compulsory activities of music, crafts and physical exercise ... and ... didactics that is void of any content and which could be given up without the least hint of an intellectual catastrophe” (Kivinen & Rinne 1989: 419*).
the 21st century! Simply put, the aim of teacher education in its current form is the educating of teachers who have sufficient knowledge that is based on scientific research about the pupils and their development; who have a good command of the disciplinary content knowledge to be taught; who comprehend the demands that the changes in society put on the school; and who sufficiently master the basic skills required for guiding the teaching process. (Uusikylä 1992: 58*).

It is believed that the scientifically informed, scientifically thinking teacher will be more prepared for future challenges and for a society of the future; more prepared to educate future citizens for a rapidly changing society (cf. Saari 2013: 75). Viljanen (1988: 26*), for example, is of the opinion that teachers should be given a “scientifically reliable picture of processes of growth and education” and that “philosophy will be of no assistance” in gaining such knowledge.

For teacher education, the transition to scientific, empirical research and knowledge comes to mark the transition from the past, defined by tradition and ignorance, to a more rational way forward in which philosophy is shifted into the margins due to its dogmatism and speculative nature (see Saari 2011, Saari et al. 2014). The out datedness and backwardness of teacher education would seem to be left behind in the spirit of Enlightenment as science comes to signify progress, the new, the open future of possibilities (see Popkewitz 2005: 23, Saari 2013: 76).

The constructed difference between academic, scientific teacher education and vocational, speculative teacher education is based on a perceived continuum of developmental stages that indicate the progression of a nation from underdeveloped to more advanced or civilised conditions. For example, Kyöstiö (1965: 7) argues that there is a direct correlation between the amount (and depth) of academic qualities of teacher education and the developmental stage of a nation: The more academic teacher education is, the clearer an indicator it is of a developed nation. This modern notion of progress and development is inscribed in the strategies through which the reformed teacher education aims to make itself more academic and modern. The marginalisation of the speculative and of tradition, and the prioritising of ‘more scientific’ modes of knowing are to contribute to the emancipation and empowerment of the teacher.
1.3 Studying the self-evident presence of research in Finnish teacher education

In the previous two subchapters, what has been introduced is the research-based, scientized space of Finnish teacher education – a space that is most often suggest as unique, exceptional, and an explanation for the Finnish educational ‘miracle.’ What would seem to be purported as a natural and logical outcome of such a space of teacher education is the training of teachers as researchers. That is, the training of teachers, in Finnish teacher education, would seem to become a question of how prospective teachers are to engage with scientific knowledge and practices. These engagements, as the analysis in the following chapters will show, involve particular significations and mobilisations of the notion of research. Examining the ways in which research (i.e. scientific knowledge and practices) is mobilised for the fabrication and governing of the teacher, within the Foucauldian orientation taken up in this study, implies considering the presence of research and science in teacher education curriculum in ways beyond the Spencerian curricular question (‘What knowledge is of most worth?’). Therefore, while significant insight has been gained by considering the scientizing of the knowledge base of teachers in Finland\(^\text{18}\) and elsewhere\(^\text{19}\) as a question of professionalization and in terms of the ways in which teaching, learning, education and schooling come to be represented and defined

---

\(^{18}\) Simola (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, Simola et al. 1997) explains the “disciplinization” (that is, the scientizing) of the Finnish teacher’s knowledge base as a process of change in Finnish teacher education that, in conjunction with the 1970s teacher education reform, saw the rise of a “didactically oriented educational science” (Simola 1998a: 344) as the predominant academic knowledge base for teachers. It could be argued that although the nuances and emphases of this disciplinization have changed since the 1990s (with the notions of ‘didactic thinking’ and ‘teacher as researcher’ that Simola mentions having been complemented with other conceptualisations of ‘pedagogically thinking teachers’ and ‘researching teachers’ – these will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4), in essence the same knowledge base is still there. For example, Krokfors et al. (2011: 2) suggest that teachers “need to be familiar with the latest research on how something can be taught and learnt”, while Mikkilä-Erdmann and Iiskala (2013: 436*) suggest that teachers must be “experts of interaction.” Niemi and Jakku-Silvonen (2006) contend, in similar vein, that teachers “must be experts of the processes of teaching and learning. … Teachers need metaknowledge of learning processes: they have to know what learning is from different theoretical viewpoints and how learners can be supported to find strategies to handle their own learning and to become active learners. They also need metaknowledge of collaborative learning processes. This involves knowing how knowledge can be construed in co-operation with others and understanding the social components of learning processes” (Niemi & Jakku-Silvonen 2006: 42).

\(^{19}\) See Labaree (1992) on the emergence of a science of teaching, and Fendler (2012) on the ‘lure of psychology’ and the emergence of the learning sciences in teacher education in the US context (but also relevant elsewhere).
through such scientized knowledge, the interest of this study lies elsewhere. The interest centres on how teacher subjectivities are worked on in terms of how teachers are to think, feel, see and act in relation to both themselves as well as their pupils and environments of schooling, and on how teacher autonomy is to be performed, conducted, and regulated. By attending to the principles and strategies that define and differentiate who the teacher should become, attention is drawn to the reasoning around how teachers are, for example, to make judgements, plan their action, and respond to challenges and problems they encounter – and how they are to perceive problems as such to begin with.

In this study, the current presence of research is examined in terms of what research ‘does,’ or effects, in Finnish teacher education. That is, the focus is on the various notions of research that are mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education, and on the discursive, cultural practices through which research comes to fabricate and govern the teacher subject. Therefore, the question is not about the intentions and motivations of teacher educators, researchers or other actors within teacher education, but about the ways through which the teacher is constructed and teacher autonomy governed. The aim is not to write for or against research-based teacher education, nor to provide an evaluation of whether teacher education has ‘got research right.’ Rather, in a Foucauldian sense, it is to consider the rationalities, strategies and effects of research as it is discursively mobilised in Finnish academic teacher education.

These questions will be examined in more detail by analysing academic publications on scientific, academic, research-based teacher education that have been produced by Finnish researchers and teacher educators for national and international audiences. Time-wise, the selected publications extend from the current decade to the 1960s and 1970s when the teacher education reform was being planned and implemented.

This study has two interrelated objectives: First, the aim of this research project is to problematize and interrogate the self-evident notion of the teacher as researcher and its related notions of research. Here, attention is paid to the constructing and governing of the teacher subject through the current and historical discourse of research-based teacher education. Secondly, the aim is also to make sense of the ‘educational language’ (Tröhler 2011) of Finnish teacher education in

---

20 For a sociological account of the academisation and scientizing of teacher education in Finland as a question of academic credibility and professional status, see Simola et al. (1997); see also Labaree (1992) for a US perspective on similar issues.
its cultural and historical specificity in order to make sense of the specific social ideals that circumscribe the aspirations for research-based teacher education. In others words, attention is drawn to the ways in which the practice of teaching and of teacher education “embodies culturally established ways of thinking, speaking and acting” (Phelan 2011: 212) – a stance that, according to Phelan (2011), has tended to gain little appreciation in teacher education research at large, and which, one could argue, is also the case in the Finnish context.

By addressing these concerns, this study brings to the fore the complexity and multi-layeredness of research-based teacher education in Finland, and in doing so, potentially contributes to and complexifies teacher education debates on curriculum and pedagogy in Finland and elsewhere. Ideas of the teacher as researcher and of teacher research/inquiry continue to pervade teacher education initiatives in different contexts around the world.21 As these ideas are taken up, the framing of questions related to schooling, on the one hand, and of those related to research, science and academic spaces, on the other hand, would seem to take place in ways that most often confine and restrict the possibilities to engage with the complexity of the practices of not only teaching and schooling, but also of research. The study therefore aims to interrogate the taken-for-grantedness of the notions of research-based teacher education and the teacher as researcher, and seeks to shed light on how such travelling notions play out as they are transformed and mobilised in historically and culturally specific contexts.

Historicizing Finnish teacher education through an approach that is concerned with the relations and effects of knowledge, power, and discourse may open up other alternatives and possibilities for thinking and action. To define research-based teacher education as a problem, then, is not to pronounce a judgement or evaluation in terms of ‘goodness’ or ‘correctness’ but to consider it as ‘dangerous’ in a constructive way – it is to problematize the discursive truths that are produced in order to think and act differently:

My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So my position leads not to apathy but to a hyper- and

21 Schulz and Hall (2004: 258), for example, argue that “the practitioner inquiry/teacher research movement is now well established on both sides of the Atlantic, and, over the years, it has gained an orthodoxy such that it would be mildly surprising to hear a teacher educator argue against the benefits of inquiry.”
pessimistic activism. I think that the ethico-political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger. (Foucault 1983: 231–232).

The structural organisation of the thesis is as follows: Chapter 2 will provide the theoretical-methodological framework of the study including the presentation of the research questions and data. Chapters 3 through 5 comprise the main analysis that will analyse the fabrication of the autonomous teacher (Chapter 3), the assemblage of notions of research and the teacher as researcher (Chapter 4), and the social ideals that ground the discourse of research-based teacher education (Chapter 5). Chapter 6 will draw together and discuss the main research findings and will conclude by considering and rethinking some curricular-pedagogical problems of Finnish teacher education.
Historicizing Finnish teacher education

The historical nature of this study is manifold. First, the primary data consists of publications from the last fifty years or so. Secondly, the study considers a particular historical event; that is, the 1970s teacher education reform in Finland. And thirdly, the study situates the reform and the related discourse of research-based teacher education in a particular historical, cultural and political context in order to examine some of the trajectories that are assembled in the discourse. In this sense, the historical scope of the study extends further back in time beyond the 1970s.

However, this study takes up a particular approach to the studying of history. This approach is a specific kind of historicizing that draws on the notion of the ‘history of the present’ (Foucault 1975/1991) in the studying of the (cultural) history of education (see Popkewitz et al. 2001a, Popkewitz 2013a). This chapter lays out the tools – that is, the theoretical underpinnings and concepts – that have made possible the investigation of ‘Finnish research-based teacher education’ in the present.

This study could be described as ‘Foucauldian’ in its approach and in its use of concepts developed by Foucault, such as power/knowledge, discourse, genealogy and governmentality. However, this is not to say that the intention has been to ‘apply Foucault correctly’ in that the work of Foucault does not provide a single method, methodology or theory for researchers to follow: There is no such thing as a systematic entity of Foucauldian methodology.22 Foucault’s work has been perceived as challenging and controversial both because he has not provided specific procedures that researchers might follow, nor has his intention been to propose solutions to problems. Despite these issues, or perhaps precisely because of them, it would seem appropriate to describe the approach assumed in this study as one inspired by Foucault, both directly through his own work, as well as, even more so, through the work of others who have ‘thought with Foucault’ (to a lesser or greater extent in conjunction with other ‘post’ theorists, theories and philosophies) in educational research.

Subchapter 2.1 will lay out the theoretical-methodological framework of the study. Subchapter 2.2 will present the research questions, and subchapter 2.3 will introduce the data as defined and produced for this study. The chapter will end with a brief note on translational issues (Subchapter 2.4).

---

22 See, for example, Baker and Heyning (2004: 3) on the question of “truly Foucaultian research.”
2.1 Writing a history of the present

The writing of a ‘history of the present’ can be contrasted to the writing of an objective, continuous, or evolutionary history. While an objective history would take as self-evident the ‘facts’ of history as represented in historical ‘evidence’ such as the archives, and would aim to reveal and present the events and actors of history ‘as they were in actuality,’ a history of the present pays attention to and problematizes historical and social constructions. From this perspective, Finnish research-based teacher education in this study is not examined as an excavation of ‘what really happened’ in order to draw attention to the main actors and events that led to the academisation of teacher education.

While a continuous history would assume the linearity and causality of events as effects of human action, a history of the present decentres the subject and also takes into account the discontinuity, points of rupture, and contingency in the passing of time. From this perspective, this study considers Finnish research-based teacher education as constructing subjects – more specifically here, teacher subjects – “in uneven time that have no single origin” (Popkewitz 2013b: 15).

While an evolutionary history would be grounded in the “presumption that societal progress is inextricably bound to the passage of time,” a history of the present does not take for granted the “automatic evolution or progress of human affairs” (Baker 1998: 155). From this perspective, it is not assumed that the case of Finnish research-based teacher education is a natural development within a linear continuum of social progress (or decline).

The point of departure is thus not to verify an ultimate reality in terms of the actual, real history of academic teacher education in Finland; it is not to “capture what the past really was,” but rather, to attempt to make sense of the “cultural practices which have made us what we are” (Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983: 204).

Therefore, considered in these ways, the historicizing of research-based teacher education points to an investigation and problematisation of the historical, social and discursive constructions of knowledge; of the ‘truths’ and common senses of teacher education. Such a historicizing, as influenced by postmodern and poststructural theorizing, aims to make visible the historical specificity of truths and to interrogate the ways in which subjects are constructed through such truths:

Postmodern historicizing takes an assumed truth of the universe and explains it as a historical happenstance, and then examines the construction of that truth as embodied in social technologies and technologies of the self. When assumed
truths are reconstituted as being historically specific, those truths lose their reins on thought; and when the constitution of the subject is problematized, the effects of power on the self can be critiqued. Herein lies the critical potential of postmodern historicizing. (Fendler 1999: 175).

In this way, the hopes for the future are placed not in the empowerment of rational human agency (that is, the Cartesian subject), but rather, in the Foucauldian notion that “freedom lies in our ability to transform our relationship to the past, to tradition and much less in being able to control the form and direction that the future will take” (Ball 2006: 63). One of the insights to be gained from Foucault’s work can be found in the way “he wrote history in order to help us gain surprising insight into our present circumstances” (Fendler 2010: 42). Writing a history of the present thus provides a strategy to make “problematic the stories we are given and those we tell” (Popkewitz & Brennan 1998: 27) – stories and “ways of ‘seeing’ education that ‘are so deeply ingrained with habit and discursive familiarity that we are pretty well insulated from shock’” (MacLure 2003: 173).

To write a history of the present, then, is to consider history, knowledge, the subject, and power in a way that distinguishes it from what might be called ‘traditional’ (i.e. objective, continuous, evolutionary) history. Youdell (2006) concisely articulates this different understanding that a Foucauldian framework provides:

*History* is understood not as the march of progress, but as marked by improvisational borrowing in the face of new and pressing demands. *Knowledge* is understood not as a reflection and transmitter of external truths, but as contingent and constructed and linked intimately to power. The *subject* is understood not as pre-existing, self-knowing, and continuous, but as subjectivated through her/his ongoing constitution in and by discourse. And *power* is understood not as wielded by the powerful over the powerless, but as at once productive and an effect of discourse. (Youdell 2006: 35, emphasis added).

These understandings will be attended to in the following sections in which the central concepts of *genealogy*, *power/knowledge* and *discourse*, and *governmentality* will be discussed in terms of how they contribute in this study; that is, to a writing of a history of the present of Finnish research-based teacher education.
2.1.1 Genealogy

Foucault’s genealogical approach has been defined, interpreted and worked with in multiple ways. Most often, it would seem to be understood as an approach that he developed (as influenced by Nietzschean notions of genealogy) in his later works after, and as a continuation of, his approach of archaeology. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983: 104), however, emphatically argue that “there is no pre- and post-archaeology or genealogy in Foucault” and that both analytical approaches can be found throughout his work although with varying emphasis at different stages. Peters and Burbules (2004) distinguish genealogy from archaeology in the following way:

Foucault’s move from archaeology to genealogy represents a fundamental shift away from synchronic analyses (models of interrelations within a system at a particular point in time), which are characteristic of structuralism, to diachronic modes of analysis (stressing the development and change of such interrelations across historical epochs) more concerned with the temporal dimension of human culture. (Peters & Burbules 2004: 62, emphasis added).

What is of central concern within this ‘temporal dimension’ is “the processes, procedures, and apparatuses whereby truth and knowledge are produced” (Tamboukou & Ball 2003: 4). That is, historical, cultural, institutional and discursive practices are examined and traced with an interest in considering the effects of power in the production of knowledge. The subject is examined not as the locus or possessor of power, but as one who is constructed through such practices:

Genealogy is not after the who or whom of power. It is the how of power that interests genealogy. Genealogy focuses upon the relations and forces of power connected to discursive practices. This focus on the how of power does not exclude people but rather seeks to analyze the complex ways they are constituted within historically and culturally specific sites where power, truth, and knowledge are interrelated. (Tamboukou & Ball 2003: 8).

In other words, a genealogical approach asks, “which kinds of practices, linked to which kinds of external conditions, determine the different knowledges in which we ourselves figure” (Tamboukou & Ball 2003: 4). Furthermore, these practices, conditions and discursive formations are not taken as having developed and continuously developing in modes of linearity and progress. Rather, through
attention paid to detail instead of “grand historical events” (Tamboukou 1999: 207), genealogy “seeks the surfaces of events, small details, minor shifts, and subtle contours” (Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983: 106).

A specific and particularly relevant example of (one kind of) a genealogical analysis is provided by Fendler (2003: 17) who “traces the genealogy of reflection in teacher education.” The genealogical approach allows Fendler to examine how different notions of reflection (specifically, notions as influenced by Descartes, Dewey, Schön and feminism) contribute to the “durability” and perceived naturalness of ‘reflection’ in teacher education discourses (Fendler 2003: 17). The focus in Fendler’s analysis is not on “how meanings fit together analytically but rather how they work together historically” (Fendler 2003: 17), which draws attention to the effects of ‘reflection’ in terms of how it constructs teacher subjects as ‘reflective,’ as well as to the multiplicity of (contradictory) meanings evoked as ‘reflection’ is mobilised in teacher education discourses. In these ways, a genealogical approach makes possible the defamiliarising of a notion or concept that is taken for granted in the everyday. Fendler’s study is also an example of how a genealogy is a history of the present in that it starts with a problem or question in the present from which it proceeds to examine its historicity; that is, its historical and cultural construction (see e.g. Tamboukou 1999). In this vein, Foucault (1988) writes:

I set out from a problem expressed in the terms current today and I try to work out its genealogy. Genealogy means that I begin my analysis from a question posed in the present. (Foucault 1988: 262).

2.1.2 Power/knowledge and discourse

What has already been pointed to in the previous sections of this subchapter is the inter-relatedness of power, knowledge and discourse as understood through the work of Foucault. The problematic of power/knowledge that Foucault introduces relates to the perception that knowledge construction is a “function of power” (Jackson & Mazzei 2012: 52); that the formation of knowledge occurs within relations of power and is an effect of power. Knowledge is understood not as transmitting objective truths, but as the production of truths under certain conditions. The concept of discourse, in this line of thought, refers to “the location where power and knowledge intersect” (O’Farrell 2005: 133), and discursive practice thus to a “historically and culturally specific set of rules for organizing and
producing different forms of knowledge” (O’Farrell 2005: 134). Discourses are perceived as “conduits” of productive power in their “potential to produce and regulate the world in their own terms as if they were true” (Youdell 2011: 25).

Foucault’s notion of power/knowledge theorises power in a way different from that implied in the notion of ‘sovereign power’ (e.g. Foucault 1980, 1998). Sovereign power, as Foucault has pointed out, implies the kind of power that is acquired, held and exercised over the dominated, for example, through physical punishment. This understanding of power is what most often prevails in everyday thinking when ‘power’ is referred to; power is something to have, take or give away. Productive power, on the other hand, suggests an understanding of power in which it is perceived as circulating through institutional and everyday practices, discourses, relations, actions. Foucault refers to the “capillary form” of the existence of productive power, thus evoking an image of an intricate network through which power operates:

Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. ... Power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex stratagical situation in a particular society. ... Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations. (Foucault 1976/1998: 93–94).

While Foucault has made visible the difference between sovereign power and power that operates productively through discourse, this does not mean to imply that these two forms of power could not operate at the same time in a given context and time. However, distinguishing between these two forms of power (and other possible forms of power), first, destabilises the common sense understanding that power is something solely to be possessed, and secondly, makes possible different analytical questions and methods related to ‘power’ in (educational) research: It is to focus on how power is deployed and mobilised, and to consider the effects and strategies of power/knowledge in discourse.

[The analysis in question] should be concerned with power at its extremities, in its ultimate destinations, with those points where it becomes capillary, that is, in its more regional and local forms and institutions. ... Its paramount concern, in fact, should be with the point where power ... invests itself in institutions, becomes embodied in techniques, and equips itself with
instruments and eventually even violent means of material intervention. (Foucault 1980: 96).

Such an understanding of the inter-relation between power, knowledge and discourse, first, distinguishes the analysis of discourse in the poststructural, Foucauldian sense from approaches of discourse analysis as developed in linguistic approaches.23 Secondly, discourses are thus perceived as the practices through which certain kinds of people are constructed; discourses “establish what kind of person one is entitled/obliged to ‘be’” (MacLure 2003: 176). The “fabrication” of specific kinds of subjects is thus an apropos expression in that it refers to the way in which the individual is “fabricated’ into the social order” (MacLure 2003: 176)24 both in terms of a “fiction” as well as in terms of a “making that has actual and material consequences” (Popkewitz et al. 2001b: ix, see also Foucault 1975/1991: 217). The subject is thus ‘decentred’ as it is perceived as being discursively constructed through social relations and cultural practices.

Let us not, therefore, ask why certain people want to dominate, what they seek, what is their overall strategy. Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of on-going subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours etc. ... We should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts etc. We should try to grasp subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects. (Foucault 1980: 97).

Understanding power, knowledge and discourse in these terms makes possible a different way of analysing a discourse. Such an analysis does not seek to identify an ideology or a set of competing ideologies in the discourse in order to reveal and overthrow their hegemonic positions. It does not attempt to trace the origin of ideas. Nor does such a reading, as a ‘discourse analysis,’ seek to construe and represent as such the variation of intentions as voiced by agents in the sense of a ‘textual analysis.’ Rather, it is concerned with investigating discourse in order to examine how statements, at a given time, “are formed and made possible” (Ball 2015: 311).

23 This distinction is most often made while recognising the affinity and historical intellectual connections between broader sociocultural approaches to the analysis of discourse, on the one hand, and more linguistic approaches to discourse analysis, on the other hand (see e.g. Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, MacLure 2003).

24 “People are woven into, and woven out of, discourse” (MacLure 2003: 176).
In the study at hand, this implies considering how the ‘teacher as researcher,’ in the Finnish context, is fabricated through different, overlapping discursive practices that differentiate and distinguish this teacher subject from other subjectivities. These discursive practices produce what Popkewitz (2009) has called ‘cultural theses’ that provide specific principles – such as moral orders – for the correct modes of life of, for example, the teacher and which are to regulate the conduct of individuals. This notion of governmentality is discussed in the following section.

2.1.3 Governmentality

The concept of governmentality, as introduced by Foucault (1975/1991) and developed by others (e.g. Dean 1994, Miller & Rose 2008, Rose & Miller 1992, Rose 1999a), refers to a liberal form of governing of individual conduct (i.e. of citizens) of a modern state. ‘Liberal’ here does not refer to an ideological stance but rather, to the relationship between the individual and the state “in which we govern ourselves as free people” (Fendler 2010: 50). Governing, in the Foucauldian sense, can be understood as working in a way that is “not opposed to freedom, autonomy, originality or spontaneity” (Martins 2013: 73) in that individuals, as governed subjects, are to exercise and express autonomy (for example, in the taking up of responsibility, in the exercising of judgement, or in the demonstration of creative attitudes) as they conduct their own conduct.

Government ... refers to all endeavors to shape, guide, direct the conduct of others, whether these be the crew of a ship, the members of a household, the employees of a boss, the children of a family or the inhabitants of a territory. And it also embraces the ways in which one might be urged and educated to bridle one’s own passions, to control one’s own instincts, to govern oneself. (Rose 1999b: 3).

In this way, governing can be understood more appropriately as a productive instead of a repressive force. Furthermore, practices of governing can be perceived as the coming together of particular historical trajectories that ground present ideals, aspirations and desires:

Government is the historically constituted matrix within which are articulated all those dreams, schemes, strategies and manoeuvres of authorities that seek to shape the beliefs and conduct of others in desired directions by acting upon
their will, their circumstances and their environment. (Rose & Miller 1992: 175).

Through the concept of governmentality, it is possible to perceive and analyse practices of schooling as “devices created to achieve the ends of governing the populational body as a whole and each person in his/her individuality” (Martins 2013: 72). Popkewitz (1998, 2008) in particular, through his studies on educational reform in the US, has drawn attention to how school subjects, such as mathematics or music, are transformed into practices through which “the dispositions, sensitivities, and awareness of the child and teacher” (Popkewitz 2002: 262) are administered and governed. He uses the concept of *alchemy* to show how the systems of reason through which school subjects are ordered result in an embodiment of “principles that are not merely about learning content” (Popkewitz 2010: 413). The concept of alchemy, therefore, draws attention to how school subjects would appear to represent their equivalent disciplinary fields (of history, mathematics, biology etc.) yet which are present in the practices of schooling for purposes other than to train pupils as scientists in those fields:

> The magic of the transformation is to reconfigure the academic fields in schools so that only the namesake appears, as a ubiquitous doorplate to mark a house. (Popkewitz 2002: 262).

Therefore, the concept of governmentality enables an analysis of, for example, mathematics education not as practices through which pupils are to become mathematicians (this is not to evaluate whether students, for example, learn how to solve equations during their schooling) but as practices through which the student is made, for example, a problem-solver as framed in social and psychological theories. What is inscribed in such alchemic practices, therefore, are social, psychological and pedagogical visions about who the child should (not) be.

In a similar manner, Martins (2013: 67) provides a historical analysis of how the arts, in the context of Portugal, have been incorporated in the school curriculum to make the child as a future citizen; that is, how art as ‘police technologies’ govern the child and fabricate the child “as a moral, autonomous citizen.”

> Even if different words are used, the arts are still conceptualized in psychological terms in school as a way of incorporating good habits or improving the power of attention, as instruments of salvation that through truth, beauty, and goodness will rescue the child from immoral or barbaric behavior. (Martins 2013: 82).
As the analysis in chapter 4 will demonstrate, it is possible to consider ‘research’ as a curricular subject in research-based teacher education that alchemically morphs into strategies through which specific qualities and dispositions of the student teacher are evoked and worked on.

2.2 Research questions

Within this poststructural, Foucauldian framework, it becomes possible to consider the (history of the) presence of research and science in Finnish teacher education in a particular way. Combining Foucauldian approaches of genealogy and governmentality while attending to the Finnish ‘language of education’ has resulted in the formulation of the following research questions:

1. How are teacher subjectivities and notions of research constructed, assembled and mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland?
2. What social ideals circumscribe the aspirations for teachers as researchers and research-based teacher education in Finland?

In the following three chapters, these research questions will be addressed in overlapping ways. The analysis provided in chapter 3 will focus on the discursive construction of the teacher in the discourse of research-based teacher education. It will examine how research and science are envisioned as emancipating the teacher and thus bringing about autonomy and change.

Chapter 4 will focus on different notions of research: the ways in which they are assembled and mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education, and the effects of these notions as strategies for fabricating and governing the teacher. Specifically, two strands or trajectories of the notion of the teacher as researcher will be examined and juxtaposed in order to make sense of the tensions between mobilisations of research and its related ideas of inquiry, reflection and critical thinking.

Chapter 5 will investigate the discourse of research-based teacher education as a culturally and historically specific narrative of progress. Teacher autonomy, educational equality, and the aspirations or desires for research-based teacher education itself, will be examined as questions that point to the social ideals inscribed in the discourse.
### 2.3 Academic publications as data

This study examines the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education by analysing academic texts that produce accounts concerning academic, scientific, research-based teacher education as an organising principle or curricular-pedagogical model. In other words, the texts chosen for analysis provide accounts that advocate for and are in agreement with research-based teacher education; texts that promote, develop and discuss curricular-pedagogical ideas that relate to research-based teacher education, or in which the authors identify the research they have carried out and are reporting on as an example or implementation of research-based teacher education.

The notion of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education and the discourse around it is not limited to academic texts. As pointed out in chapter 1, the notion and discourse of research-based teacher education circulates widely in various spaces and contexts, and can be found in policy and curricular texts as well as in the everyday conversations that take place in teacher education departments. In this study, however, the focus centres on the discourse as produced in academic publications, thus drawing specific attention to “discursive practices” as “distinguished from the speech acts of everyday life:” to “serious speech acts: what experts say when they are speaking as experts” (Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983: xxiv). In other words, the institutional framing of the chosen texts is of a specific nature that positions the authors as experts who, through the academic, institutional convention of publishing, are involved in producing knowledge for and about teacher education. The serious speech acts articulated in the texts can be considered as representing the disciplinary field itself: What is articulated draws attention to the disciplinary self-understanding of the field of education. In this way, the statements and arguments expressed in the publications can be read as expressions that relate to the discipline of education itself concerning for example, how educational science and educational theory come to be defined, and how specific tasks and purposes are prescribed for educational research.

The texts analysed in this study primarily represent work published from around the time of the reform until the present decade. The reform that was fully

---

25 In the initial stages of the research process, in particular, the notion of and discussion around research-based teacher education was mapped by interviewing teacher educators, attending related national seminars, reading policy and curricular texts, and making observations in everyday teacher education settings as a teacher educator and researcher. This has also been influenced by prior experiences as a student in teacher education in Finland.
implemented in 1979 (when primary school teachers commenced their training in five year Master’s programmes in universities) was preceded by years of debate and discussion on the appropriate location and organisation of teacher education. In this study, some of these debates have been traced into the 1960s and 1970s, and therefore, the texts that have been analysed for this study represent work from the last six decades.

The publications include articles, monographs, book chapters and edited collections, and have been written in Finnish and English for both national and international audiences, respectively. The selected texts have been written by authors affiliated with Finnish universities, with the exception of a few articles that have been co-authored by researchers located elsewhere (e.g. Sahi & Manning 1981, Westbury et al. 2005). It is worth noting that the amount of publications on academic, research-based teacher education gradually increases during the decades under examination. Also, a most striking change takes place at the beginning of the 2000s when publications in English and for international audiences first appear and most suddenly proliferate.

In addition to research reports and conceptual pieces, the selected publications include a variety of other kinds of texts, such as prefaces, transcribed speeches (e.g. inaugural lectures and graduation ceremony speeches), and positions papers. It is important, therefore, to note that the texts have been produced for different purposes and thus represent different argumentative styles of writing.

Thematically, in terms of content, the publications under examination touch on a variety of issues concerning teacher education that, to some extent, reflect the time of publication (there are also publications that are written in a way that makes it difficult to detect the time of publication from the actual content). For example, the texts published in the 1960s and 1970s are defined by debates on the reform that is yet to take place. These publications discuss, for example, the possible benefits for teacher education of being located within the university, and how academic requirements for engagement with scientific knowledge might be reconciled with the vocational aims of teacher education. The publications produced in the 1980s and early 1990s, on the other hand, are characterised by a phase during which the newly established academic teacher education was heavily criticised and doubted. These texts, therefore, can be read as responses to the

26 It must be noted that Swedish is the other official language in Finland, and teacher education is also provided in Swedish in one teacher education department in Finland. However, it was not possible within the scope of this study to include texts published in Swedish in the literature search and analysis.
criticism; as accounts in which academic teacher education is rigorously defended. The publications from the last two decades would seem to assume yet another mode. Currently, research-based teacher education would not seem to be under any major threat or criticism – rather, the educational success as brought about through the PISA results have bolstered the firmly established status of teacher education in its current form. The stabilised position of teacher education as a university-based, academic programme is evident in the publications of the most recent decades, as they would seem to concentrate on the further elaboration and development of the now well established idea of research-based teacher education.

Throughout the decades under examination, different issues and challenges emerging in the social contexts of teacher education are used and responded to in ways that can be perceived as re-enforcing the significance and relevance of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education. For example, in the texts published in the 1960s and 1970s, the scientifically and academically trained teacher is constructed as a response to the challenges of urbanisation and the emergence of a new era defined by modern technologies and technological advancement. The rise of new theories of learning, the changing professional contexts of schools (such as the re-organisation of multi-professional collaboration), and the ‘new’ challenges brought about through a more multicultural Finnish society are further examples of the perceived turning points that are taken up in the publications as the constantly changing rationale for research-based teacher education. Furthermore, school reforms, namely, the Comprehensive School Reform of the 1970s as well as the Curriculum Reform of the 1990s, are mobilised in the publications as providing the justification for academic teacher education and teachers as researchers.

The discourse (or discourses) of the examined period from the 1960s to the 2010s also reflect the paradigmatic changes that took place at different points of time and which influenced the arguments for scientific, research-based teacher education. The tensions and reactions around the shift from speculative to empirical educational sciences; the shift from positivist, quantitative approaches to qualitative, interpretive approaches in educational research; and the shift from behaviourist to constructivist theorisations of learning are all discernible in the publications under investigation.

In practical terms, the selection of publications to be included as ‘data’ was not a simple, clear-cut process, and it refuted easy definitions of data and its boundaries. Relevant publications about teacher education in Finland were first searched for through the national library database (Melinda) and international research
databases (EBSCO, ERIC) on ‘research-based teacher education’ and related keywords such as ‘inquiry-based teacher education’ and ‘teacher as researcher.’ However, the search was not limited to the use of these databases and keywords, as many of the publications that were read for this study were identified as relevant not based on their title or keywords but by extensive reading and following the ‘tracks’ of references in other publications.

While the ‘core’ of the data can be quite clearly defined as comprising academic publications that engage with, develop and promote the idea of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education as a curricular-pedagogical idea, model or principle, the actual reading of academic publications has necessarily required reading beyond that core. That is, specific ‘trails’ have drawn attention on themselves, which has led to a kind of reading around the core data and which has thus disrupted a fixed notion of where the data begins and ends. Therefore, what is provided in the Appendix is a list of publications that represent the core of the data in an exemplifying rather than exhaustive manner. The list is provided in order to make visible how the discourse of research-based teacher education has been defined and constructed for the purpose of analysis through a situated and provisional selection of texts. This perception of the wavering boundaries of data is reflected in the organisation of the references at the end of the thesis. The conventional distinction that is often made by differentiating between works cited as data, and works cited as references has not been applied due to the problematic ways in which such conventions inscribe fixed notions of data.

Therefore, references to ‘the discourse’ of research-based teacher education, do not mean to suggest the actual existence of a discourse with clearly defined boundaries, a historical artefact or a ‘data set’ that can be retrieved from the (archival) shelf as a clearly defined entity. Rather, it is important to recognise that ‘the discourse’ being referred to in this study has been defined and produced in a situated way for analytical purposes. Furthermore, references to ‘the discourse’ do not mean to suggest the existence of a unified discourse in which all notions and statements are aligned in relation to each other. Such an approach would diminish and overlook the nuances between the speech acts that are evident in the discourse. Indeed, there are different arguments and emphases that are brought into the discourse at different times and in relation to specific concerns that are addressed.

Nevertheless, it possible to perceive of the chosen publications as producing a discourse; a discursive formation of a “historical grid” (Popkewitz 2008: 21) in which ideas, ideals, concerns, problems, solutions and aspirations are enunciated and ordered. The analysis of the discourse of research-based teacher education, in
this study, is more appropriately characterised, therefore, as “discourse work” rather than “text work”, if text work is to imply an “analysis of key or recurrent words and phrases” (Ball 2015: 311) in a textual, linguistic sense. Rather, to interrogate discourse is to consider how statements and notions are made possible, what they do, and how they fabricate subjectivities. Through what Popkewitz and Brennan (1998: 9) refer to as a social epistemology, the notion of ‘research,’ as appearing in the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland, can thus be considered as “embodying a range of historically constructed values, priorities, and dispositions toward how one should see and act toward the world.”

2.4 A note on translation

A vast amount of the texts cited in this study were originally published in Finnish, and have been translated into English by the author for this thesis. Occasionally, the translational challenges and ambiguities encountered will be commented on in footnotes.

One of the most challenging and interesting translational issues in this study is related to the most central keyword of this study: ‘research.’ ‘Research-based,’ in Finnish, is tutkimusperustainen – tutkimus referring to ‘research’ as a noun. The Finnish verb for ‘carrying out research’ is tutkia, while tutkija refers to ‘researcher.’

However, the semantics of tutkia (the verb) is different from its English counterpart that generally refers to systematic and careful study, inquiry or investigation. The online Oxford Dictionaries (Oxford University Press 2015), for example, provides the definition for ‘research’ (as a verb) as follows: “1. Investigate systematically” and “1.1 Discover or verify information for use in (a book, programme, etc.).” Furthermore, it provides the definition for ‘research’ (as a noun) as follows: “The systematic investigation into and study of materials and sources in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions,” with example sentences all relating to academic, scientific research (e.g. qualitative research, medical research) (Oxford University Press 2015). However, tutkia is a more multifaceted term, and, as the Dictionary of Contemporary Finnish (Nykysuomen sanakirja by Sadeniemi 1992: 87) suggests, ‘to carry out scientific research’ is only one of its more specified meanings. Tutkia, first and foremost, refers broadly to a

---

27 For discussions on poststructural educational research and the tensions and relations between discourse, text, language and history, see Cormack and Green (2009); and between discourse, text, language and policy, see Ball (2015).
variety of actions and practices such as: to examine (someone’s baggage, or a patient), to check (something for mistakes), to study (a map), to explore (the possibilities, or space), to investigate (a crime), to search (one’s pockets). Moreover, the verb *tutkia* is also used in reference to spiritual or religious practices: The practice of reading spiritual texts meditatively, and the Biblical notion of being examined and known by God both incorporate the word *tutkia* (see Sadeniemi 1992: 87).

While the analysis carried out in the following on the discourse of research-based teacher education is not one of linguistic nature, the process of reading publications in two very different languages on ‘research,’ ‘research-basedness’ and ‘researchers’ has drawn attention to the discursive-linguistic effects in a particular (and initially unexpected) way. What might be at least tentatively argued is that the multiple meanings of *tutkia* have a significant effect on how notions of ‘research’ are mobilised in the Finnish texts in particular. The obscure semantic connotations, at least to some extent, would seem to affect the significations and discursive mobilisations of ‘research’ in a constant oscillation between academic or scientific inquiry, curiosity and wondering, inquiry-based learning, and introspection. This, in itself, would seem to point to a particular kind of alchemy.

---


29 For example: “Herra, sinä olet minut *tutkinut*, sinä tunnet minut” (Psalms 139:1, 1993 Finnish translation, emphasis added); “You have searched me, Lord, and you know me” (Psalms 139:1, New International Version). “Sinä vanhurskas Jumala, sinä joka *tutkit* sydämen ja ajatukset” (Psalms 7:10, 1993 Finnish translation, emphasis added); “You, the righteous God who probes minds and hearts” (Psalms 7:9, New International Version).
3 Fabricating the autonomous teacher

This chapter examines the fabrication of the teacher in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. What is considered in the following is how the scientifically trained teacher of the reformed, ‘modernised’ teacher education is envisioned as a more autonomous subject than its non-academically trained counterpart. The discourse of research-based teacher education, in this analysis, is examined as inscribing a binary logic, including distinctions such as old/new, traditional/modern, backward/forward, passive/active in a narrative of progress and newness that refutes and rejects tradition and the past. The reconstructed narrative provided in this chapter is not meant as an assertion or explanation of an empirical reality, nor as an attempt to defend either side of the binary. Rather, the binary is to be understood as a conceptual organiser that makes visible the fabrication of the teacher. The purpose of reconstructing the juxtaposition of the ‘new’ and the teacher ‘of old’ in the following analysis is performative rather than representational: It aims to disrupt the common sense of causality and linear development that is inscribed in the notion of the scientization and modernisation of teacher education. It draws attention to the “elimination” of tradition as a particular “creation of modernity” (Popkewitz 2005: 23). However, this analysis is not performed in order to defend tradition against modernity by reverting the hierarchical binary constructed in the narrative. The analysis is performed to illuminate the construction and limitations of the binary itself. As discussed in chapters 1 and 2, the notion of fabrication is used to consider how the teacher subject is made in teacher education discourse, and how that fabrication is a certain kind of fabulation with material effects. The notion of autonomy, in the following analysis, is also considered as a construction, an empirical category in the grid or matrix through which subjectivities are shaped and governed.

The first three subchapters to follow will focus on the fabrication of the autonomous teacher who is to be emancipated, empowered, and activated through scientific, research-based teacher education. More specifically, what will be examined is how teacher autonomy is envisioned in conjunction with an evocation of teacher commitment. First, the discourse is considered in terms of how it constructs the teacher as school reformer who is to be committed to change and renewal in schools (Subchapter 3.1). Secondly, attention is paid to the rationalities through which the teacher is made as a decision-maker who is to be committed to a professional mode of practice (Subchapter 3.2). Thirdly, what is analysed is the ways in which the teacher is produced as an active learner who is to be committed
to his or her own active and lifelong learning (Subchapter 3.3). Subchapter 3.4 is different in its scope. It takes as its point of departure the arguments of the preceding subchapters and examines how autonomous teacher thinking is ‘naturalised’ as scientific in essence, and consequently, how research-based teacher education is constructed as a ‘natural’ space for the training of teachers.

3.1 The teacher as school reformer

This subchapter focuses on the production of the teacher as a central agent of change and renewal in schools. That is, the changes taking place in society and the world are perceived, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, as demanding a response from schools: Schools must ‘keep up’ with new developments in society instead of lagging behind in their ‘traditional’ ways of existence. What follows from this idea is: Teachers are key actors who either bring about or hinder change and development in schools; and teacher education is a key actor in preparing future teachers as agents of change who will take up the task of school reform instead of maintaining the unchanging ways of schooling. What is suggested in the discourse is that the orientation of teacher education must be towards the future, and that of the teacher must, likewise, be directed to active anticipation and preparation for what lies ahead. Change is not only to be expected but also intentionally worked towards in order to gain distance from the past, from tradition. In these ways, the aspiration for change in research-based teacher education can be perceived as being embedded in a notion of progress that equates tradition with stagnation and the future with activity and advancement.

In the discourse of research-based teacher education, it is envisioned that academic, scientific, research-based teacher education is to pursue the making of the “future-oriented contributor-teacher” instead of a “static implementer teacher” (Krokfors 2005: 72*). The future orientation that academic teacher education is to instil in prospective teachers implies a need to emphasise a “willingness towards change” (Kyöstiö 1971: 297*). What is further suggested is that changes in society “require a fundamental re-organisation of teacher education”, a re-assessment of and a “critical stance towards the tasks of the teacher”, for “the future community is most likely to be in need of thinking and motivating supervisors instead of traditional teachers” (Kyöstiö 1971: 297*). The solution to the question of “how to educate ... teachers oriented towards the future” (Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990: 142*) is perceived as being provided by academic teacher education:
Teacher education is the best way to develop the teacher and the school; this is why teacher education must be of the highest educational level, in other words, university level. (Ojanen 1993a: 8*).

Therefore, the fabrication of the teacher as school reformer is effected through a rationality suggesting that teacher autonomy is to be ‘worked on’ through academic teacher education that is to move teachers away from replication, routine and personal experience. In each case, research-based teacher education is envisioned as bringing about newness and change, and thus emancipating the teacher from unconscious habit towards consciousness; that is, towards conscious thinking and action. In the discourse, academic, scientific teacher education is juxtaposed with vocational, practice-based, master-apprentice approaches to teacher education, for it is perceived that in the latter approaches, tradition is:

... transmitted in more or less unspoken form and most often without the creative contribution of the apprentice. This is how to train teachers who will internalise the vocational tradition. Unfortunately, such teachers will simultaneously adopt practices that could potentially be renewed and reformed if new perspectives, provided, for example, by the academic disciplines, were enabled to contribute to common sense thinking and current practices. The process of knowledge acquisition as well as independent, premise-based reasoning are distinctive characteristics of science. If teachers do not have the ability to think independently and to determinedly find new premises that influence situations, their individual development is in danger. They will continue to repeat the principles deemed practical by the professional community of teachers. (Niemi 1989a: 70*).

What is rejected in the discourse of research-based teacher education is, therefore, the non-academic, non-scientific approach to teacher training that places emphasis on learning from the vocational or professional community of experienced, senior teachers and from ‘mere’ practice. Such learning, it is suggested, is repetitive, replicative, and hence technicist (e.g. Niemi 1986). The danger of teacher education that does not provide prospective teachers with engagements with academic knowledge and scientific theory is perceived as lying in how it deprives teachers of the capacity to make judgements of their own, and how it, therefore, “makes teachers opposers of reform” (Niemi 1986: 57*). For example, Kynäslahti et al. (2006) state that:
It may be that nothing changes in their everyday work even if they enter teacher education. They thus continue to do what they have always done in their work. From the point of view of teacher education, this is not a satisfactory situation. (Kynäslahti et al. 2006: 252).

The presence of science and research in teacher education is to ensure and enable change in schools by providing teachers the freedom to form their own, individual views on teaching instead of teachers having to be unconsciously constrained by tradition and unquestioned, routinized practice. The problem of school reform and change is thus addressed by holding on to the promise of emancipation that scientific knowledge and practices are to bring about. It would therefore seem to appear that it is precisely the academic, scientific nature of teacher education that is to install in teachers a critical and independent attitude towards potentially routinized practice:

A critical, independent stance towards one’s work ... increases self-reflection and reduces naïve trust in authorities, which transpires as a positive attitude towards change. ... Does our teacher education ... include elements that support the teacher as researcher and the development of the practice of teaching; that prevent the teacher from routinized practices and exhaustion? (Ojanen 1993b: 31*).

In the discourse, it is specifically deemed the task of academic teacher education to make teachers critically examine the taken-for-granted “reality of schooling” and “become aware of the fact that, as professionals, they cannot return to the same course of action from which they have parted as pupils” (Nuutinen 1996: 64*). Personal experiences gained during one’s own school years are perceived as hindering the professional development and autonomy of the prospective teacher:

For student teachers, the unquestioned familiarity [of teaching] is the pitfall of learning to teach. ... This sense of familiarity is the least receptive to inquiry. What a person can know, based on one’s own experience, is only a part of all the possibilities in the universe. Personal experiences, as such, might make it difficult to see alternatives. There is a great difference between mere habit and conscious understanding. (Ojanen 1993a: 9*).

Academic training is to disrupt this sense of familiarity acquired through one’s own schooling; it is to “trigger conceptual change” and help teachers “think for themselves” (Ojanen 1997: 7*).
At the very beginning of their university studies, class teacher students should be provided with a package of theory to “bump against” through which they are first ushered into the study of educational sciences and of becoming a professionally trained class teacher. After this, what is needed is subject didactics, more educational sciences and teaching practice. (Mikkilä-Erdmann & Iiskala 2013: 436*).

In the discourse, it is perceived that scientific, research-based teacher education is to bring about “openness, the absence of prejudice, and honest observation” that work as safeguards against the “replication of authoritative, ready-made solutions” (Niemi 1989b: 253*). Science is envisioned as “a tool for development and an inducement to searching for the new” (Niemi 1989b: 252*) and as bringing about newness in thinking.

If they do not have an understanding of theoretical backgrounds, is there not the danger that their thinking will narrow down and the examination of everyday experiences will not produce anything renewing or essentially new? (Niemi 1986: 57*).

In these ways, science, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, is assigned the task and the promise of shaking off unquestioned habit, unconscious routine, tradition and common sense practice, and hence to ‘wake up’ or enlighten the teacher who is to think independently, anew, and in a critical manner. The autonomous teacher is to be committed to change.

3.2 The teacher as decision-maker

This subchapter focuses on the fabrication of the teacher as autonomous in terms of independent decision-making and commitment to a professional mode of practice. Here, the discourse of research-based teacher education can be perceived as articulating a concern for the teacher’s ability to make independent judgements rather than rely on ‘recipe knowledge’ or to merely implement externally defined instructions. For example, it is argued:

There is reason for concern ... if the greatest contribution of teacher education is a collection of checklists on how certain learning content should be orthodoxly taught. It seems that, until now, the training has specifically emphasised such detailed instructions at the expense of encouraging students to make personal decisions. (Uusikylä 1977: 87*).
If teachers are trained solely under the conditions prescribed externally, they will remain externally controlled and directed. (Niemi 1986: 56*).

Teachers have ... been controlled through administrative means and instructions, and demands have been placed on them from above, externally, instead of teachers being supported in expressing and developing their own thoughts and opinions and in new ways of working. (Niikko 1996: 109*).

Niemi (1989a) also suggests that teachers should not be bound by tradition but, instead, they should have the right to construct their own views on teaching:

The danger [in the idealising of the practical] is that the teaching profession and teacher education turn into the transmission of vocational tradition; practices stay unchanged from one decade to another just because some experienced teacher has, at some point, judged his own principles as practicable. Each new teacher is an individual and has the right to find their own principles. (Niemi 1989a: 70*).

In contrast to traditional and vocational teacher education, research-based teacher education is perceived as encouraging “student teachers to make independent pedagogical judgements” instead of “providing ready answers and tips” (Toom et al. 2010: 336). In other words, what is purported, in the discourse, is that teachers must have personal ownership of educational knowledge and professional practice:

As professionals, teachers cannot be only implementers of decisions, but they must also be partners in their development. (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen 2006: 45).

What is suggested is that the autonomous teacher is not to submit to external authorities or technicist guidelines. For example, concerns are raised about the need for teachers to be able to evaluate the teaching material:

If the metacognitive skills of teachers are weak and their knowledge is at a superficial and concrete level, it is difficult for them to choose and modify the learning content and teaching material. In such cases, they are extremely dependent on set material and they attempt to teach everything in the textbook without reducing any of the content. It is reasonable to expect from teachers the ability to evaluate what is important and what isn’t. (Niemi 1989a: 88*).

Furthermore, it is suggested that the task of the autonomous teacher must not be reduced to the role of the technician who “transmit[s] objective new knowledge to
students” in schools that function as “factories for society” (Asunta et al. 2005: 234–235*).30

In another register, the requirement for independent decision-making is also related to new imaginaries of the learner:

In the future, one of the significant tasks of the teacher will be the directing of pupils towards independent decision-making. What naturally follows from this requirement for the goals of teacher preparation is that what must be kept in mind is how teachers themselves are directed towards the making of justified decisions and towards the practising of such procedures. (Ruutu 1967: 171*).

The concerns regarding the subordinated teacher as technician and implementer who is neither capable of nor interested in autonomous judgement, in the discourse, are responded to by putting forward the solution of research-based teacher education. That is, research-based teacher education is thought as countering subordination by making teachers think for themselves, and at the same time, by evoking teachers’ sense of calling and moral commitment to the task of teaching.

Therefore, first, while it is forcefully and frequently argued in the discourse that teacher autonomy “requires sufficient educational knowledge” (Toom et al. 2010: 336), it is simultaneously also pointed out that caution must be taken in order for scientific, educational knowledge not to become yet another external force that prescribes what teachers must do and that leaves the teacher in the role of mere implementer and technician.

Teachers who content themselves with the applying of theory to practice give away their intellectual strength and responsibility (Smyth 1986). Such an attitude of dependence deprives teachers of their status and autonomy and positions teachers in the role of the technician. What becomes the paradox of teaching, in such cases, is that the same motions are repeated without thought or renewal. (Ojanen 1993a: 12*).

If the integration of scientificity and professionalism is not successful, the result is a dualistic world of the theory of teaching, separated from practice. In such a case, there is a danger that teacher growth is restricted to learning to repeat previous practices, and that science and research mean nothing more

30 Asunta et al. (2005) relate their argument to what they perceive as having been the ‘low point’ in the historical development of the autonomous teacher: They argue that the technicist role of the teacher was particularly strong in the 1960s, before the teacher education reform, due to new technologies and an increased expenditure on teaching material that reduced teaching to a technical procedure.
than an academic degree whose value is acknowledged but whose significance for teaching is left without appreciation. (Niemi 1989a: 77*).

The university itself is also perceived as a potential threat to independent thinking and professional autonomy:

Young students should be helped to become active in their professional development, for otherwise they will not know what they are doing – they will just follow the instructions and orders of the university. (Ojanen 1989: 7*).

Therefore, instead of the technical *application* of theory to practice, it is thought that what must be pursued in scientific, research-based teacher education is the active *integration* of theory and practice (e.g. Syrjälä & Laurila 1990, Maaranen & Krokfors 2008). It becomes the task of the autonomous teacher to make the connections between theory and practice in ways that go beyond mere application; to enter into more advanced professional practices and processes where theory and practice “interact” (Malinen 1974b: 27–28*). This is to be enabled through the practices of *research*. 31 Kansanen (1985), for example, posits research as the solution to the question of professional ownership and autonomy:

I believe that the current type of training, with all its research projects, produces more independent teachers than before. I also believe that this independence becomes apparent in a way such that teachers do not need to look for all kinds of alternative pedagogies beyond the classroom. Instead, teachers develop their own, independent style by thinking originally and experimenting in their own classroom. I also believe that it is only one’s own attempts to carry out research that will help in comprehending the practical difficulties of education and the emptiness of instructional advice. Knowing that no-one else knows any better, in the end, results in independent thinking and more self-confidence. (Kansanen 1985: 46–47*).

What is reasoned, in accounts such as these, is that research practices are to enable independent, creative, original, personal styles and understandings of teaching. In other words, it is suggested that through their own research practices, teachers will ‘think for themselves’ instead of relying on knowledge or instructions given from above or elsewhere. Teachers are envisioned as innovative professionals who solve

---

31 As chapter 4 will show, the question is not only about ‘research,’ but perhaps more accurately, about ‘research/reflection,’ with both notions (counter) translating into *tutkimus.*
pedagogical problems through research and experimenting instead of in a routine manner (e.g. Malinen 1974b: 36).

Therefore, in the discourse, the teacher is envisioned as a constructor of personal practical theories and educational philosophies; as a professional who practices “argumentative reasoning in the contexts of education, teaching and schooling.” (Krokfors 2005: 72*) and who, through reflective practices questions authoritarian norms and consequently develops personal educational theories (e.g. Niemi 1989a: 75). Research and reflection are envisioned as the means through which teachers are to become aware of the educational goals that influence their practice and of their own pedagogical action and its effects on the “growth and learning” of their pupils (Ojanen 1993b: 35*). Through reflective practices, teachers are to stop and “study their beliefs and intentions” (Ojanen 1993b: 35*).

In conclusion, the scientifically trained teacher, in the discourse, is envisioned as an autonomous professional who not only has the ability to make independent pedagogical decisions and judgement, but who also displays personal, moral commitment. Research-based teacher education is to enhance and evoke a sense of personal conviction, motivation, and sense of meaning:

Future teachers should have views of their own, calling, motivation and personal professional trust in themselves. (Sahi & Manning 1981: 397*).

In these ways, science and research (and hence, reflection) are to contribute to the making of the teacher who is an autonomous decision-maker instead of a passive implementer of orders and instructions given from above. Science and research are to not only enlighten the teacher in terms of more true and rational knowledge about teaching, but also to evoke autonomy and authenticity in terms of moral dispositions and attitudes towards the tasks of teaching.

### 3.3 The teacher as active learner

This subchapter considers the discursive construction of the autonomous teacher as a learner – specifically, an active and lifelong learner – who is to be committed to their own learning. In this construction, the envisioned task of research-based teacher education is to bring about teacher subjectivities that are in a constant process of change, development and learning. The fabrication of the teacher as learner is tied to rationalities concerning a changing society: In the discourse, it is argued that teachers – and thus, schools – will not be able to respond to the new challenges of changing social conditions if they do not have the ability to learn
throughout their careers. It is precisely the academically trained teacher who is to have the capacity to face the challenges that a changing society poses. This teacher, as a lifelong learner, is to be able to “solve problems” in an “investigational”\textsuperscript{32} manner (Niikko 1996: 120*) and thus display and exercise autonomy.

In the discourse of research-based teacher education, teachers as learners are fabricated, in particular, through cognitive and psychological theories that envision learners as individuals who take initiative towards, are conscious of and responsible for their own learning. Teachers are to engage in professional development that transforms their dependent stance to “interested, committed, and self-guided learner” positions (Ojanen & Lauriala 2006: 73, see also Kohonen 1993: 66). In such fabrications, teacher learning is to be intentional and purposeful, and teachers are to have ownership of their own learning processes:

To learn successfully is to internalise, make personal, and comprehend the significance of knowledge. (Niemi 1986: 56*).

The task of teacher education in Finland involves the promotion and support of demanding intentional learning processes. According to researchers of metacognition and self-regulated learning ... learners need knowledge, and the ability to reflect, understand and control learning. Intentional learning is a consequence of cognitive goals, conscious control and the intentional use of knowledge. Students with intentional goals are committed to the learning process and are very much aware of their own individual motives, goals, beliefs and emotions. (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen 2006: 42).

In such accounts, the teacher of research-based teacher education is produced as a subject who is to display autonomy through a commitment to learning and a reflexivity or consciousness regarding their own intentions, values and dispositions concerning their learning. Furthermore, they are to display an open-mindedness and curious attitude towards the object of their professional learning. That is, a commitment to learning is connected with a commitment to knowing and aspiring to know:

\textsuperscript{32} While ‘investigational’ is a more fluent translation, it is noteworthy that the original word in Finnish, \textit{tutkimuksellinen}, has, as its root, the term \textit{tutkimus}. This is an example of how the linguistic moves (including translations and counter translations) make possible the morphing of notions from inquiry (as an inner attitude or mode of learning) through \textit{tutkimus} to research, and hence to academic research.
Teaching ... requires an interest in phenomena related to learning, as well as in the formation of knowledge and the role of the subject in such formation. (Ojanen 1993a: 12*).

The scientific, research-based approach to teacher education is mobilised as the enabler of active, lifelong learning and professional growth:

A research-based programme is one solution to the aim of the continual development of a teacher’s work. (Kansanen 2008: 168*).

Research-based teacher education leans on the idea that teachers’ professional development should be supported as a process that continues throughout their career. (Silander & Välijärvi 2013: 79–80).

That is, instead of equipping teachers with a set of competences sufficient for a lifelong career, academic teacher education is to provide the tools with which teachers can “fix their old tools and prepare new ones and use them appropriately” (Viljanen 1984: 13*, see also Viljanen 1979: 218). This constant readiness includes both the capability to renew oneself as well as the will, or disposition, to do so:

During their scientific education, students should develop the desire and ability to continually develop oneself. Teachers who are not in motion33 very quickly become incompetent despite their formal qualifications. (Uusikylä 1992: 60*).

The task of teacher education is to provide teachers the “keys to growth,” a kind of preparedness comprising components of knowledge, attitudes and thinking skills that enable continuous development (Niemi 1990: 44*). It is thought that the “conceptual level” that characterises academic, research-based teacher education “makes possible ... the continual development of competence” (Kansanen 2008: 169*). The presence of research in teacher education is envisioned as “bringing about a meta level to expertise, without which the expert will not remain expert for the following 30 years” (Mikkilä-Erdmann & Liskala 2013: 436*).

Scientific, research-based teacher education thus emerges as the strategy for developing not only the competences but also the attitudes required for active and lifelong learning. The invigoration of active and committed professional attitudes is to be initiated by scientific teacher education that seeks to prepare in students a “willingness and receptiveness to learn and study throughout their careers” (Maaranen 2010a: 155*).

33 The original expression in Finnish, paikalleen jähmettyvä, could be literally translated as somebody who ‘becomes frozen to the spot.’
Yet, at the same time, this professional attitude of lifelong learning is also evoked as an inherent quality that attaches professional commitment to the life story of the teacher in an essentialist way: To become a teacher implies a lifetime journey of growth as an individual: it begins “at home with the mother,” proceeding “through day-care, primary and secondary school, to higher education” and to continue as in-service training and possible further academic studies “until retirement” (Jussila & Nurmi 1978: 231).

3.4 The teacher as scientific thinker

In the previous three subchapters, the discursively constructed notion of the autonomous teacher has been examined in terms of how the teacher is envisioned as a school reformer, independent decision-maker and active learner. In these constructions and envisionings, the academic, scientific and research-based nature of teacher education is perceived as key to enabling and enhancing autonomy. The autonomous thinking and action of the teacher is perceived, in the discourse, as a question that scientific knowledge, thinking and practices are to solve.

This subchapter examines a particular thread in the discourse of research-based teacher education that would seem to contribute to the force of the notion of the teacher as a scientific – and thus autonomous – thinker and actor and hence, to the force of the notion of the teacher as a researcher. That is, the competences, mind-sets and attitudes that scientific, research-based teacher education is to evoke and enforce – such as deep thinking, deliberation, evaluation, questioning, and creativity – are constructed and naturalised as of scientific nature in essence. In this way, the analysis provided in the following could be framed as an examination of how teacher thinking itself is scientized. What will also become evident in this examination is the way in which disciplinary discussions around research paradigms come to regulate and rationalise perceptions of what constitutes scientific and autonomous teacher thinking. For the most part, the analysis here will refer to the work of Malinen whose accounts are used as exemplars. Here, as elsewhere in this study, the purpose is not to draw attention to the intentions or meanings of specific authors but to consider the trajectories, strategies and effects of the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland.

The following analysis will be structured around two arguments that emerge in the discourse of research-based teacher education. The first argument suggests that

34 The original word in Finnish, äidinkoulu, could be literally translated as ‘mother’s school.’
the research skills to be provided in academic teacher education differ from those regularly included in the research training of other academic programmes. In other words, what is suggested while defining the scientific nature of academic teacher education is that the appropriate understanding and approach to ‘the scientific’ in teacher education should be determined in relation to the practical requirements of the practice of teaching. The second argument suggests that the skills and ways of thinking that teachers draw on in their everyday practice are, in fact, those required of a researcher. That is, it is suggested that teachers who think and act autonomously naturally carry out their practice in a researcher-like manner.

In a report titled *Teacher Education as a Part of Academic Studies: an Analysis of the Scientificity of Teacher Education and of the Research Activities of Teacher Education to Date* (Malinen 1974b) and in a shorter piece summarising the report (Malinen 1974a), Malinen takes up the task of considering the question of ‘scientificity’ in regard to its meaning and relevance for academic, scientific teacher education. He suggests that while “academic teacher education should be ‘research training’ in its entirety” not unlike that provided in any other university programme, the design and scope of research training needs to be considered differently. He argues that in scientific teacher education:

> The concept of ‘researcher’ should be interpreted more broadly than usual in the university. It is true that teachers must have gained knowledge on basic research, but nevertheless their research tasks are related to the everyday planning of teaching, the observation of issues arising during teaching situations, the analysis of their own tasks as teachers etc. The forms of research are thus diverse, and to some extent, they differ from traditional academic research. (Malinen 1974a: 351*).

Malinen’s argument would seem to point to two assumptions concerning the defining of research training as relevant to teachers: First, what is suggested is that the research skills acquired during the academic training of teachers should be directly applicable and of direct relevance to the ‘practicality’ of teaching. Secondly, it is assumed that the modes, approaches and forms of research that are perceived as traditional and conventional in academic terms may not be useful or sufficient as such for the practices of both teaching and (teaching-related) research.

What would seem to follow from these assumptions is a redefining of what is to qualify as research in the specific case of teacher education. In this respect, it is important to note that Malinen’s (1974a, 1974b) accounts were provided in a period of Finnish educational sciences that was dominated by positivism. However, in his
texts published in the mid-1970s, in contrast to the paradigms of the time, Malinen expresses a concern about the inadequacy of positivism to attend to the concerns of teacher education. Malinen justifies his argument by pointing out the particular needs of teachers and teacher education: He suggests that in order for teachers to think and make decisions independently, they must be equipped with tools that will assist them in thinking and deliberation. Therefore, Malinen proposes the addition of hermeneutics to complement the paradigm or “theory of science” of teacher education (Malinen 1974a: 350). What is suggested is that teachers must be able to interpret events and processes in the classroom instead of merely implementing or applying scientific knowledge to classroom practices. In contrast to the prevailing paradigms of the time, Malinen perceives this hermeneutic interpretation to be carried out by the teacher as a true form of research (Malinen 1974a: 350) – therefore redefining scientificity within the space of teacher education as well as contributing to the signification of the teacher as scientific researcher. He explains the need for interpretation – that is, hermeneutic research – in the practice of teaching as follows:

Part of a teacher’s practical work takes place outside the lessons, during conversations with teachers, parents, student welfare personnel etc. In such cases, what is required even more immediately than in the classroom is the interpretation of educational situations as they are situated in society. It may not be necessary for students to practise these situations external to the classroom in the same way as teaching needs to be practised, but teachers do need to be prepared to analyse issues related to different situations and understand the consequences. Action research, as related to such aspects, implies the analysis of the environment, planning, and evaluation etc. (Malinen 1974b: 28*).

For Malinen, teachers as scientific thinkers and researchers must learn to engage in interpretative (i.e. hermeneutic) processes of inquiry and analysis in relation to not

---

35 This concern is less frequently articulated in the discourse during the 1970s. However, such articulations increase towards the end of the 1980s as the shift towards qualitative approaches takes place in Finnish educational sciences and teacher education research (see e.g. Hakala 1993, Kohonen 1989, Kohonen 1993, Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990).

36 At the beginning of the 1990s, Siljander (1991) noted that the critique of positivism had been accompanied by a proliferation of conceptions of hermeneutic and interpretive approaches, often resulting in a confusion of meanings. However, while German philosophy in the form of hermeneutics may have re-emerged and been revived for a while with the increasing criticism of positivism, Finnish educational sciences within teacher education, for the most part, has continued its strong partnership with the Anglo-American-influenced empirical traditions from positivist to qualitative approaches.
only the process or event of teaching but also in relation to one’s self (i.e. one’s own goals and action), interactive situations in schooling (e.g. with parents), school contexts (e.g. broader social and cultural contexts) and teaching material and other sources (e.g. curricular texts, research publications, textbooks). In similar vein, over a decade later, Niemi suggests that teachers’ “knowledge acquisition skills should also include the hermeneutic-phenomenological approach” in order for them to be able to examine phenomena through “observation, discussion, interviewing, monitoring, as well as philosophical analysis” (Niemi 1989a: 76*).

While, on the one hand, what would seem to be taking place in such thinking as exemplified by Malinen and Niemi above is a renegotiation and enlargement of what ‘counts’ as scientific within educational research and as research training within the field of educational sciences. On the other hand, what would also seem to be taking place at the same time is a construction of teacher thinking as ‘naturally’ of scientific nature. Scientificity emerges as imperative to autonomous professional thinking:

Scientificity is ... a constitutive part of the everyday of teaching. This is the case if we wish to perceive the profession of teaching as a self-renewing professional field and the members of this profession as independent educators who are capable of personal, responsible decisions. (Niemi 1989a: 76*).

Furthermore, and perhaps more significantly, scientific thinking comes to be equated with everyday, common sense thinking:

Scientific thinking refers to a kind of thinking that aims at concept formation and the objective examining of phenomena based on shared knowledge. Scientific thinking is needed in everyday situations just as much as in academic studies. With the aid of well-articulated concept formation, it is possible to examine pedagogical processes and other phenomena of the surrounding reality and investigate their principles. ... A significant part of ‘scientificity’ is the perceiving of the real connections between action, consequences, and goals. Connected to this is the ability to form procedures that lead to action. The scientificity of thinking leads to increased consciousness. Such qualities, in everyday speech, are referred to as “common sense thinking” and “common

37 Malinen (1974a: 349*) further relates such hermeneutic approaches of inquiry and analysis to action research as a way of examining “the possibilities for developing the curriculum” and “the societal connections of the teacher’s work.”

38 Considering the argument being made, it is worth noting that the original word, elimellinen, could also be translated as ‘organic.’
sensetion." This is what ‘scientificity’ means according to, for example, the hermeneutic philosophy of science. At an academic level, this includes the extra requirement of analysing complicated and abstract principles. (Malinen 1974b: 6*).

In these ways, autonomous scientific teacher thinking – that which is perceived as taking place in the form of, for example, decision-making, problem-solving, observation and evaluation – is produced as something that resembles scientific practice and inquiry as well as which, consequently, can be most suitably enhanced through personal engagement with scientific practice and inquiry. What is thus mobilised in the notion of the teacher as researcher is the perception that teachers are, inherently and organically, researchers; that teachers should – and in fact, naturally do – carry out research in and on their everyday practices; and that teachers, therefore, should be trained as researchers in the sense of formal academic training and degrees.

Academic, scientific teacher education, in turn, becomes a natural, self-evident space for the training of teachers who are to think autonomously and hence – according to the logic of the discourse – scientifically. In this way, the cultivating mission (in the spirit of Bildung) of teacher education is equated and conflated with the development of scientific thinking in general:

What is most important in academic teacher education is the goal of a scientific, questioning and problematizing way of thinking. ... Such a way of thinking, grounded in the ideal of sivistys, should be the leading epistemological and ethical principle of teacher education and in-service training. Such a starting point as the idea of teacher education ... naturally directs teacher education towards scientific thinking. ... In this way, in fact, teacher education will have the same epistemic foundation that is characteristic of scientific thinking in general. (Heikkinen et al. 2008: 272*).

The purpose of this subchapter has been to examine how autonomous teacher thinking is naturalised as a scientific practice, thus enforcing the specific suitability

---

39 The original expression, tervejärkinen toiminta, could be translated literally as ‘sane action,’ but this does not seem suitable a translation in the given context.

40 The original expression for ‘ideal of sivistys’ is sivistysideaali, sivistys referring to the Finnish equivalent of Bildung. Heikkinen et al. (2008: 273*) refer to sivistysideaali another time in the same piece later on when suggesting that in-service training, if provided systematically for teachers throughout their career, would affect the construction of the curriculum of academic teacher education as a whole, and would “provide better conditions for the construction of a worldview that is based on ideals of sivistys.” In this piece, it remains unclear what these ideals imply in specific.
of a scientific space – that is, the university – for the training of teachers. Furthermore, what has become evident is the effect of the historical trajectory of research paradigms through which teacher thinking comes to be perceived and defined as scientific. As will be elaborated on in chapter 4, research methodologies come to play a significant role in the making of teachers who are to make decisions and solve problems independently.

3.5 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to examine the construction of the autonomous teacher in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. The analysis has pointed to how teacher autonomy is envisioned, in the discourse, as a specific outcome of reformed, scientized and thus modernised teacher education. The binary logic between what is to be left behind and what is to be pursued for the future can be perceived as embodying a modernist narrative of linear progress towards a more developed future.

The scientifically trained teacher, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, is to be equipped for a changing school and society as well as to become an active, transformative agent. The teacher of research-based teacher education is fabricated as a school reformer, decision-maker and active learner who is to think anew, rationally and critically; make independent judgements and form personal professional opinions; and engage in a constant process of learning. In this way, science and research come to be taken up in the discourse as the means – that is, the strategies and technologies – through which to enlighten, emancipate and empower the teacher from a perceived state of stagnation, passivity and unconsciousness to an envisioned state of newness, activity and consciousness. The hope for a brighter future of progress and advancement is coupled with a rejection and elimination of the past of backwardness and outdatedness. While a scientized teacher education is to detach itself from tradition that is influenced by the speculative, the aspiration for rationality is nevertheless embedded in the redemptive narrative:

Although science is to shed the appeal of magic and the spiritual through its attention to the empirical world, it does not shed themes of salvation and redemption. (Popkewitz 2008: 32).

The principles and strategies that emerge with the insertion of particular notions of science and research into teacher education can be perceived as producing a
specific kind of teacher autonomy that is to be administered and regulated – that is, governed – in particular ways and for particular purposes. What has already become evident in the analysis and will be elaborated on in the following chapters is that the presence of science and research, in Finnish teacher education, while possibly denoting a shift towards a more rationalised and effective scientific approach to teacher training, would nevertheless seem to contribute to a humanist project of teacher growth and self-cultivation. The preferred term for Finnish teacher education since the 1970s reform has indeed been education rather than training or preparation (e.g. Uusikylä 1992: 61). The academisation of teacher education, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, is seen as a shift from a technicist to a humanist approach that makes possible the teacher’s “personal processes of growth” (Ojanen 1989: 10*, see also Kohonen 1989: 34–37). In this way, research-based teacher education produces itself as a space in which prospective teachers are to enter into a process of growth and development through which authenticity and autonomy become attainable and exercisable:

What we must be remember in the supervision of future teachers ... is that growing as a human being, as well as practising scientific thinking, is a slow process. It cannot be done in haste. It is, for the most parts, a peaceful experiencing of things and a widening of one’s worldview. (Syrjälä 1981: 391*).

Which is more important: that teacher education comprises running from one lecture to another, from one exercise to another, from one examination to another in order to collect credit points, or that the future teacher is provided with a reasonable amount of time to grow into his/her future role of responsibility? (Uusikylä 1992: 58*).

The fabricating and governing of the autonomous teacher through research-based teacher education can, therefore, be considered as a specific evocation of the inner, true self: Through the insertion of science and research into teacher education, teachers are envisioned not only as being given autonomy, but also as conducting themselves in ways that denote an emergence of autonomy from within. What is inscribed in the notions of science and scientific thinking is a teacher subject whose

41 In the Finnish context, Simola (1993: 177–178) explains that while ‘teacher preparation’ is a “more final, and limited conception”, ‘teacher education’ emphasizes its “dynamic and life-long character.” ‘Teacher education’ is preferred in the US as well, while ‘teacher training’ is more common in the UK, Canada and Australia (Fendler 2012: 349).
innate qualities are to be evoked and worked on. That is, a certain disconnectedness from the self, affected by unquestioned routine that dulls the mind, is to be replaced with a connectedness to the authentic self, its creativity, curiosity, awareness and vitality.\(^{42}\)

The focus of this chapter has been on the insertion and presence of research in teacher education and the related rationalities through which the autonomous teacher of research-based teacher education is fabricated. Subchapter 3.4, in particular, considered how, in the discourse, autonomous teacher thinking is equated and conflated with scientific thinking, which, from the outset, makes the mobilisation of research and science in the making of the teacher a ‘logical’ and ‘natural’ step in the modernising of teacher education. The next chapter will turn to a more detailed analysis of specific notions of research that are mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education through which the teacher is produced as not only autonomous but also as a researcher.

---

\(^{42}\) While it is not possible to elaborate on the theological underpinnings of Finnish teacher education within the scope of this thesis, it is interesting and important to note that the notion of internal autonomy evoked in the discourse of research-based teacher education would seem to point to the influence of the tradition of *Bildung* and its Lutheran Protestant legacy in Finnish educational thinking.
4 Fabricating the teacher as researcher: Two trajectories

Due to its strong curricular and pedagogical emphasis on research, it would seem particularly fitting that Finnish teacher education strongly promotes the notion of the teacher as researcher in its advocacy for teacher autonomy and school reform:

A teacher-as-researcher approach offers one promising way of strengthening teachers’ pedagogical autonomy and critical awareness, which are key qualities in school reform and pedagogical innovations. (Ojanen & Lauriala 2006: 75).

Different notions and movements of the teacher as researcher vary in their cultural and historical specificity, but as the expression itself conveys, the main idea of the teacher as researcher concerns the perception of the teacher as not only a practitioner of teaching but also as one engaged in some kind of research or inquiry while working as a teacher. 43 The purpose of this chapter is to analyse in more detail two trajectories of the notion of the researching teacher in the Finnish discourse of teacher education that both contribute to the fabrication and governing of the autonomous teacher.

Drawing on Popkewitz’s insight on the alchemy of school subjects (discussed in Chapter 2), the analysis in this chapter suggests that research, in Finnish research-based teacher education, can be perceived in much the same way as school subjects in schools. That is, if schools subjects, such as mathematics or history, from a governmentality perspective, can be seen as transmogrifications of their disciplinary practices in order to produce certain kinds of individuals with certain capacities and dispositions, so can research, as a ‘school subject’ of the teacher education curriculum be perceived as a governing strategy for constructing certain kinds of teachers.

There is a certain irony to referring to such an alchemy in the context of an academic space. For, in the work of Popkewitz (1998, 2008), the alchemy could be seen as referring to the morphing of disciplinary thinking that takes place within an academic space (that which “physicists and biologists actually do”, Popkewitz 2005: 24) into another substance in the space of schooling. Although the notion of alchemy as conceptualised by Popkewitz does not rely on or refer to a physical or abstract distance, it nevertheless might be perceived as evoking an image of

43 For an overview of different teacher as researcher movements and the related ideas of action, teacher and practitioner research, see Hammersley (1993), Zeichner and Noffke (2001).
academia as the space in which what research and scientists ‘actually do’ takes place as opposed to school as a space with different practices and intentions. However, the aim of this chapter is precisely to suggest that it is an academic space in which research, as disciplinary thinking, is morphed and mobilised into strategies and technologies for fabricating and governing the autonomous teacher, and that the academic nature of the space could be perceived, in part, as making such a transmogrification possible.

In this chapter, the mobilisation of different notions of research, and the configurations and effects of research in Finnish teacher education, are considered in terms of the pedagogical practices and envisionings through which teachers are fabricated and governed as researchers. As the analysis unfolds, what is pointed to is how various notions of the teacher as researcher would seem to resolve the question of “what kind of role research should have” (Viljanen 1979: 216*) in teacher training. The Finnish discussions on teacher education curriculum and pedagogy would seem to point to a tension that is constantly addressed and re-assessed in the discourse: Scientific teacher education, on the one hand, is suggested as the solution to improved teaching and more autonomous teachers. Yet, on the other hand, science itself poses certain problems for teaching. Concerns are raised in the discourse that, if the curricular knowledge of teacher education is too theoretical or technicist and thus detached from practice, it cannot be of relevance nor of use to teachers. Furthermore, it is perceived that scientific, researched knowledge must not become the new external authority for teachers; teachers must be their own authorities. And finally, the concerns raised in the discussions point to how the insertion of science and research into the teacher education curriculum must not interfere with the ‘real’ educational and vocational issues of becoming a teacher.

Therefore, the following analysis focuses on how the presence of research in the reformed, scientized, academic teacher education comes to be framed as a question and challenge regarding the enforcement of teacher autonomy. Two different strands of the idea of the teacher as researcher are considered in terms of their particular significations of research and their implications for teacher thinking and practice. Both strands provide a profile of the teacher as one incorporating the stance of a researcher. However, the two constructions of the teacher as researcher are different even while their vocabularies (of, for example, reflection and critical thinking) would seem to resemble each other. The existence of these two strands that construct the Finnish researching teacher is analysed in terms of their effects on the production of the teacher. Therefore, as discussed in chapter 2, the purpose
is not to evaluate whether the different notions and ideas fit together logically but to consider the effects of the assemblage.

Subchapter 4.1 will examine the particularly Finnish notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher as researcher. Subchapter 4.2 will analyse the internationally circulating notions around the researching teacher that are related to teacher, action and practitioner research. It is important to note, first, that although these two threads are separated in this chapter for the purpose of analysis, they do not necessarily exist as distinctly identifiable threads throughout the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. That is, in the analysis provided in the following, it is not possible nor purposeful to ascertain or distinguish certain publications or authors as attesting to one specific strand in an orthodox manner. Some authors may, in fact, be cited in the following analysis in relation to both strands in the following analysis. Rather, the purpose of the analysis is to identify, examine and articulate the presence of an array of notions of research in the discourse of research-based teacher education that contribute to the production of the teacher as researcher. Secondly, the distinction made between the ‘Finnish’ notion and ‘international’ notions is somewhat artificial: It must be recognised that the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher that is identified as a Finnish notion is, in itself, one that is historically underpinned by culturally mobile theorisations and conceptualisations, and could thus also be defined as an international or transnational notion. In other words, while it is of utmost importance to consider the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher in the culturally, socially, historically, politically specific context of Finland, in doing so, it must be recognised that the notion (or any other notion, for that matter) has not originated in Finnish terrain in solitude but is underpinned by a multiplicity of cultural and historical influences. And thirdly, juxtaposing the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher with ‘other’ teacher as researcher movements does not mean to imply that these other movements could or should be perceived as a coherent entity. However, instead of attending to the differences between the movements, the intention is to examine, in a broad sense, how the variety of other notions around the researching teacher are taken up and deployed in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education alongside the Finnish notion of the teacher as researcher.

44 Consider, for example, how Koskenniemi was influenced by German reform pedagogue Peter Petersen and the Jena Plan (see e.g. Saari et al. 2014), and how Koskenniemi and other researchers who have taken up his work have also been influenced by the US literature on teacher thinking (see e.g. Kansanen 2009, Toom et al. 2010).
As with chapter 3, the analysis is performative rather than representational: The intention is not to affirm any particular notions of the researching teacher or of research-based teacher education. Instead, the analysis is performed in order to shed light on the particular ways in which the teacher is fabricated, on the assemblage of notions of research, and on the tensions involved in the configuration – and in this way, to disrupt and defamiliarise the taken-for-granted notion of the teacher as researcher in Finnish teacher education.

4.1 Didactic/pedagogical thinking: The teacher as scientist

While the internationally circulating teacher as researcher movements have been taken up in Finnish teacher education as in many other teacher education contexts around the world, there is also a particularly Finnish version of the teacher as researcher that is currently most often referred to as the didactically or pedagogically thinking teacher. The notion of didactic thinking was initiated and developed most notably by Koskenniemi and his colleagues during the 1960s and 1970s, after which it has been accompanied by or substituted with the concept of pedagogical thinking (see Kansanen 2009). Nevertheless, it is important to note that these two terms stem from the same tradition even though some variation and alteration can be found across the decades and among different writers using the terms.45 In this subchapter, for the sake of clarity, a combining expression of ‘didactic/pedagogical thinking’ will be used whenever appropriate.

As noted above, the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher has been most strongly influenced by the work of Finnish empirical educational researcher, Matti Koskenniemi. His most significant empirical research project, the Didactic Process Analysis (DPA) Project, was to provide empirical knowledge on the didactic process, that is, the process of teaching,46 and thus to contribute to the understanding of the nature of the teaching process.47 It is important to note that this examination of the teaching process, as influenced by the German tradition of

---

45 Kansanen (2009, see also Tirri 2012) describes how taking up the concept of ‘pedagogical thinking’ has been a pragmatic question: As there is no equivalent for the German notion of Didaktik in the English-speaking world, the term may not be that accessible or intelligible to readers from the English-speaking world. Thus a conscious choice has been made to refer to pedagogy instead of didactics (despite the translational ambivalence here as well).

46 In the literature on didactic/pedagogical thinking, this ‘teaching process’ is also referred to as the ‘teaching event,’ ‘instructional process’ and ‘teaching-studying-learning process.’

47 For an analysis of Koskenniemi’s work on didactic thinking in specific relation to the history of Finnish empirical educational sciences and child-centredness, see Saari (2011).
*Bildung*, or *Bildung-Didaktik*, refers to the production of knowledge about teaching not merely in the disciplinary terms of psychology or sociology but in terms of the *educational*, and hence, the *moral* purpose of teaching (see *e.g.* Autio 2014). In this tradition, the moral task of the teacher is to educate the pupil towards self-transformation. This *Didaktik*-influenced perception of the teaching process, and the related perception of research on the teaching process, is suggested in Koskenniemi’s account:

> It is precisely the task [of basic research within the field of educational sciences] to find the answer to the question, “*how does education influence?*”, in other words ... to find out what the teaching process is like in its full entity; the teaching process in which pupils, parents and the whole society place their hope. (Koskenniemi 1978: 223*, emphasis added).

Following from this aim of producing knowledge on the process of teaching, the purpose of Koskenniemi’s DPA Project was to contribute to the construction of a professionally, didactically thinking, autonomous teacher. That is, the aim of empirical educational research was to reveal the ‘laws’ of teaching, and in conjunction, the role of the teacher was envisioned as active and creative instead of a mere mechanical applier of educational models and scientific theory (see Saari 2011: 340). Empirical sciences, in Koskenniemi’s work, was inserted into the didactic process of teaching in order to support the teacher in his or her task of teaching by providing the teacher with ‘true knowledge,’ and thus releasing the teacher from speculating on the appropriate course of action in specific situations. Teachers were envisioned as being able to analyse and evaluate the conditions and capacities of pupils for engaging in the teaching-learning event in appropriate ways – all the while bearing in mind the educational goals as defined by the curriculum and cultural context. (Koskenniemi 1978: 226, see also Kansanen 2009, Saari 2011).

In its aim to produce empirical knowledge about the teaching process, the DPA Project utilized video cameras and one-way mirrors that were perceived as enabling a more systematic way of collecting and analysing data through observation (see *e.g.* Komulainen 2009). Within this research setting, the empirical educational researcher was positioned as an *observer* of the didactic process of teaching; that is, of its structure, dynamics, and different (sociological and other) factors affecting the didactic process. The teacher was to *take up the position of the researcher* – to

---

48 See Biesta (2011, 2015) on this particularly German-influenced construction of the discipline of education as a discipline in its own right.

49 The original question expressed in this quote is: *Miten kasvatus vaikuttaa?*
‘step into the shoes’ of the researcher – in order to attain empirical knowledge and understanding about the event of teaching from the specific, methodologically informed vantage point of the researcher. Therefore, as Saari (2011: 343) points out, in Koskenniemi’s research projects, it was assumed from the outset that teachers must be trained in specific ways in order for the teaching event in the classroom to become visible and observable to them. What was simultaneously implied was that mere experience and interaction with pupils, without scientific training, would not yield sufficient knowledge for making autonomous, justified pedagogical decisions. Therefore, during their training, teachers were to learn different observation techniques such as those deployed in the DPA Project. In this way, the act of carrying out research on teaching, and the developing of one’s practical skills as a teacher, were combined in the notion of the didactically thinking teacher (Alikoski 1973: 212).

In other words, it was perceived that teachers would benefit from seeing the event of teaching through the eyes of the researcher. That is, teachers would benefit from being equipped with the methodological skill, conceptualisations and theorisations generated through research projects on the didactic teaching process as these would make possible the seeing of the event of teaching in its complexity (Saari et al. 2014, Uusikylä 1977). In the DPA Project, teachers were thus envisioned as scientists and researchers who were to make use of appropriate research methodology in order to observe the classroom, the pupils and the teacher, and in this way, to make sense of what was taking place during the process of teaching. Teachers, as didactic thinkers, were to learn to analyse the teaching process in a systematic manner (Alikoski 1973, Uusikylä 1977: 89) which, at the time of the DPA Project and its aftermath, included the observation and analysis of issues such as the properties of verbal communication, the emotional atmosphere in the classroom, authority relationships, the flexibility of the teacher, and the participatory characteristics of pupils (Uusikylä 1977: 89). The ability to “understand students’ activity”, was perceived as requiring “the development of observation and interpretation skills” (Malinen 1974a: 350*).

50 It is important to note that although the settings and technologies described here may resemble those of microteaching as developed in the US in the 1960s (see e.g. Grossman 2005: 429–432), the starting points are different. The research on didactic thinking as carried out by Koskenniemi and others, and research on microteaching in the US context, are embedded in different legacies of educational thinking and therefore, cannot be associated with behaviourism in the same way (see Tröhler 2011, especially 135–138, on the historical differences between German and American interests in experimental psychology).
In the following two sections, the specific trajectory of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher will be examined in terms of the notions of research it mobilises in the construction of the teacher as a researcher. Section 4.1.1 considers the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking, researching teacher as an actor who is to make independent, unique and creative decisions and solve problems in the classroom. Section 4.1.2 examines the effect of the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher on the notion of teacher reflection. Both sections point to the significance of research methodology in the construction of the researching teacher as didactic/pedagogical thinker.

4.1.1 Research as decision-making and problem-solving

The emergence of the notion of the didactic/pedagogical thinking, first through the work of Koskenniemi and later on through the work of others, replaced the Herbartian tradition of instruction that was perceived as providing too rigid a model for teaching (see Saari et al. 2014, Simola et al. 1997), and sought to construct a more autonomous teacher who was to be intentional in his or her actions and thinking and who was to base such action and thinking on scientific knowledge. Furthermore, this intentionality was to be combined with creativity. That is, didactic/pedagogical thinking came to be perceived as characteristic of teachers who were ‘alert’ in that they were to be responsive to the unique situations that arose in the classroom during the event of teaching, and who were to take responsibility for and deliberate on their decisions and solutions in these unique situations. These aspects of didactic/pedagogical thinking will be elaborated on in the following.

Within the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher, the intentionality or purposefulness of teaching, together with the creativity, responsiveness and sense of responsibility required from autonomous teachers comes to underscore the ethical nature of the practice of teaching. That is, didactic/pedagogical thinking is envisioned as emancipating the teacher from dependence on habit, routine, and external authority towards autonomous thinking and action, thus increasing the teacher’s ethical responsibility. Didactic/pedagogical thinking is understood as being based not merely on intuition, experience, unconscious routine, tradition, nor on models or guidelines over which one cannot claim personal ownership, but rather, on systematically and empirically produced educational theory that is to support and enhance the teacher’s
independent thinking and action. For example, Koskenniemi juxtaposes action based on didactic thinking with action based on technological models of teaching:

Teaching technology aims to rationalise didactic action and to free the teacher from solutions that are inadequately justified. These technological “models” are appealing to many teachers: It is safer to lean on such expertise instead of finding the appropriate solution by oneself. It is likely that the technological “model solution” will be suitable, or at least moderately so, in certain situations, but it is also likely that in other situations, it will be ill-suited. When the teacher’s action is restricted to a chosen “model”, s/he is not required to be aware of how the laws of the teaching event are to be made use of; in other words, s/he is not required to practise didactic thinking. The ethical aspect is also weakened as the teacher transfers part of the responsibility of planning to the “model.” (Koskenniemi 1978: 225*).

Within the tradition of didactic/pedagogical thinking, teaching events are perceived as unique and context specific, requiring unique and original action from the teacher. Therefore, the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher is to comprehend the context specific nature of each situation during the event of teaching as well as to understand that the solution to a problem is dependent on an awareness and evaluation of that specific context. Thus the autonomous, researching teacher is one who is able to deliberate on and justify each solution individually:

According to didactic thinking, [the following of] detailed instructions must be avoided. Instead, the objective is for the teacher, in every situation, to consider which course of action would best support the development of the pupil. (Koskenniemi & Hälinen 1970: 248*).

Through teacher education, future teachers are developed as independent professionals of school work who do not trust in dogma, but rather, who take initiative in finding solutions that are not only based on the theory and research methodology of educational sciences but are also context specific. (Sahi & Manning 1981: 397*).

Didactic/pedagogical thinking, therefore, is perceived as requiring a sufficient acquisition of researched, scientific knowledge that is to inform the teacher’s decision-making and problem-solving. To be trained academically and scientifically is to have access to scientific knowledge and the latest research results to be used in and related to one’s daily activities as a teacher in the classroom; it is
to consume research in an active sense; to be able to understand the scientifically produced knowledge one engages; and to think with such knowledge in one’s work:\footnote{51}{The importance of (critical) scientific literacy – that is, the ability to read research reports and scientific publications – and its development during teacher education is emphasised, for example, by Kansanen (1993), Koskenniemi (1967), Kynäslahti et al. (2006), Lahdes (1970), and Niemi (2010).}

The goals [of teaching] are associated with a clear endeavour to influence the educatee. However, simultaneously, the teacher must act in a manner based on researched, scientific knowledge. The application of research requires a continuous interpretation of educational goals and the choosing of different educational methods. Set knowledge is never available for such situations; the teacher’s creative thinking and independent interpretation is required. However, such interpretation does not need to be carried out subjectively ..., for social knowledge, as well as psychological and didactic knowledge is available [to the teacher]. (Malinen 1974b: 16*).

In this way, the notion of the researching teacher as didactic/pedagogical thinker suggests the idea that having access to researched knowledge enables teachers to think and act in ways that “are grounded in a wider, and hopefully more systematised, experience than the circumscribed worlds of immediate places and settings” (Westbury et al. 2005: 478). Prospective teachers are envisioned as engaging in research-based thinking when reading scientific literature, and hence they “learn how to discuss and argue with a constant reference to research, and not rely on everyday thinking and ‘magical’ or ‘mystical’ arguments” (Westbury et al. 2005: 479).

However, it is perceived that teachers should not only be able to read and utilise researched knowledge on teaching, but that they should also, during their training, learn to produce knowledge on teaching by themselves. This first-hand experience of carrying out research not only enhances their scientific literacy, but also – perhaps more importantly – develops their ability to think didactically/pedagogically by taking up the gaze of the researcher on the teaching process. The ability to see the teaching event and its influencing factors in a more systematic, analytical and scientific manner is perceived as making it possible for teachers to make informed, justified decisions regarding his or her course of action and thus to exercise more autonomy and take more responsibility (see Saari 2011).

In this way, didactic/pedagogical thinking is perceived as suggesting a \textit{mind-set of a scientist}, and thus an \textit{attitude of inquiry}:\footnote{51}
The objective is to acquire an inquiring attitude to teaching. Thus, teachers are able to observe, analyse and develop their work. Teachers’ pedagogical thinking means the ability to conceptualise everyday phenomena, to look at them as part of a larger instructional process and to justify decisions and actions made during this process. (Toom et al. 2010: 339).

Educational knowledge, or theory, is therefore a “friend” and “helper” of the teacher (Uusikylä 1992: 60*) who is all the while by the side of the teacher, yet not as an authoritative figure who commands or dictates action. The didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher is to find his or her own way and own solutions. It is the unpredictable nature of teaching – due to the complexity of human and situational factors – that is perceived as offering itself as an opportunity for the teacher to be creative and inventive and to divert from the original plan in order to attain the goals set for teaching (e.g. Syrjälä 1981: 389). To ‘professionally grow’ into a didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher, therefore, is to learn to “[balance] critical scientific thinking and creativity” (Meisalo 2007: 171).

In this way, didactic/pedagogical thinking is characterised in the discourse of research-based teacher education as both scientific and creative in nature. That is, while didactically/pedagogically thinking teachers are to make sense of the teaching process through ‘objective’ scientific knowledge, they must work with that knowledge in both experimental and creative ways (e.g. Koskenniemi 1970, Malinen 1974b: 7). Therefore, such teachers are able to hypothesize, experiment, evaluate outcomes, adjust their action, re-evaluate, and draw on their own experiences and observations, all the while keeping in mind what scientific knowledge – that is, scientific theory on teaching – has deemed feasible and possible. Niemi (1989b: 252*), for example, depicts teachers as scientists (such as anthropologists or sociologists) engaging in ‘field work,’ and, at the same time, envisions teachers working as scientists who “experiment” and “monitor” their experiments. This experimental attitude implies, thus, the ability to observe (as a researcher) one’s own behaviour (as a teacher) and consequently to change one’s behaviour and strategies for action in line with the intended outcomes:

Researching teaching is thus a dynamic attempt to understand classroom events. The aim is to encourage an inquiring and questioning attitude and thus find topics for contemplation and development. The aim is, through research, to acquire knowledge that is not separate from teaching and from the teacher, but which is formed through them. Personal deliberation develops the teacher’s professional consciousness. The goal of such deliberation is the independent
teacher who is able to self-initiatively change his/her behaviour and strategies for action. Such a teacher is aware of his/her own thinking while making decisions, yet is also capable of evaluating his/her thinking after the decision has been made. (Kohonen 1993: 72*).

In this way, the notion of the didactic/pedagogical thinking can be perceived as a strategy through which to reconcile the tensions between theory as descriptive and objective on the one hand, and theory as normative and subjective on the other hand; between scientific thinking based on facts, and creative thinking based on intangible qualities of the inner self. Because teaching requires creativity, it involves the personal and innate of the teacher, which is where independence and originality are perceived as being located. Yet that autonomous teacher self who is evoked through creativity and originality comes to be regulated through scientific knowledge that is to be drawn on when making unique, educational decisions. It would thus seem that the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher involves two overlapping balancing acts that are concerned with the individual personality of the teacher: one is that between scientific and creative thinking, and the other between theoretical and experiential orientations in teaching. While the purely theoretical orientation, in its generalizability, would rob the teacher of any space for personal and original action, an experiential orientation would confine the teacher to narrow-mindedness and repetitiveness. Therefore, in order to make possible the teacher who draws on theory yet whose autonomy is not jeopardized by it, teachers are envisioned as researchers who exercise practices of observation, deliberation between alternative courses of action, experimenting and evaluation, and who work in creative ways while working with theoretical knowledge (e.g. Niemi 1990: 36–37). Didactic/pedagogical thinking comes to imply a practice of research/reflection as deliberation between theory and practice: This practice is signified as research because of the position of observation that the teacher takes up as a researcher, yet it is also signified as reflection because of the act of contemplation and evaluation; hence the combined notion of research/reflection that translates into/from Finnish as one word: tutkimus.

The reliance on empirical educational research through which the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher is constructed as a thinker and actor in the position of a researcher – and hence as taking up the gaze of the researcher – brings about an emphasis on the significance of research methodology for teachers.

52 Here, it becomes apparent how such modes of thinking and deliberation are to some extent connected to Deweyan notions of problem-solving within the discourse (see e.g. Niemi 1990).
That is, in order for teachers to take up the position and gaze of the researcher – that is, the carrying out of systematic, scientific observation of the classroom – in their decision-making and problem-solving, they must not only acquire a “precise definition, understanding and use of concepts” (Hytönen 1977: 107*) but also, they must be competent in empirical research methodology. In order for decisions and judgements to be made at a level beyond the everyday and the intuitional (although these need not be rejected, but rather, incorporated), thinking must take place “along the lines of research principles,” which “presupposes a general understanding of all-around research methods” (Kynäslahti et al. 2006: 248–249).

Educational decisions are thus envisioned as being based on “rational argumentation” in an independent manner instead of teachers relying on “ready answers and tips” (Toom et al. 2010: 336). With a researching, or inquiring, attitude, and by applying “one or more methods to their own everyday practice” (Kynäslahti et al. 2006: 248), it becomes possible for teachers to “find and evaluate evidence” (Niemi 2010: 41*), and “find and analyse problems” (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen 2006: 37) in their classrooms as they observe their students and approach decision-making and problem-solving with the tools that research methodology provide:

[The integration of theory and practice] takes place also in the problem-based situations where student teachers practise their methodological skills and use research methods to solve pedagogical problems. A real research orientation in teacher education means that investigation, inquiry and research also need guided practice and practicing these skills in pedagogically meaningful situations can also be seen as integration of the theoretical knowledge base or theoretical knowing with the use of appropriate data collecting and analyzing practices. (Krokfors 2007: 153).

Researching pedagogical issues as part of a teacher education programme provides future teachers with the possibility, as well as ability, to solve problems using methodological tools. (Maaranen & Krokfors 2008: 207).

In the discourse, it is envisioned that as student teachers familiarize themselves with different research approaches and methodologies (such as phenomenography, ethnography, discourse analysis, statistical analysis, content analysis) and methods of data collection (such as interviews, focus groups discussions, questionnaires of

---

53 During the last several decades, in accordance with the general trends in educational research and teacher education research, the emphasis on research methodology in teacher education curricula has shifted from primarily positivist and quantitative to primarily interpretive and qualitative approaches.
both qualitative and quantitative nature), and participate in research projects (joint or individual), they will be able to transfer these skills to their work as teachers. This notion implies that methodologies can be translated from procedures of academic knowledge production to decision-making and problem-solving in everyday practices. For example, Niemi (1989b) proposes that competence in research methodology enhances the ability to address and solve problems in the classroom. Malinen (1974a) suggests that teachers must be able to “make decisions concerning the goals, the structure of teaching material, evaluation, etc.” and that they need the ability to “understand students’ activity”, which “requires the developing of observation and interpretation skills” (Malinen 1974a: 350*). Similarly, Syrjälä and Lauriala (1990: 155) point out that qualitative analysis and interpretation “are beneficial for teachers’ everyday observations.” Another example is provided by Kansanen (1993: 43), who suggests that the selecting of textbooks to be used with pupils can benefit from content analysis. Westbury et al. (2005: 478) also suggest that “discussions with students, formal interviews, and observation techniques offer methods for securing comprehensive descriptions and understanding” in order for the teacher to “get to know his or her students.” In other words, formal competence in research methodology is envisioned as contributing to how teachers perceive and act upon the school and its pupils:

Teachers need to be equipped to study the community in which they live and to become aware of its prevalent characteristics. They need the proficiency to interview, keep track of the learning difficulties of pupils, and interpret linguistic meaning and nonverbal communication. That is why teachers would benefit from scientific approaches that are used in other human sciences, such as anthropology, psychology, psychiatry, social psychology and historical field work. (Niemi 1989b: 252*).

It is natural to think that methodology is, for scientific teacher education and for the researching teacher, both a tool for developing pedagogical thinking as well as a key to solving problems in the everyday of schooling. (Krokfors 2005: 75*).

This section has examined how the notion of the researching teacher as didactic/pedagogical thinker contributes to the fabrication of the teacher as an

---

54 The original word, tutkia, could be translated in this context as ‘study,’ ‘research,’ ‘examine,’ ‘inquire.’
55 The original word, menetelmäisyys, suggests something more than methodology; perhaps a notion of methodology as an overarching framework or emphasis in the curriculum of teacher education.
autonomous decision-maker and problem-solver by placing the teacher in the observer position of the researcher. What the analysis suggests is that the current emphasis on competence in research methodology in the curriculum of Finnish teacher education is influenced by the historical legacy of Finnish empirical educational research. Formal research training would seem to have become a constitutive part of teacher training not only due to the requirements of an academic degree but also, and more significantly, because of an understanding of research methodological skill as providing the competence to make independent decisions and evaluations related to the everyday tasks of teaching. In the discourse of research-based teacher education, research methodology is envisioned as the strategy for evoking autonomous, authentic and creative teacher selves. What has already been pointed to in this section is how the notion of research is combined with a notion of reflection as teachers are to make observations and contemplate on their observations in order to connect or integrate theory and practice. The next section further considers the positioning of the teacher as empirical researcher as a particular construction of the reflective teacher.

4.1.2 Research as self-observation and reflection

The notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher incorporates not only the idea of the teacher as an observer and researcher behind the video camera or one-way mirror but also as a practitioner in front of the camera or mirror upon which the researcher gaze is fixed. In this way, the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher as a reflective teachers is embedded in the Cartesian framework of the modern self who is both the subject and object of reflection (see Fendler 2003). In this Finnish notion of the researching teacher, the prospective teacher is to be trained not only to observe the classroom systematically and scientifically in order to participate in the production of knowledge on teaching, but also to observe oneself in the classroom in order to produce knowledge on and for oneself as a teacher. Therefore, while the discourse of research-based teacher education emphasises the importance of the acquisition of formal research skills, it also stresses the need for teachers to learn to carry out research on themselves. That is, the researcher gaze to be directed towards the teacher in the research setting of the classroom also implies a gaze on the self that is expressed in the discourse as a reflective practice of metacognition. Lahdes (1994), for example, describes a research project carried out by students at a teacher education department as follows:

80
The aim of the project was ... to familiarize the students with the carrying out of scientific research by pointing to the importance of the interaction between theory and practice as well as by familiarizing them with different research methods. The other aim was to help students to develop themselves in a didactic area. The purpose was thus to develop the future teacher’s “didactic metacognition.” (Lahdes 1994: 120–121*).

In another example, while reporting on a teacher education course in which student teachers were to analyse video material of classroom teaching, Uusikylä (1977) provides an account of student evaluations of the course. The student assessment of the impact of the course is synthesized and reported as follows:

- The precise analysis of teaching helped me to notice new things and to relate critically to teaching
- The course helped me to broaden my perceptions on the multidimensionality of teaching
- I realized the dominant role of the teacher in the teaching event
- Presumably, I will be more able to more consciously pay attention to certain aspects in my teaching
- It would seem that teaching is plannable; it is not intuitive. (Uusikylä 1977: 89*).

Uusikylä discusses the implications of these research findings by suggesting that teachers should be provided with “systematic and exact knowledge about their own teaching” (Uusikylä 1977: 89*, emphasis added). While he justifies this claim by referring to motivational factors (that is, the assumption that it is more interesting to analyse one’s own teaching than somebody else’s), what is embedded in this pedagogical idea of self-observation is the notion of rational consciousness that is to improve teaching. The student teacher who is to step into the position of the researcher who is distanced and detached from the actual event as an external observer, is simultaneously to be personally involved in the actual, concrete event of teaching. Therefore, as a strategy of professional training, student teachers are to be positioned in front of the lens as an object as well as behind the camera as the subject. It is perceived that learning to observe the event of teaching that takes place in the classroom in a researcher-like manner, and to scientifically observe and analyse the pupils and teacher involved in the event, improves the teacher’s ability to be aware of and critically examine his or her own thinking and actions as a teacher (e.g. Uusikylä 1977: 89). The didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher,
as both subject and object of research, thus embodies the notion of rational, conscious and autonomous action and problem-solving:

It is most natural for each student teacher to, ... through an internal television, receive feedback on his/her own teaching, which can then, together with the supervisors, be analysed within the framework of general didactics as well as based on research on the teaching event. This is a question of training teachers as professionals who are to solve the complex problems that arise in the teaching process. (Alikoski 1973: 214*).

In order to evaluate one’s teaching and reflect on one’s action, audio or visual technology should be used for recording lessons. With the aid of video recordings, it is easy to receive feedback on one’s work. (Sahlberg 1993: 170*).

In research-based teacher education, the observation techniques devised for empirical educational research are thus deployed for the purpose of professional training through the observation and evaluation of both the self as well as of peers:

All candidates [of the final teaching practicum] should be given tasks that require the analysing of their own or somebody else’s educational problems – including problems beyond those of didactic nature. Candidates should investigate the experienced educational problem, the measures taken, which issues were successful, which were not, what further measures were needed. ... In this way, the self-observation skill required of educators is trained. (Kaikkonen 1977: 106*).

It is, therefore, perceived that to become a didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher is to become an effective and systematic observer: The teacher must have the “ability to ask the appropriate questions” and to think in ways that “direct the discerning of action.” In order to develop professionally, the teacher must have scientific knowledge of the didactic/pedagogical problems and challenges that pervade the event of teaching. (Kansanen 1993: 45*).

While current practices of self-observation, self-evaluation and self-reflection during teaching practicums in teacher education programmes rarely involve video recording or observation through one-way mirrors, and while the research methodologies involved have shifted from quantitative to qualitative, interpretive approaches, it could be argued that the pursuit of “the reconstruction and examination of the procedures of thought at the time of the practicum”

---

56 For another example, see Lahdes (1994: 120) on peer-observation during teaching practicums.
(Koskenniemi 1966: 239*) has prevailed. The self-observation techniques that, during the earlier decades of research-based teacher education, took place through the aid of visual technology are no longer in use, yet they continue to be inscribed in the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher (even as this notion is assembled with other notions of inquiry and reflection) as a particular fabrication of the teacher-researcher who does ‘what scientists really do’ in terms of the theoretically, conceptually and methodologically informed researcher gaze:

During teaching practice, besides frequent reflective discussions with their supervisors, they must observe and analyse their own as well as others’ teaching. They are also expected to relate their teaching practice experiences with theoretical knowledge, which is then reported in a portfolio at the end of the teaching practice. (Toom et al. 2010: 333).

In the Finnish tradition of didactic/pedagogical thinking, research and reflection thus constitute the same practice – and, linguistically, it is possible to signify both concepts with the word *tutkimus*.\(^{57}\) The practice of thinking at a ‘higher,’ distanced, more conceptual level about one’s own teaching implies “discussion, thinking, reflection, research and other equivalent metacognitive action” (Kansanen 2008: 166*).\(^{58}\) Kynäslahti et al. (2006), for example, argue that:

Reflection is a way to gain knowledge about one’s own doings and about the interaction that occurs in the teaching-studying-learning process. ... In reflection, a certain distance is needed in order to be able to ponder one’s own decisions and their role in practice. In this process, teachers may utilise their knowledge about research-based thinking skills. (Kynäslahti et al. 2006: 248).

In sum, it is suggested in the discourse that to think didactically/pedagogically is to carry out research (Malinen 1974b), to think independently or, in other words, to reflect (Usiskylä 1992), to carry out metacognitive thinking (Kansanen 1993), and to contemplate or ponder (Lahdes 1994). Thus the student teachers to be trained as didactical/pedagogical thinkers must practise both teaching and researching (e.g. Kansanen 2008, Toom et al. 2010). Research skills are suggested as the means through which it is possible for teachers (or practitioners in general, such as doctors) to ‘distance themselves’ from practice. It is thought that through the use and application of research methodology, classroom phenomena can be made visible,

\(^{57}\) For a concrete example, see e.g. Malinen (1974b: 27–28).

\(^{58}\) See Kansanen (1993) for an elaboration on the differences between the hierarchical levels of action, object-theory and meta-theory in relation to pedagogical thinking as a practice of research.
observable and analysable, and teachers are able to make sense of their own experiences both during teaching practicums and as qualified teachers (e.g. Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990: 155, Toom et al. 2010: 333).

Currently, through teaching practicum supervision meetings, practicum portfolios, learning journals and essays, as well as Master’s theses on one’s own teaching, the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher is to display the capacity to exercise self (and peer) observation and evaluation, and thus to become an autonomous teacher who is able to scientifically, rationally and consciously direct his or her thinking and action. What thus follows is that the practical training that is to take place during teacher education is perceived as including not only the practising of teaching but also the practising of research:

Specific attention must be paid to the fact that practice does not refer to teaching practice alone. Practice must be understood in a broader sense. It must be perceived as including the observation and analysis of teaching. (Maaranen 2010a: 153*).

In the discourse of research-based teacher education, during the last several decades, the scope of the objects of observation has been broadened to include issues of schooling in a broader sense beyond factors around the event of teaching. Järvinen (1990: 96*), for example, is of the opinion that what is to be examined and observed during teaching practicums in terms of teacher action should be broadened “from teacher-centredness and an emphasis on the teaching process to the learning process as well as [curricular] contents, the curriculum and the school institution.” Compared to the early days of the DPA Project, the gaze has been widened to aspects beyond the classroom to the school as a whole, as an environment and community. This broadening of perspectives might be perceived as relating to the emergence of the teacher as an expert of schooling and education instead of the teacher’s professional expertise constructed as limited to that of the instructional process. The current discursive construction suggests that didactically/pedagogically thinking teachers reflect on their (self)-observations not only in order to develop their own teaching but also to improve schooling in other ways, too (see e.g. Niemi 2008: 195).

---

59 For example, Maaranen (2010b) reports on a research project that studied reflective processes related to student teachers’ Master’s theses: “More often today, primary school teacher students use their own work as teachers as a foundation for their MA thesis research. The teachers chosen for this research had conducted their MA thesis on a topic that related to teachers’ everyday surroundings of teaching and learning, pupils, schools, and themselves as teachers” (Maaranen 2010b: 487).
Finally, related to this notion of research/reflection through methodological competence for what is perceived as a higher degree of self-awareness is the idea that the mastering of research skills will contribute to the development of ‘personal philosophies’ or ‘personal theories’ of teaching:

Becoming familiar with research methods is important. In this way, the students have the opportunity for self-directed reflection and for developing a personal and practical theory of the instructional process. (Maaranen & Krokfors 2007: 360).60

That is, teachers as researchers, as fabricated through the notion of didactic/pedagogical thinking, are envisioned as developing their own theories of teaching as they oscillate between the positions of the scientist and practitioner, reflecting on and drawing connections between the theoretical and practical.

In conclusion, what is inscribed in the practice of reflection, in the Finnish notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher, is a practice of metacognitive thinking that is only possible through the scientifically competent use of theoretical and methodological conceptualisations (e.g. Hytönen 1977, Meisalo 2007). This is a crucial point that suggests itself in the discourse of Finnish research-based teacher education: What would seem to be proposed in the discourse is that Finnish academic teacher education trains its teachers as researchers in a more scientific sense of the word that is lacking in other approaches to teacher education that are to be found elsewhere, regardless of whether they are university-based approaches or not. That is, it is suggested in the discourse that while it may be a common idea for teachers to be trained in ways that promote inquiry and reflection, the Finnish case is exceptional because it also attends to the scientific dimension of teacher thinking and academic training.

In terms of the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher, the alchemy of research would seem to take place through a mobilisation of formal research methodologies through which to govern what autonomous teachers are to think, see and act upon in and through their practice. The notion of the researching teacher, in the sense of didactic/pedagogical thinking, suggests a requirement for competence in research methodology, yet simultaneously, the aspirations for such a requirement are directed towards evoking specific attitudes and dispositions and mind-sets of the teacher. Research methodology would seem to become the technology through which the teacher’s gaze in the classroom and on the self is

60 See also e.g. Toom et al. (2010: 333).
regulated. However, this regulation, or governing, works in a way that is to enforce the autonomy of the teacher: The teacher as researcher is to be emancipated through the taking up of the position of the researcher in order to be more independent, rational and original in his or her thinking and action. What is implied is that autonomy as a scientist and researcher enhances autonomy as a teacher:

It is not enough that students familiarise themselves with certain research methods during a research project. They should also be able to apply them independently. (Malinen 1974b: 11*).

In our country, there are tens of thousands of teachers, yet only a few of them are privileged to work jointly with researchers. That is why independent research-based thinking, that is, pedagogical thinking, is needed. (Kansanen 1993: 49–50*).61

The ability to carry out research independently is, therefore, suggested as making possible the professional development of teachers, and thus as sustaining their professional autonomy throughout their career (see e.g. Niemi 2010).

In the subchapter to follow, another trajectory in the assemblage of notions of the researching teacher will be examined and juxtaposed with the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher. The purpose is to consider how these two different trajectories configure in the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland, and hence to interrogate the Finnish discourse and its vocabulary that would seem to suggest the universality and self-evidence of concepts such as reflection and critical thinking.

4.2 Teacher research: The teacher as empowered knower

While subchapter 4.1 above examined the discursive construction of the researching teacher as scientist through the notion of didactic/pedagogical thinking, this subchapter will consider the construction of the researching teacher as empowered knower through the internationally circulating movements of teacher research that are mobilised in the Finnish discourse of teacher education. By juxtaposing these two strands that both contribute to the production of specific imaginaries and ideals of the teacher as researcher, the purpose is to interrogate the

61 Kansanen also suggests that teachers need not be “at the mercy of others when participating in research as they can cope with professional development by themselves” if their research training during teacher education is sufficient (Kansanen 1993: 48*).
presence of research in Finnish teacher education and the effects of different notions of research on the fabrication and governing of the teacher subject. The specific aim of this subchapter is to examine the internationally travelling notions of the researching teacher as they are reconfigured and mobilised in the Finnish discursive landscape of teacher education.62

In the academic discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland, a variety of conceptualisations of the teacher as researcher and their related notions of teacher thinking and reflection are referred to and engaged with. Some of the most prominent references include:63

- Reflective thinking, especially in reference to John Dewey (How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process [1933]).
- Inquiry-based teacher education as discussed by, for example, Alan Tom (Inquiring into Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education [1985]).
- Research on teacher thinking as investigated by, for example, Christopher Clark (The Study of Teacher Thinking: Implications for Teacher Education [1986] with Magdalene Lampert; Teachers’ Thought Processes [1986] with Penelope Peterson).
- The teacher as researcher movement in the different traditions and contexts of, among others, Laurence Stenhouse (An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development [1975]) and Joe Kincheloe (Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative Inquiry as a Path to Empowerment [1994]).
- Donald Schön’s work on the reflective practitioner (The Reflective Practitioner [1983], Educating the Reflective Practitioner [1987]).
- Action research, especially in reference to John Elliott (Action Research for Educational Change [1991]) as well as Wilfred Carr and Stephen Kemmis (Becoming Critical: Education, knowledge and Action Research [1986]).

62 Teacher as researcher movements are referred to here in a broad sense that encompass the overlapping ideas of teacher research, action research and practitioner research. Therefore, distinctions will not be drawn between these ideas. Furthermore, it is important to note that these notions of the teacher as researcher are also embedded in a multitude of significations of reflection and reflective practice. See Fendler (2003) for a genealogical analysis of the various influences of Descartes, Dewey, Schön and feminism on reflective practices in teacher education.

63 This list is provided as a general mapping and does not represent a systematic, exhaustive or quantitative analysis of citations as appearing in a clearly defined set of publications. In similar manner, the publication titles are included in order to provide the reader with a general idea of the kind work that has been taken up; they do not represent an exhaustive entry of the complete works of an author cited.
Practitioner research and inquiry as discussed, in particular, by Virginia Richardson (Conducting Research on Practice [1994]).

Teacher research as discussed by, for example, Marilyn Cochran-Smyth and Susan Lytle (Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge [1993]).

Teacher reflection, with particular reference to Kenneth Zeichner (Reflective Teaching [1996] with Daniel Liston) and Fred Korthagen (Linking Practice and Theory: The Pedagogy of Realistic Teacher Education [2001]).

During the last forty years, these and other conceptualisations, theorisations and discussions related to the researching teacher have been drawn on with different emphases during different periods. For example, it would seem that UK discussions are referred to less frequently after the 1990s, while US conversations, especially those relating to the work of Kenneth Zeichner and his colleagues (and in connection to Pragmatism and the work of Dewey), continue to this day to be central to the Finnish debates on teacher research and the researching teacher.

Also, it is also important to note that the beginning of the 1990s saw a short period in the discourse of Finnish research-based teacher education during which several critical approaches were engaged with more notably. Namely, through the work of Wilfred Carr and Stephen Kemmis, the knowledge interests as developed by critical theorist Jürgen Habermas emerged in the discourse of academic teacher education (e.g. Kohonen 1993, Lahdes 1989, Niemi 1993, Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990). Also, during this period, critical pedagogy, through the work of, for example, Paulo Freire and Henry Giroux, was explicitly referred to (e.g. Hytönen 1989, Ojanen 1997). These frameworks of critical theory and pedagogy would seemed to have provided an entry point into educational perspectives on social transformation, social critique, and issues of democracy and social justice. However, these perspectives seem to have been short-lived, or at least marginalised, in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education, and are currently not very visible. Therefore, it could be argued that the critical approaches underscoring many (although not all) of the notions of teacher research and the researching teacher would not seem to have had a notable impact on the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. That is, questions related to social

64 The work of, for example, Jack Mezirow (1991) on transformative learning also appears in connection with this thread of thinking.
65 This argument is based on an extensive reading of academic publications on research-based teacher education in Finland.
66 See Zeichner (1996) for a discussion on the issue of equity and social justice in different approaches around the idea of teacher research and reflective practice in the US context.
justice, social transformation and social critique that are characteristic of many of the teacher research movements do not seem to ‘stick’ to the Finnish discourse. However, the teacher research movements engaged with in the Finnish discourse would appear to have two distinct effects relating to the fabrication of the academically trained – and thus emancipated and empowered – teacher. Specifically, section 4.2.1 will examine how, in an attempt to democratise practices of educational research, researching teachers are produced as producers of insider knowledge. In the following three sections, attention is drawn to what might be called a ‘demystification’ of research: Sections 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 consider how practices of research are ‘naturalised’ as attitudes and ways of thinking and inquiring that are inherent to the processes of autonomous teaching. There practices are, respectively: research as curiosity, research as inquiry, and research as reflection. Therefore, as in subchapter 4.1, the analysis considers the alchemic strategies through which notions of research morph into techniques for installing and governing the mind-sets and dispositions of teachers who, at the same time, are fabricated as autonomous. The issue of social justice and social critique in relation to the Finnish discourse of teacher education will be returned to in chapter 5.

4.2.1 Research as insider knowledge production

In his critique of teacher research, Hammersley (1993) identifies several criticisms that circulate among teacher research movements and which would seem to be directed towards conventional educational research. He argues that advocates of teacher research (to various degrees and with different emphases) find that conventional educational research is most often irrelevant to the everyday, practical concerns of teachers; that it is detached from the actual classroom practice of teachers which results in ‘outsiders’ producing knowledge that seems invalid from the ‘insider’ perspective; that it assumes an authoritarian voice on educational matters in an undemocratic, paternalist manner; and that it is carried out not for the benefit of teachers but for researchers. (Hammersley 1993: 429–436).

Many of these criticisms would seem to surface in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education as the literature on the teacher as researcher movement is engaged with. For example, concerns are raised that researchers “have distanced themselves from the reality of teaching” (Ojanen 1993a: 9*), that academic knowledge is “technicist” (Ojanen 1993a: 12*) and that consequently, research has little impact on educational practices. In contrast to the Finnish notion of the didactic/pedagogical thinking that can be seen precisely as dependent on a
strong relationship with formally established research (discussed above in Subchapter 4.1), teacher research, in the broad sense, would seem to challenge the perceived hegemony of conventional research. The criticisms raised by teacher research movements, as mobilised in the Finnish teacher education discourse, would thus seem to be in tension with the notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher. In order to consider this tension in more detail, this section examines the pursuit for the democratizing of knowledge production as constructed in the Finnish discourse. This pursuit, in the discourse, can be seen as an attempt to challenge or overthrow the hegemony of conventional educational research.

A central concern raised in the discourse in relation to the construction of the teacher as researcher is that of the practical relevance of research. The idea of the teacher as researcher is perceived as beneficial in that the researcher who defines the educational problem to be investigated is an ‘insider’; the researcher is the teacher him/herself:

The researcher and teacher are merged: the researcher-teacher comes into being. The teacher identifies problems emerging from his/her work that require investigation, and the researcher pursues the investigation. The teacher eagerly awaits the research results in order to utilise them. (Kohonen 1993: 73*).

In accounts such as these, it is perceived that problems suggested for investigation will be more accurately defined in terms of their practical relevance if teachers themselves are given the opportunity to raise the questions. In other words, a scepticism is expressed towards conventional researchers in their ability to define, investigate and solve problems in a manner that teachers would also find relevant and useful. What this would seem to suggest is a perception of the degree of relevance as dependent on the distance (both physical and abstract) between the researcher and teacher. Research, as carried out in academic spaces, would seem to be constructed as distanced and detached from the ‘real’ world of teaching. In the discourse, academia is thus referred to as imposing its own interests and logic on a realm that it does not have access to, and consequently, research produced by academia on teaching is perceived as (at least potentially) invalid and irrelevant. For example, it is suggested that teachers, as researchers, have the opportunity to make observations that provide them with particular knowledge; that teachers know their pupils and their work in ways that are inaccessible to outsiders; and that they are thus in a position to inquire into and develop their work in ways that may be
beyond the reach of outsiders (Niikko 1996: 116). Furthermore, resistance is expressed against the top-down processes through which academic knowledge is conveyed to teachers and student teachers. That is, academic knowledge is perceived as authoritarian and unintelligible, and since it is produced by academics instead of teachers themselves, the teacher’s voice and perspective is perceived as remaining unheard (e.g. Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990). In a publication describing her work as a researching teacher, Rantala (2008) provides a precise example of the resistance and frustration inherent to this stance:

The emotion that initiated this research was an irritation that increased over the years of teaching and was caused by the fact that, too often, teachers are given advice “from the outside” on “how teachers should carry out their work” and especially on “what teachers shouldn’t do.” Educational sciences talk over the heads of teachers. I would like to make heard from the field the voice of the researching teacher, for, in addition to the pupils, no-one knows the everyday life of schools as well as the teacher. (Rantala 2008: 201*).

In this line of thought, it thus follows that research on teaching would be more productive and useful if it was carried out by teachers themselves. In the discourse, teachers are portrayed as having privileged access to insider knowledge. Teacher research is thus constructed as a unique site of inquiry that cannot be produced or replicated elsewhere, and therefore, in its uniqueness, is to be considered as of equal value compared to research produced by conventional researchers. In this way,

67 In a manner that is tempting to be interpreted as sarcastic, Niikko (1996: 116*) refers to such outsiders as ‘so-called experts.’
68 Syrjälä and Lauriala (1990: 142*), for example, specifically refer to “psychologists, sociologists and philosophers.”
69 As the use of the concept of voice might suggest, much of the critique of conventional research as expressed in the discourse is directed towards the positivist approach to educational research. Following the knowledge interests of Habermas that are drawn upon in the work of Carr and Kemmis (1986), the positivist approach is regarded as technicist, while the emerging qualitative approaches are perceived as working towards the critical. Qualitative, interpretive methodologies are understood as accessing and taking better into account the actual realities and contexts of classroom teaching, while a dissatisfaction is expressed towards positivist research due to its perceived detachment from the ‘real’ nature of teaching (see e.g. Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990). Unlike positivist research, qualitative approaches value the internal perspectives of the teacher (i.e. voice in terms of, for example, interpretation and cognition) instead of external factors (such as behaviour and effectiveness) (see e.g. Kosunen & Mikkola 2002).
70 For another example of this action research rhetoric, consider Blakley-Reid’s (2000) account, enunciated within a different educational and geographical context: “As adult educators, we know our students. We know our programs. We know our strengths and weaknesses. Why, then, would we look elsewhere for answers? Why would we choose the knowledge of outsiders over that created through our own as-real-as-it-gets practices?” (Blakley-Reid 2000: 26).
what is advocated for is a notion of participatory democracy: The carrying out of research, and the professional status of researchers, should not be restricted to the conventional academic space. That is, teachers should also be acknowledged as researchers and as producers of knowledge. For some, this argument is tied to a resistance toward the belittling of the inquiring nature of teachers’ work. What is suggested in such accounts of resistance is that although teachers may produce knowledge that is different in nature compared to that of a scientist, their work as researchers should not be undermined (e.g. Ojanen 1993a).

In what could be perceived as an attempt to reverse the hegemony, teachers are constructed as researchers in a far more privileged position than conventional researchers: The double positioning as both teacher and researcher is suggested as providing a particularly enriching space that is unique (e.g. Niikko 1996: 116). This double positioning, in the discourse, could be seen as embodying the hopes for progress and change: On the one hand, it is considered improbable for change to take place if teachers do not engage in research and inquiry (as, in such cases, they would be bound by unconscious routine and tradition). On the other hand, it is also perceived that research, if carried out in the confines of the university (i.e. in ivory towers), will not be able to tap into the everyday reality of the classroom (e.g. Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990: 141). Thus the combining of the two positions – that of teacher and researcher – is perceived as the most fruitful solution to the question of school reform.

The advocacy for repositioning teachers more advantageously in relation to conventional researchers is also attached to the argument that teachers should be subjects rather than objects of research; that teacher research should lead to teachers carrying out research instead of having to make themselves available as “passive targets of research” (Kosunen & Mikkola 2002: 144) and implementers of scientific theory (e.g. Lahdes 1994: 114). While the scientific nature of teacher education is narrated as the emancipator of the teacher (as discussed especially in Chapter 3), in a self-contradictory way, it is suggested that teachers should be emancipated from the perceived authoritarian sphere of academia and science:

In a way, it is paradoxical, now that the responsibility of teacher preparation has been transferred to the university also in the case of class teacher training, that teacher preparation requires the altering of the academic curricular content in order for it to better meet the needs of school. This requirement can, however, be perceived as a milestone in the endeavour of the school to become independent: One hundred years ago, the school was freed from the tutelage of
the Church that lasted for centuries. Now, the school must be freed from the university’s exclusive emphasis on its scientific task, which constitutes a restricting bond on the part of teacher preparation. (Lahdes 1994: 220*).

In the various ways discussed above, the question of validity and relevance in the production of knowledge for and about teachers could be perceived as an issue relating to academic hierarchy, on the one hand, and to the hierarchy between practical and academic knowledge. That is, in the discourse, what would seem to be purported, at least by some, is that due to the unique and privileged access that student teachers and teachers have to the everyday reality, they are higher in the hierarchy of knowing compared to other academics:

Student teachers are the holders of special knowledge. They know the school, its pedagogical atmosphere, the pupils, parents, the local community and other such contextual issues and have surpassed their supervisors in this sense. Students have more precise actual knowledge about the school as a pedagogical context than their professors and lecturers in the teacher education department as well. (Kynäslahti et al. 2006: 254).

In an extreme account, exemplified below, the work of conventional educational researchers would seem to be undermined to the point of uselessness:

The educational sciences need scientists who have an immediate connection to the educational reality. Researching teachers should provide improved conditions in which to carry out research while working as teachers. Educational sciences cannot do without them, even if researching teachers could do without educational sciences. (Korpinen 1994: 446*, emphasis added).

Connected to this doubtful disposition – or even disregard – towards academic knowledge and hierarchy is what could be interpreted as an indifferent, or at least lax, attitude towards academic standards of rigour. While the account above does not seem a frequently articulated perspective, it would nevertheless seem to resonate with other arguments in the discourse. For example, in an account of a Finnish teacher research collective, the Teacher Researcher Network, it is expressed that “the academic level of publications” published by the network “is not the most important criterion” (Husso et al. 2006: 113). Although such a prioritising of the relevance, significance and currency of the topics over their “academic level” (Husso et al. 2006: 113) can be understood in terms of measures
taken towards participation, inclusion and dialogue among educators and educationalists, it can, however, also be considered as a discursive effort to ‘equalize’ different spheres of inquiry and knowing and to resist perceived hierarchies.71

Overall, what can be detected from the discursive moves related to the mobilisation of teacher research advocacy is an attempt to bridge the gap, to narrow down the distance, between teacher and researcher. It is suggested that if researchers are to be defined as residing ‘closer’ to theory, and teachers as more ‘in touch’ with practice, then the most fruitful way forward is to perceive of the relation between theory and practice as dialectical. Therefore, any distinctions between the theorist-researcher and teacher-researcher must cease to exist (Ojanen 1993a: 9, Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990: 143). Niikko (1996: 116*), for example, speaks of the “dialogical relation between teaching, knowledge and research” that implies a transformation of the teacher “from recipient to researcher, from user to knower, and from subject to participant.”

In conclusion, the uneasy relationship that Finnish teacher education, in its academic, research-based nature, seems to have in relation to academic knowledge and scientific theory can be considered not only in reference to teacher education discussions on the appropriate balancing of theory and practice at a general level across different contexts. In the Finnish context, this common (and continual) point of debate can further be understood as emerging from the tensions between the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher who is dependent on an acquisition of the scientist’s conventional ways of seeing, thinking and acting, and the researching teacher as constructed through the teacher research movements whose seeing, thinking and acting is made possible through the unique position that is grounded in practice and experience – and, hence, to varying degrees, is positioned in opposition to academia, academic research and scientific knowledge.

The next three sections consider the discursive mobilisations of research through which these tensions would seem to be resolved.72 That is, these

---

71 While the goals of participation, inclusion and dialogue may also be problematic (see e.g. Fendler 2006 on the notion of ‘community’ as a device for social regulation and governance), the intention here is not to argue against these intentions but to point to the apparent effort in the discourse to democratize research communities through a resistance of academic hierarchy and publication standards.

72 It is, once again, important to note that the purpose is not to examine the intentions of authors. Therefore, to suggest that certain tensions are resolved does not mean to imply a focus on conscious efforts of actors to resolve the tension. Rather, the purpose is to draw attention to the discursive moves through which it becomes possible for different notions of research to become assembled within a discourse.
mobilisations are examined as discursive acts through which practices of research are demystified and naturalised: What will be suggested through the analysis is that research becomes signified as a way of thinking and inquiring that is inherent to the process of teaching. Hammersley’s (1993: 436) observation is, once again, useful in that he points out how notions of teacher research are generally based on the argument that “traditional teaching should be replaced by a form of pedagogy that is closer in nature to research; and this is proposed on epistemological, pedagogic and/or political grounds.” In this way, teacher research can be understood as a response to the ‘transmission model’ of teaching and learning – this response emerging from a variety of re-articulations of pedagogy and teaching, such as critical pedagogy and constructivist theories of learning. The demystification of research (that is, the claim that teachers naturally do what researchers do) can be perceived as relating to the democratization of knowledge production (that is, the claim that teachers should be involved as equals in the production of educational knowledge). Both efforts would, therefore, appear to construct research as a practice that resists differentiation between teachers and researchers.

4.2.2 Research as curiosity

While the notion of didactic/pedagogical thinking would seem to evoke a particular kind of creativity and inquiry that is tied to a scientific mind-set (in terms of scientifically informed observation, thinking and evaluation), notions embedded in teacher research would seem to entail attitudes of curiosity, questioning and open-mindedness in a different mode. That is, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, in specific relation to teacher research notions, it is assumed that an attitude of questioning has the potential to emancipate teachers from taken-for-granted modes of thinking, seeing and acting: The teacher is perceived as a researcher who continuously asks questions, and in doing so, will not become routinized in his or her work.73 Through an inquiring, problematizing approach to one’s work, it is suggested that pedagogical questions cease to appear as self-

---

73 Such perceptions can be found in the literature on teacher research in other contexts as well. For example, in her article, ‘Researchers in our own classrooms: What propels teacher researchers?’, published in 1997, Jane Hansen suggests that, “A teacher researcher, among other things, is a questioner. Her questions propel her forward” (Souto-Manning & Mitchell 2010: 271).
evident (e.g. Niikko 1996: 118), thus ensuring a constant direction towards change and newness in the practices of schooling.74

The act of questioning, as constructed in teacher and action research, is established as originating from the natural human tendency to be curious and inquisitive.75 Questioning, inquiry, and even a sense of wonder are discursively mobilised as the underlying dispositions that are to be evoked in students (and teacher educators) of academic, research-based teacher education.

At its best, academic teacher education resembles a research process in which new knowledge, know-how and understanding are constructed collectively. In such a process, the most significant resources are wonder and curiosity. (Lonka & Pyhältö 2010: 320*).

In such accounts, teacher education is constructed as scientific and research-based, not through its role as a provider of a scientific knowledge base for professional practice per se, but rather, through the potential ways in which it may encourage and nurture an inquisitive, contemplative attitude – an attitude that is also attached to a sense of responsibility, caring and community:

The abundant content that you, [teacher education graduates], have received during teacher education is not merely for application. It is, above all, for research.76 For this reason, it does not make sense to acquire an established, conclusive set of skills in, for example, the teaching of different subject matter. Rather, [one should aim to learn] an inquiring,77 inquisitive, responsible and caring disposition. In such a way, the teacher focuses the spotlight of awareness on what is taking place here and now – in the classroom. To think contemplatively is to ponder lingeringly. Most often, the keys to the solution

---

74 Curiosity, questioning and a problematizing attitude, in the Finnish discourse, are given a multiplicity of meanings and definitions, all of which cannot be examined in detail here. Ojanen (1993b: 32), for one, associates approaches of problematizing with Socratic questioning.

75 For examples in other contexts, see, for example, Blakley-Reid (2000) on action research and the ‘glorification of curiosity.’ Blakley-Reid (2000: 25) recalls an action research summer school educator stating that, “It’s curiosity – that’s all it is. Research is just a glorified form of curiosity.” Consider also Rudduck’s (1985) statement on teacher research: “Research liberates curiosity and generates excitement” (Rudduck 1985: 283).

76 A more fluent translation of the original word, tutkimus, in this context would be ‘inquiry’ or ‘examining.’ However, ‘research’ has been chosen here in order to bring attention to the effect of the semantics at play which contribute to the complex significations of research-based teacher education (see Subchapter 2.4).

77 The original word, tutkiva, connotes the notion of research.
are found when we are not in a rush to find the answer to a problem. (Ojanen 2003: 132*).

The notion of research and inquiry here is quite different from that associated with didactic/pedagogical thinking. Rather than suggesting a researching, inquiring attitude in the position of the conventional researcher who bases his or her thinking and seeing on scientific knowing and methods, what is evoked through the notion of teacher research, here, is a teacher who keeps his or her thinking, seeing and acting in a constant state of renewal through the ‘natural’ dispositions of curiosity and through ‘thinking out of the box.’ Research-based teacher education is envisioned as a pedagogical space in which such dispositions can be nurtured and in which students are encouraged to think in alternative ways.

In this line of thinking, experimenting does not primarily refer to ‘scientific’ experiments in various phases of the teaching event as suggested in didactic/pedagogical thinking. Instead, to experiment is to try out alternative pedagogies and ways of carrying out classroom practices in order for them not to become routinized; it is to be open to different ways of doing things even at the risk of going against established conventions. Experimenting, conceptualized as and drawing from action research, is understood as a way for prospective and practicing teachers to problematize their former perceptions of teaching and schooling, and thus for them to enter into continuous (lifelong) professional growth and development as inquiring, researching teachers. In this way, the dispositions evoked are those not only of curiosity and inquiry but also of a kind pertaining to a critical mind-set (e.g. Niemi 1989b, Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990).

Movements of teacher research, at a general level, most often hold the assumption that attitudes and practices of inquiry resemble the practice of teaching itself (see Grossman 2005: 445, Hammersley 1993: 438–440). That is, teaching is inquiry, as Tabachnick and Zeichner (1999), referring to the work of Stenhouse (1975), state:

It is not so much a matter of doing action research on teaching as it is of viewing teaching itself as a form of inquiry or experimentation. (Tabachnick & Zeichner 1999: 311).

This assumption is visible in the Finnish discourse as well, in which the teaching process is equated with the process of research (e.g. Maaranen & Kroksfors 2007: 360) – a research process that, while assuming the inherently curious attitude of the teacher, is also to be constructed in line with the principles of formal research.
Teachers are envisioned as researchers as they engage with pedagogical questions and design new ways of approaching their teaching (e.g. Niikko 1996: 115).

It is significant to note, once again, that the Finnish linguistic-semantic moves around research, inquiry, reflection and tutkimus contribute to the amalgam of notions around research, and perpetually uphold the idea of Finnish teacher education, its curriculum and pedagogy, as not only inquiry-based but research-based in the sense of the formally scientific and academic. The ways in which the authentic dispositions of the teacher are evoked can be perceived, at the same time, as strategies of governing the teacher subject. These strategies, while mobilised in the scientific realm of research, would appear to define and regulate teacher autonomy in relation to the very core of life itself:

Action research and teaching are analogous ... in that both concern the setting of hypotheses that are verified, tested, analysed and evaluated. In action research, the course of action can be perceived as advancing within a constant cycle of planning, action, problem-solving, observation and reflection. The same takes place in teaching. We can also parallel action research to the teacher’s own thinking, action and the cyclic nature of his/her life. What is in question is the dialogue between life, teaching and research and their concurrent processes. Up until now, we have been accustomed to keeping these three elements strictly apart and to focus on that which separates them instead of on their commonalities. (Niikko 1996: 119*, emphasis added).

Teachers, therefore, are fabricated as researchers and problem-solvers by signifying research as something that is inherent not only to teaching but to life in general.78 Again, here, the Finnish discourse oscillates between teacher research as a practice in which formal research designs, structures and methodologies are taken up, and as an attitude of contemplation, deliberation and problem-solving. Niikko (1996), for example, is for the latter option:

Action research is suitable ... because it takes the approach of defining and solving problems. Just like what happens in life. What is in question is a searching of solutions to practical issues in flexible and diverse ways rather than strictly adhering to a research structure that has been prepared in advance. (Niikko 1996: 119*).

78 In one way, this resonates with the Deweyan notion of scientific modes of living that are to be applied to everyday life (see Popkewitz 2005, Popkewitz et al. 2006).
Rather than perceiving of teaching as an event that requires constant decision-making in order to stay in the intended course of action (as in the notion of didactic/pedagogical thinking), the practice of teaching, in teacher research, is perceived as a form of action that can – and should – at any given time, be rethought and questioned. In the mobilisations of teacher research in the discourse of research-based teacher education, teacher autonomy is constructed not through the creative moment of independent decision-making in which the teacher is to take into account the alternatives deemed possible by scientific knowledge but rather, autonomy is fabricated through the notion of an emancipated teacher self whose mind is open to identifying and facing questions and problems previously unthought of, and who is prepared “if need be, to question his/her own knowledge, beliefs, perceptions, and even his/her own, well-functioning pedagogical practices” (Kohonen 1993: 67*). Teacher research, as taken up in the Finnish discourse, thus mobilises the notion of research as a natural, innate disposition, hence situating the locus of change in the individual. Teachers, through their innate abilities to question and problematize – abilities that are deemed inherent to being human as well as, more specifically, to being a teacher – are hence envisioned as able to transcend current contexts and bring about reform and newness.

4.2.3 Research as inquiry-based and collaborative learning

In terms of the teacher research movements as assembled in the discourse, another aspect contributing to the defining of Finnish teacher education as research-based is related to a perception of learning as active knowledge construction and inquiry. This conception, first, contributes to the construction of the student teacher’s role as active instead of passive (see e.g. Byman et al. 2009: 81, Krokfors et al. 2009: 208); in other words, as a constructor of knowledge instead of a recipient of transmitted knowledge. Following from this insight, first, teacher research is perceived as a useful means for future teachers to learn about teaching in actual classrooms. Therefore, learning about teaching through teacher research is signified as inquiry-based learning. It is perceived that prospective teachers will learn more efficiently in this way than when merely ‘being taught’ about teaching (see e.g.

79 Drawing on the work of Zeichner (e.g. 1983), such approaches to pedagogy in teacher education are perceived (to some extent, interchangeably) as inquiry-based or research-based approaches (see e.g. Byman et al. 2009).
Syrjälä & Lauriala 1990). Secondly, as learning is conceived of as inherently a process of inquiry or research, the construction of the teacher-learner as researcher is extended to that of the pupil: Pupils in the classroom, as learners, are also inquirers and researchers (see Hammersley 1993). In this way, in the discourse, the mobilisation of conceptualisations of inquiry-based learning together with teacher research can be perceived as contributing to a demystification of research in the way it is naturalised as something that all learners do. For example, Lonka and Pyhältö (2010: 322+) consider inquiry-based learning to be particularly suitable a model for research-based teacher education “because it resembles the carrying out of research,” and that these same principles of inquiry-based learning apply to learning in primary and early education. Furthermore, such arguments assume that when teachers act as inquirers and carry out research in their classrooms, they act as an example of inquiry-based learning for their pupils:

Inquiry-orientation is also transmitted from the teacher to the students. ... Because inquiry-oriented teachers observe or study their own teaching, they also serve as an example and guide their students towards inquiring learning. (Toom et al. 2010: 340).

It must be pointed out, however, that, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, a continual tension can be seen in the ways in which research is signified either as conventional, formal research or as an inquiry-based or reflective mode of learning and knowing. On the one hand, the task of carrying out research in formal academic settings is constructed as distinct from inquiry and reflection at a more general level. Yet on the other hand, arguments in the discourse can frequently be found according to which “research-based learning may take place among people of any age” as they “participate actively in knowledge acquisition and processing” (Niemi 2010: 39*). This tension would seem to result in a variety of attempts to reconcile the two conceptions of research. For example, one such attempt suggests that what distinguishes university-based researchers/inquirers from other inquirers in other contexts is their “active connection to the research community and research projects” (Niemi 2010: 39*).

The notion of inquiry, in the mobilisations of teacher research within the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education, is further attached to ideas

---

80 Again, it is worth pointing out that in arguments such as these, the Finnish word *tutkimus* and its derivatives are used when referring to inquiry as a learning-related concept. For example, the Finnish equivalent for ‘inquiry-based learning’ is *tutkiva oppiminen*, which could be counter translated as ‘research-based learning.’
of collective practice within collegial communities. That is, a specific emphasis can be found on research as collegial and collaborative inquiry. For example, Mikkilä-Erdmann and Iiskala (2013: 434*) consider “science as mostly a collective practice that one grows into through participation.” This collective practice, for Mikkilä-Erdmann and Iiskala (2013: 434*), incorporates the idea that science is not to be perceived as a “closed” practice to which there is only limited access; that the perceptions of science and research as “mystical and remote” practices through “secret” methods should, therefore, be challenged; and that student teachers should be brought into the academic space of research by encouraging an “inquiring attitude” that encourages students to naturally examine phenomena in an inquiring, researching manner.

In a similar way, Lonka and Pyhältö (2010) associate inquiry-based or research-based learning with the collective nature of scientific practices in academia:

Scientific research is ... typically carried out in research groups, and even individual researchers are always a part of the collective efforts of the scientific community. Research-based learning aims to bring this collective aspect to the fore from the very beginning of [student teachers’] academic studies. (Lonka & Pyhältö 2010: 322*).

Furthermore, it would seem that research is also deployed as a strategy for governing sentiments of solidarity and community that entail an emotional space of belonging and empowerment. Kaikkonen’s (2008) fictional account provides one such example:

Once upon a time, there was a school in which every teacher studied his/her own work. Every teacher – regardless of the subject – was interested in researching his/her own teaching and what and how his/her students were learning. The school had a collegial body of teachers whose attitude towards work was based on the idea of ‘teachers researching their own work.’ In addition, the teachers were enthusiastic about discussing together – even in a

---

81 See Fendler (2006) for a problematisation of the notion of community in terms of the political neutrality it may often inscribe, which would very much seem to be in line with the notion of community that is evoked in the discourse of research-based teacher education.

82 In terms of translation, it is difficult to discern whether tutkiva oppiminen should be translated as ‘inquiry-based learning’ or ‘research-based learning’ (as suggested in footnote 80).

83 This account is provided by Kaikkonen in the Preface to an edited volume with contributions from teachers completing their advanced studies in education while working as teachers.
critical manner, if needed – questions concerning education, teaching, the curriculum and the task of schooling in society. They were prepared to plan, develop and assess education and teaching as carried out in their school, even to question it and their own actions. In every way, they endeavoured to teach this same attitude to their pupils through, for example, inquiring together into studying and learning. Regardless of the fact that many of the external expectations and actions towards the school were against their educational principles and resulted in a lot of extra work, the teachers had the will and courage to achieve the goals they had commonly agreed on and judged as right. (Kaikkonen 2008: 5*).  

As we can see, this account mobilises a variety of ideas that have been discussed above and in previous sections, such as the teacher who thinks didactically/pedagogically as s/he plans, teaches and assesses, the teacher who questions his/her own pedagogical thinking and action, the teacher who models inquiry for his/her pupils, the teacher who is motivated and committed to his/her own educational principles. What is further evoked is the notion of community and connection through inscriptions of ‘enthusiasm’ and ‘standing together’ against external forces. Teachers, as a collective of individuals, are envisioned as autonomous and empowered as they think critically (also in relation to themselves) and work together in the interest of their pupils.

The discursive production of such collegial communities can be perceived as a strategy through which to fabricate the modern(ised) teacher against the teacher of the past, the subordinated and alienated teacher (as discussed in Chapter 3). The fabricated notion of community, as a collective space of learning, reflection, inquiry, critical thinking, empowered thinking and action, contributes to the construction and governing of the teacher as an autonomous agent. The teacher subject is discursively inserted into professional, scientific, even therapeutic communities through which a sense of solidarity and vitalisation as well as democratic ideals are evoked. In the following, these arguments are elaborated on by providing several

---

84 Rautiainen’s (2013) account resonates strongly with the exemplar of Kaikkonen. This account, however, is not from an academic publication in the formal sense, but from a short piece published in the annual Membership Bulletin of the Finnish Educational Research Association (FERA): “Nowadays, more and more teachers consider alternative careers and experience feelings of inadequacy and anxiety, even fear. At the same time, there are more teachers who would be willing to change the direction in which schools are heading, to shake off the sense of hurry and insufficiency of time. Schools can work towards such change only as a community. Teachers must restore the intellectual nature of their work; they must form communities in schools in which they might discuss, inquire and develop the school together” (Rautiainen 2013: Conclusion section, para. 5*).
exemplars from publications that address the academic or research-based nature of Finnish teacher education pedagogy.

For example, it is suggested that teachers “assembling to inquire” makes possible a pedagogical setting in teacher education where “teachers help each other to learn” (Ojanen 1996: 12*). Through a mobilisation of conceptualisations of inquiry-based and problem-based learning, and through inscribed notions of creativity and innovation therein, progress is envisioned as teachers learn to learn, inquire and construct knowledge together (see e.g. Lonka & Pyhältö 2010: 320). The ‘investigative attitude’ combines notions of self-observation, reflection and inquiry:

By participating in the activities of critical teacher communities working ‘in the field,’ teachers and student teachers adopt an investigative attitude, a research-oriented approach to teaching, learning and education. At the same time, they scrutinise critically their own and others’ notions and practices, as well as the aims and implementation of the teacher education they have received. (Kosunen & Mikkola 2002: 145).

In these ways, professional development and the internal renewal of working communities are constructed as processes that are made governable and self-governable as teacher-researchers build collegial relationships through practices of critical reflection, peer support and collaboration. Notions of collaborative inquiry and learning together evoke dispositions of collegial trust and support as well as professional commitment and motivation (e.g. Kohonen 1993: 69, 78, Lahdes 1989: 474). Senses of alienation, loneliness and fatigue are installed as problems of the individual teacher subject – problems that result in routinized, unchanging practice. Building ‘community spirit’ thus comes to suggest a way to empowerment (e.g. Asunta et al. 2005: 232). Collective practices of research and inquiry are thus envisioned as the ways through which teachers are to be redeemed from their solitude, alienation and stagnation, as the following account exemplifies (see also e.g. Niemi 1993: 61):

The work of a teacher may be lonely and mentally burdensome. Teaching itself as well as the other related everyday routines take up so much of a teacher’s

---

85 Again, the original word, tutkia, could be translated here as ‘to inquire,’ ‘to research,’ or ‘to examine.’
86 The article in which Kosunen and Mikkola (2002) use the expression of ‘investigative attitude’ is a translation of an article originally published in Finnish. In the Finnish article, the Finnish expression used is tutkiva asenne (Kosunen & Mikkola 2001: 488), which could also be translated as a ‘researching attitude.’
time that, most often, there is no time left to talk about or plan teaching together. Collective practices remain at the level of coffee break chitchat. Discussions about teaching, learning, teaching methods or curriculum development seldom take place. Typically, teachers make their decisions concerning the planning of teaching alone, without the support or comments of other teachers. For this reason, teachers would rather stick to the familiar and safe instead of trying out the new and unknown. The lack of co-operation makes it difficult to see problems that are common to the whole working community. The resources of an individual teacher will not suffice in the solving of problems relating to the whole school or its teaching staff. (Sahlberg 1993: 161*).

In conclusion, the notion of research as inquiry, as taken up and mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education, would seem to appear as fabricating researching teachers as learners through their involvement in inquiry-based learning. This mode of learning, in the discourse, would seem to oscillate between what, on the one hand, is suggested as a specifically scientific form of acquiring knowledge, and, on the other hand, a ‘natural’ model of learning that individuals of all ages are able to engage in. The notion of research as inquiry, as deployed in the discourse, can also be perceived as envisioning teachers as forming collaborative communities that are to enhance emotional dispositions such as trust, solidarity, and motivation towards a changing future.

Furthermore, what could be argued about the mobilisation of certain ideas related to teacher research movements in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education is that it contributes to a construction of the pupils through the construction of the teacher. That is, if, “in the professional preparation of teachers, the medium is the message” (Grossman 2005: 425), then the message of research-based teacher education, to be presented through the medium of teacher research, is that pupils are researchers and inquirers just like their teachers. In contrast, the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher as researcher would seem to be fabricated in a different way. In the latter notion, teachers are to draw on scientific knowledge and thinking in order for them to take on their educative role in the educational relationship, which leaves for the pupil a very different position that is not necessarily based on assuming a researcher-learner identity.
4.2.4 *Research as reflection for consciousness*

The notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher produces the researching teacher as a reflective teacher through a self-observational, metacognitive gaze that is dependent on competence in research methodology (as discussed in Section 4.1.2). However, in the discourse, the researching teacher is produced as a reflective teacher also through the deployment of notions inherent to the teacher research movements in a way that is distinct from that relating to the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher. This section considers the signification of research as reflection as mobilised through the teacher research movements, and thus further attends to how the practice of research would appear to be demystified – not only as a mind-set of curiosity (see Section 4.2.2) and as a mode of learning through inquiry (see Section 4.2.3) – but also as a form of reflection.87

The notion of reflection as a form, attitude or mind-set of thinking has, in one sense, already been touched upon to a great extent in the previous sections in that reflection, in the Finnish discourse, would seem to intimately resonate with notions of a disposition of curiosity and wonder (see Section 4.2.2), a mind-set of inquiry as well as a collective practice of sharing questions, thoughts and feelings (see Section 4.2.3). As explained in subchapter 2.4, this morphing of research and reflection can at least partly be perceived as being made possible through the semantics of *tutkia*, which refers not only (and not primarily) to scientific, academic research but to the act of examination, study, meditation and introspection.

The notion of reflection, through specific influences and interpretations of teacher research, is perceived as “a vital part of any learning” (Ojanen 1996: 13*) that would seem to construct and envision the teacher-learner-researcher as mindful and conscious. Such mindfulness and consciousness is, first, juxtaposed with the un-thinking, unconscious, unreflective teacher and learner who does not disengage herself from everyday routines in order to contemplate and ponder.88 Reflection is fabricated as a space and disposition in which there is “time to think” (Maaranen

---

87 There would seem to be additional notions of reflection that are mobilised in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education but which are beyond the scope of this thesis, as the purpose here is to focus on the two main strands of the notion of the researching teacher as appearing in the discourse.

88 This disposition of mindfulness would seem to be evoked frequently throughout the discourse. For example, prospective teachers are envisioned as mindful instead of routinized students: “Academic studies imply, above all, the disciplined immersion of oneself into the essence of things – not obediently going through the programme or running senselessly from one lecture to another” (Ojanen 1997: 7*, see also Subchapter 3.2 on mindfulness in terms of conscious decision-making, and Section 4.2.2 on mindfulness in terms of curiosity and being open to new ways of questioning).
& Kroksfors 2007), to 'stop and think' – or more specifically, as expressed in Finnish, to 'stop and research.'

The researching teacher as a reflective teacher is envisioned as bringing about a self-consciousness towards one's own practices, thinking and beliefs. Therefore, while the particularly Finnish notion of the researching teacher (discussed in Subchapter 4.1) is constructed as a reflective, metacognitive observer of the teacher self who is engaged in the didactic process of teaching and who is to become conscious of the didactic decisions to be made in a specific situation, the researching teacher as constructed through the teacher research movements is to exercise self-consciousness, self-regulation and self-discipline in a different way and for different purposes. In the latter notion, teachers are constructed as inherent professionals (as discussed in Section 4.2.1); that is, possessors of professional knowledge on teaching in their own right instead of through an acquisition of scientific knowledge that defines and reveals 'true knowledge' about teaching. Therefore, reflection is suggested as the means through which to become more conscious of the personally constructed assumptions teachers, as professionals, have about teaching – assumptions that inform and direct teachers’ perceptions, knowledge, and actions related to teaching, as suggested by Kohonen (1993):

According to constructivist theory, there is no such thing as an absolute, objective reality. Every individual, through social interaction, moulds his/her own reality in which knowledge is personally structured in a way that is characteristic of oneself. (Kohonen 1993: 77*).

Kohonen continues by pointing out the benefits of collective reflection among teachers:

As colleagues listen to each other’s thinking and as they explain their own thoughts to others, they must each consciously examine their own thinking, structures, conceptions and beliefs. (Kohonen 1993: 77*).

Therefore, the “observation of the self” (e.g. Niikko 1996: 116*) taken up through notions of teacher research would appear to point to an introspective gaze resembling confessional practices rather than a researcher gaze resembling a detached observer. In this discursive thread, reflective practices are mobilised with

---

89 Ojanen, for example, conjoins two expressions: “to stop to research, [that is,] to reflect” (Ojanen 1996: 13*, original text: tutkimaan pysähtyminen, reflektoiminen). Again, these linguistic iterations and semantic conjoinings can be perceived as adding force to the discursive fabrication of teacher education as research-based.
the aim of challenging and reforming the teacher’s inner thoughts and feelings in order to reform and improve teaching:

Teachers, as researchers, deepen and enrich their experiential knowledge and wish to break their rigid belief structures. They aim for the simultaneous change and development of their thinking, feelings and action with the goal of a continuous broadening and diversifying of their teaching and learning experiences. The teacher’s action, when dependent on one’s “ingrained and musty” concepts, easily leads to misinterpretation and detours. (Niikko 1996: 110*).

Research, as a reflective practice for self-consciousness, can hence be perceived as being deployed in the discourse in ways that construct researching teachers as self-governing subjects who are self-critical, committed to their work and prepared to problematize their own thinking:

Teachers develop their professional thinking and action in interaction with others as they self-critically evaluate and consider the grounds and consequences of their work. ... They have the courage to face problematic situations and, if need be, to also question their own knowledge, beliefs, conceptions and even well-functioning pedagogical practices. (Kohonen 1993: 67*).

Notions of research, inquiry, and reflection would seem to be simultaneously mobilised in the fabrication of the researching teacher as a teacher-learner who is to become conscious, independent and self-regulating through holistic learning:

The learning objective of holistic learning is, therefore, broad: learning implies the deepening of the learner’s consciousness about him/herself as a person and as a learner, about the management of the learning process (learning to learn) and about the content and structure of the learning task. Such consciousness and self-regulation and social interaction skills related to it make it possible for learning to become more and more directed from within, for it to become more independent, and for it to be structured and assessed by the learner him/herself. (Kohonen 1993: 69*).

Therefore, researching teachers, through the deployment of reflective practices, are envisioned as autonomous in that they are conscious of their own thinking and action and are capable and committed to the renewal of their own practices. Autonomous, reflective teachers are fabricated as practitioners equipped with a
mind-set of problematisation in that they are prepared to question the everyday practices and routines – including those of their own – of teaching and schooling (e.g. Lahdes 1989: 471, Ojanen 1993a: 10). Reflection, in this way, is taken up as a form of critical thinking that is evoked from within in order to enhance the personal-professional renewal of the teacher. While theory – or ‘book knowledge’ – is, to some extent, perceived as useful in this process (see e.g. Kohonen 1993: 69), the key to change is perceived as being located in the teacher self:

Book knowledge may be of use, but the true renewal of the teacher can only take place through personal research and reflection. (Lahdes 1989: 471*).90

4.3 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to examine the self-evident notion of the teacher as researcher within the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. For this purpose, two different trajectories of the notion of the researching teacher have been explored and analysed: the ‘Finnish’ notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher and the notion of the researching teacher as constructed through the internationally circulating movements of teacher research. In this way, it has been possible to consider how the notion of research is mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education to fabricate academically trained, autonomous teachers. What has specifically been analysed and drawn attention to is what the presence of research ‘does’ within the discourse; that is, how notions of research are mobilised and assembled, and what the effect of these mobilisations and assemblages are on the fabrication of the teacher.

The construction of the teacher as researcher and thus as an autonomous subject has been examined by considering research as a governing pedagogical technology in the discourse of academic teacher education. In other words, while the focus on research in teacher education draws on academic conventions for its organising principles (e.g. courses on research methodology and thesis work), another set of organising principles is simultaneously at work. On the one hand, research, as a governing technology, would seem to be mobilised in efforts to enhance rationality and consciousness through metacognition, self-examination and reflection. On the other hand, and in a related manner, research, as a governing technology, would also seem to evoke and install inner, authentic qualities and dispositions of the

90 The original word for ‘reflection,’ pohdiskelu, could also be translated as ‘thinking,’ ‘contemplation’ or ‘pondering.’
teacher, such as creativity, curiosity, mindfulness, and introspection. It would seem, therefore, that the mobilisation of research in academic teacher education does not imply a notion of research as a disciplinary academic practice of inquiry, but rather, an assemblage of strategies to evoke and enhance attitudes and dispositions. In this way, it could be argued that the presence of research in Finnish research-based teacher education embodies an alchemy through which research, as an academic, disciplinary practice, is morphed into pedagogical rationalities and technologies for governing the teacher subject. The insertion of research in the discourse of academic teacher education comes to mark the difference between two kinds of teachers: those ‘of old’ who are not their own masters but, instead, bound by unconscious thinking and external authority, and those who are emancipated and redeemed through the consciousness brought about through conscious thinking, observation, reflection and inquiry.

While the two examined trajectories or strands would seem to aim at combining the tasks of the teacher and researcher, this combining is enacted in the discourse in different ways. That is, both strands consider research as enhancing the work and the autonomy of the teacher, yet the two different notions of the teacher as researcher, as they are assembled in the discourse, would seem to contribute to two different positionings of the teacher-researcher who is to see, think and act in specific ways. The notion of didactic/pedagogical thinking suggests a teacher subject who is to take up a researcher gaze: Problems in the classroom are not otherwise to be seen, for only scientific knowledge, acquaintance with scientific theory and methodological competence make possible the making of decisions and judgements in independent terms. Notions of teacher research, on the other hand, suggest a teacher subject who is an empowered educational knower in his or her own right without reference to the authoritative knowledge of scientists: Problems in the classroom are exclusively and uniquely accessibly to teachers and cannot be discerned by outsider scientists or researchers.

Therefore, reflective practices and critical thinking also come to be signified through different practices in the two trajectories. Change and progress in schools, in the case of didactic/pedagogical thinking, is to be achieved as teachers work more in line with the ‘true nature’ of the teaching event as it unfolds through the accumulation of empirical research. In this case, reflection is a metacognitive skill to be used in order to observe oneself as one works towards specified goals and makes decisions in the process of teaching in a prominently linear sense. Such reflection is embedded in scientific techniques of observation that teachers are to gain access to through competence in research methodology. However, in the case
of teacher research, change and progress are perceived as being brought about as teachers bring in new insight on themselves, on the practices of schooling, and on theoretical knowledge about teaching. Reflection, as related to teacher research, would seem to be concerned more prominently with contemplative and inquisitive dispositions that seek to think anew. Critical thinking, in terms of didactic/pedagogical thinking, would appear as implying the teacher’s ownership of scientific knowledge that is to be acquired through scientific literacy and personal experience in carrying out research, and hence, teacher autonomy, and through which teaching and schooling are to be improved. In terms of other teacher research movements, autonomous critical thinking would seem to point more towards a self-critical, problematizing attitude that is to bring about change, reform and newness in teaching and schooling.

The different notions of research that are assembled in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education may seem incompatible, contradictory and in tension with each other. Yet if these notions are considered in a genealogical manner, the focus is shifted from the question of how the different threads fit together logically, or whether the concepts have been understood and interpreted correctly, to the ways in which intelligibility is brought to the notions in the specific cultural and historical landscape that they are inserted or attached to. This cultural-historical landscape will be examined in more detail in the chapter to follow. However, what is to be discussed as a concluding remark on this chapter is how the tensions around the different notions of research would seem to play out within the discourse.

First, it must be pointed out that although the two different threads have been attended to in two distinct subchapters, the discourse as a whole would suggest that the notions are most often woven together in inseparable ways. This observation is not intended as an evaluation of the coherence or logic of the texts. Rather, it must be understood as a genealogical observation in that the discursive use of a notion with multiple trajectories is bound to evoke all of them, for the discursive force of the notion is dependent on the multiplicity of its significations (see Fendler 2003). In this sense, the reconstruction of two distinct notions of the teacher as researcher is a fabrication in itself: As readers may have noted, some publications have been cited in both subchapter 4.1 on didactic/pedagogical thinking as well as in subchapter 4.2 on teacher research. This observation may perhaps also serve as a reminder to the reader: The aim has not been to categorize the authors and their publications according to ‘affiliations’ with either version of the teacher as researcher nor to draw attention to the logical intentions of the authors.
The overlapping notions and the tensions between different notions are visible within the Finnish discourse in various ways. What can be found in the discourse are both instances of oscillation between different significations of research and of the researching teacher, as well as instances in which a multitude of different notions would seem to be evoked at the same time.

For example, Meisalo (2007) makes a clear distinction between the pedagogically thinking teacher and the reflective teacher:

The general objective of a teacher as a researcher and developer of his/her own work has a long tradition and was originally thought as a ‘pedagogically-thinking teacher’ in Finland. This is considered to be a definitely more powerful approach than that of “reflective teacher”, since personal experiences only are not as valid and reliable as research outcomes. (Meisalo 2007: 172).

It would seem that the distinction between the pedagogically thinking teacher and the reflective teacher is most commonly made in the discourse in instances where the purpose is to highlight the unique Finnish model of academic, scientific, research-based teacher education that sets it apart from other teacher education models elsewhere. However, the following exemplar, on the other hand, would seem to mobilise both the notion of curiosity as well as methodological competence, thus conjoining instead of separating different threads of the teacher as researcher into the notion of pedagogical thinking:

In everyday language, a researching teacher is curious and observes situations, but additionally, his/her pedagogical thinking can be guided by the criteria learned through research methodology. (Kansanen 1993: 50*).

In other instances still, the different strands are forcefully merged into a ‘mixture’ that would seem to construct Finnish research-based teacher education as an all-encompassing notion for training teachers as researchers:

The shift was also obvious in Finnish teacher education. The professional character of a teacher’s work was emphasised, with pedagogical thinking and the research-based approach as the main organising themes (Kansanen et al. 1991; Kansanen 2000; Jakku-Sihvonen and Niemi 2006). This is near what Zeichner calls inquiry-oriented teacher education (Zeichner 1983, 5–6) or teacher inquiry (Noffke and Zeichner 2005). The aim is to develop teachers who will base their pedagogical decisions on rational arguments as well as experiential arguments (Westbury et al. 2005, 477). In addition, teachers should
be able to conduct inquiries in addition to reading critically educational academic literature. (Jyrhämä et al. 2008: 3).

However, the sense of an all-encompassing mixture that such exemplars would seem to suggest will be further interrogated in the following chapter. Chapter 5 will focus on the specific language of education, and hence, on specific notions of progress and advancement that the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education would appear to be embedded in. This specific language would, in fact, seem to refute certain notions of teacher autonomy and engagements with research while embracing others.
5  Research-based teacher education and Finnish notions of progress

Chapters 3 and 4 have aimed to answer the first research question of this study: How are teacher subjectivities and notions of research constructed, assembled and mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland? This final analysis chapter will attend more specifically to the second research question: What social ideals circumscribe the aspirations for teachers as researchers and research-based teacher education in Finland? Therefore, drawing on the analyses provided in chapters 3 and 4, this chapter will further consider the discourse of research-based teacher education in relation to the Finnish ‘language of education’ (see Tröhler 2011) and thus to a specific language of national progress that grounds the ideas and ideals for the autonomous teacher as researcher and for academic, scientific, research-based teacher education.

Modern ideas of progress, civilization, development and humanity have been analysed and critiqued in educational literature from both poststructural and postcolonial orientations (e.g. Andreotti 2011, Baker 2001, Popkewitz 2008, Todd 2009, Willinsky 1998). The insight provided by such work has drawn attention, first, to the ways in which Western projects of Enlightenment and humanism, through the privileging and universalising of Western epistemologies and rationalities, have resulted in educational (and other social, cultural, political) imaginations and practices that have come to ‘divide the world’ (Willinsky 1998) into the binary categories of civilised/savage, developed/primitive, and hence, Western/Other. Secondly, such critique has made visible the redemptive narratives that permeate educational thinking and the discourses of schooling through which educational subjects (the child, learner, citizen) are produced as embodying hopes for a future of progress and advancement, on the one hand, and fears of backwardness and savagery, on the other hand – narratives that rely on a modernist faith in Western/Enlightenment (scientific) rationality as well as on humanist cosmopolitan notions that idealise humanity whilst simultaneously inscribing a social exclusionary logic.

Historically, German influences have had a significant role in Finnish philosophical and educational thinking. Hegelian philosophy, through Finnish philosopher and politician Johan Vilhelm Snellman, strongly influenced a

91 For discussions on the ethico-political configurations between postcolonial and poststructural theory, see de Oliveira Andreotti (2014), Nichols (2010).
philosophy of education that was tied to the German notion of Bildung as the hope and strength of the nation (Saari 2011, Saari et al. 2014). During the second half of the nineteenth century in Finland, the movement of national romanticism and awakening affected a need to create, educate and civilize (the new category of) the Finnish people, a people of a ‘sacred Fatherland’ (Koski 2005, Koski & Filander 2013). Bildung, as the “essence of education” (Saari et al. 2014: 185), was seen as the means to elevate each individual, and through them, the nation and people as a whole towards a greater national and cultural self-consciousness and towards a state of cultivation and culture.

Engrained in this aspiration for cultivation is a notion of the ‘true self’ – of both the individual and the nation – as an elevated state of culture to be pursued. Within this national and educational ethos, education and schooling emerge as the means to raise the people from material poverty and moral degradation to a state of national prosperity in material (economic) and spiritual (moral) terms, as advocated for by, for example, Uno Cygnaeus, the ‘father’ of Finnish basic education. In this way, the legacies of German idealism and Hegelian philosophy, Lutheran Protestantism and Bildung are entwined in the efforts to civilize Finnish individuals for an “economically, politically and spiritually bright future for the nation” and “a new, spiritually enlightened humanity” (Koski & Filander 2013: 586).

It could be suggested that the Finnish educational language of today is still very much embedded in this tradition of educational thinking as influenced by Lutheran Protestantism. While studies in the Finnish landscape of education have provided analyses that attend to the ways in which overtly religious and/or nationalist vocabularies and discourses have been replaced by those of a more secular or professional kind,92 the focus of the following analysis is different. It will address how the underlying, politically and religiously influenced educational languages, even if not explicitly recognizable anymore (although they sometimes are), might nevertheless still be perceived as “effective” in current educational practices and discourses (Tröhler 2011: 2). Of particular interest here is the observation Tröhler (2011) makes concerning the differences between two dominant languages of education in which different forms of Protestantism and republicanism are engrained. Tröhler (2011) suggests:

---

92 For example, Koski’s (2001, 2005) work on the changes in the ‘moral cosmology’ of Finnish ABC books that indicate a shift from a ‘sacred order’ of ‘divine harmony’ to a ‘profane order’ of ‘social harmony’; as well as analyses carried out on the changing roles of the Finnish teacher from a ‘candle of the nation’ to that of an ‘expert’ or ‘professional’ (e.g. Luukkainen 2004).
The reformed Calvinist language, inscribed in notions of republican socialization and public virtue, is deliberately socially and politically oriented in its educational aim of making the child a future citizen, whereas the inner Lutheran evangelical language is strikingly silent when it comes to social and first and foremost political questions. (Tröhler 2011: 15).

This ‘silence,’ that is, the political indifference of Lutheranism, Tröhler (2011) argues, can be found in its dualistic, two-kingdom doctrine. According to this doctrine, Christ rules in one kingdom while the Emperor is ruler of the other, which thus separates questions of the inner soul from politics. The legacy of this Lutheran language in the educational tradition of Bildung, Tröhler suggests, renders education a question of the inner soul, of the individual’s inner cultivation and self-formation rather than a social (or societal), political question as in American Pragmatism as influenced by reformed Calvinism.93

This chapter will, therefore, consider the notions of educational and national progress and advancement that are inscribed in the discourse of Finnish research-based teacher education, and will explore the influence of this politically indifferent language of Lutheran Protestantism and Bildung on the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland. Three issues that emerge in the discourse of research-based teacher education will be examined. Subchapter 5.1 will focus on the problem of teacher autonomy as constructed and governed in the tradition of Bildung-Didaktik in terms of the national ethos that teaching is attached to. Subchapter 5.2 will consider the specific case of educational progressivism, equality and inclusion that research-based teacher education is envisioned as responding to. Subchapter 5.3 will examine the discourse of research-based teacher education as a self-narrative of Finnish teacher education as a signifier of cultural elevation and civilisation.

5.1 Teaching in/for the nation

Tröhler’s insight on the politically indifferent language of Bildung, as discussed above in the introduction to this chapter, would seem to bring intelligibility to the nature of the autonomy that is prescribed for the Finnish teacher. First, the societal

---

93 In addition to Tröhler (2011), see, for example, the following scholarly contributions that provide perspectives on the differences and connections between Continental and North American educational theories and traditions: Autio (2006), Biesta (2011), Gundem and Hopmann (1998), and Siljander et al. (2012).
role, task and significance of the teacher – the teacher as, for example, a ‘societal contributor’ (see e.g. Jakku-Sihvonen & Niemi 2007) – as influenced by the tradition of Bildung, would thus seem to be defined in accordance with a transcendent idea of the nation. Autio (2006, 2014) asserts that this tradition would appear to “subordinate” the teacher’s “pedagogic intentions and will ... to the speculative metaphysical values manifested in ‘the inner form of the State’” (emphasis added) and to “harness” teacher autonomy “solely to the interests of the nation-state in the name of humanist science and ethics” (Autio 2006: 5). In other words, in the tradition of Bildung, the specific underlying notions of individual and national progress can be perceived as producing a programme that “strives toward governing [teacher] subjectivity via the subtly mixed discourses of nationalism and humanity” (Autio 2014: 26).

Through the Lutheran idea of Bildung, the ‘progressive’ role of the Finnish teacher as a societal contributor can thus be perceived as not being determined in terms of an interest in the political. The progressivism of Finnish education (to be further discussed in Subchapter 5.2), while possibly thematically resonating in part with Deweyan, Pragmatist versions of progressivism, differs in a significant way from the latter in its indifference to social, political questions of democracy and justice. An example of this is pointed out by Ahonen (2012: 262), who states that, “Universal education was in Finland advocated rather for the national cause than for social justice.”

The autonomy of Finnish teachers, within such parameters, then, would appear to be exercised and governed in specific ways that will be examined in the following. First, the normative role of the curriculum will be examined in terms of the ways in which it attaches the teacher’s role to the ‘inner form’ of the nation. Secondly, this attachment will be discussed in terms of the specific implications it incorporates for the fabricating and governing of teacher autonomy. In the following analysis, the writing of Kansanen will be mostly referred to, as his publications include most explicit articulations on the normative nature of (a Finnish understanding of) Didaktik. The ideas expressed by Kansanen are not exceptional in the discourse of research-based teacher education, for which reason it is both useful and appropriate to use his work here as an exemplar.

---

94 Saari (2011: 325–327, Saari et al. 2014: 193–194), for example, points to the resonance between Koskenniemi’s and Dewey’s thinking in terms of a certain kind of progressivism. Simola (2014: 278), in a different register, discusses a certain kind of “paternalistic progressivism” that is particular to Finnish education. Within this discussion, Simola’s (2014: 278) reference to a Finnish “‘no child left behind’ ideology” would seem to suggest a resonance with its US counterpart.
Koskenniemi (1970), the prominent developer of the Finnish notion of didactic thinking (see Subchapter 4.1), writes:

[A teacher’s] work is most confined: ... the teacher is bound by the educational goals set by society. (Koskenniemi 1970: 69*).

In similar vein, Kansanen (1993), another key developer of Finnish didactics asserts:

School teachers work in a cultural environment where they implement society’s idea of basic education. (Kansanen 1993: 46*).

In this line of thinking, as articulated by Koskenniemi and Kansanen in the quotes above, the ‘idea of education’ as well as the educational goals, as defined by society and as articulated in the national curriculum, are what define the teacher’s moral and professional duty. In the tradition of Bildung-Didaktik, as pointed to in subchapter 4.1, the didactic question is not one related merely to a question of teaching method or a descriptive theory of teaching. Rather, what this tradition suggests is the event of teaching as one primarily to be defined by and grounded in the moral purpose of teaching. This moral aim, and hence the intentionality of the teacher, is further tied to the idea of the nation and, hence, to the nationally defined curriculum:

The mutual value base of teaching is defined in the national curriculum and teachers of different subjects need to conform to the values in the curriculum. ... This makes education normative in nature and has implications to the teacher’s role as a moral educator. (Tirri 2012: 57).

Didactics, in other words, is attached to the national curriculum in a normative sense (see Kansanen 1991, see also Simola et al. 1997). According to Simola et al. (1997: 880, see also Lahdes 1986), Lahdes, for example, also perceives didactics “as the general presentation of those means by which one seeks to realize the precedent curriculum.”

As the curriculum to be implemented in schools, in this tradition of didactic thinking, is defined by the norms, values and expectations of the surrounding culture in its historicity, it can be perceived as representing the very ethos of the nation itself. To teach according to the curriculum is, in this sense, to teach in a way and with the aims that are appropriate and in line with the inner form of the nation. Correspondingly, in his discussion of the scientific nature of teacher education, Malinen (1974b: 21*) asserts that scientific research – as well as education – can
only take place within the parameters that a politically and culturally specific context allows, and that “the nature of scientificity is dependent on each society’s cultural conception.” He conjoins the two questions – that of science and of education – in relation to their cultural specificity in the following way:

The development and developing of [an individual’s] personality is connected to the ethical and social thinking prevalent in a society. When a society’s values have been clarified both theoretically and empirically, it also becomes possible to perceive what kind of research would be beneficial and what kind of possibilities there would be for the utilizing of the research results. In addition, it is necessary to analyse the values and educational goals of this specific society. After this it is then possible, with the aid of educational psychology, to investigate the possibilities and processes for achieving the goals. (Malinen 1974b: 17*).95

What is visible in the articulations of Kansanen, Koskenniemi, Lahdes and Malinen discussed above is that the teacher’s task is to teach in a manner suitable to the cultural context in which s/he teaches. This is not a question of ‘cultural sensitivity’ as related to within a framing of, for example, multicultural education. Rather, what is implied in this notion of didactics can be perceived as what Autio (2006), as discussed in the introduction to this chapter, refers to as the ‘subordination’ of teacher autonomy to the ‘inner form’ of the nation. What, then, are the implications for teacher education? Hakala inserts a response into his articulation of this question:

Teacher education must, in part, respond to a question of broader scope: Of what nature is the society in which the teacher carries out his/her work? The school and society must be seen as one. (Hakala 1993: 385*).

For Kansanen (2002), the obvious response and solution is research-based teacher education. He proposes that since the essential task of teaching is to achieve the goals defined in the curriculum, and since the core of the teaching event is “interaction” that requires purposeful action on the part of the teacher and motivation on the part of the pupil, the main objective of teacher education is to “guide student teachers into this world of education” (Kansanen 2002: 52–53*).  

95 While it is not central to the argument here, it is interesting to note the particular ways in which the scientific projects of empirical research and educational psychology are assembled in the educational discourse with individual personality, societal values and national ethos.
This ‘world of education,’ specifically, would thus appear to be referring to the didactic event of teaching, the teaching process. Kansanen (2002) concludes:

Could there be any better a solution to this question than research-based teacher education? (Kansanen 2002: 52–53*).

The Finnish notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher has already been discussed in detail in subchapter 4.1, in which the focus was on the governing technologies that construct teacher autonomy as independent decision-making during the teaching event. However, here, the question of teacher autonomy as evoked in this Finnish notion is returned to from another perspective, with the aim of attending to the challenges that the normativity of didactic thinking would appear to bring to the fabrication of teacher autonomy. How would the ‘harnessing’ (to use Autio’s choice of word) of teacher autonomy to the ‘interest of the nation’ in the Bildung-Didaktik tradition seem to play out in the Finnish construction of the autonomous teacher as researcher? How, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, is the expectation to teach within nationally normative boundaries reconciled with the notion of a researching teacher who is critical and reflective? To a certain extent, these questions relate to the degree of freedom that is envisioned for teachers:

Broadly speaking, from the perspective of the school at large, the teacher has a utilitarian position, but the closer we are to the practical level, the higher the degree of freedom s/he has in his/her work. (Kansanen 1993: 43*).

From the perspective of the teacher, the significant question is, how to plan and implement coherent educational practices within a value-bound context, and through these practices to purposefully develop one’s own educational judgement. (Kohonen 1993: 73*).

The exemplars above would seem to point to a tension between the autonomous judgement that teachers, on the one hand, are envisioned as exercising, yet, on the other hand, that autonomy being regulated by the concerns, values, and expectations of society; that is, the nation. Therefore, in the following, what is examined is how teacher autonomy, within such limits, is fabricated and governed through specific notions of ownership, rationality and consciousness.

In the excerpt below, the autonomy of the prospective teacher is perceived as dependent on a sufficient amount of knowledge concerning both the ways in which education is framed in actuality as well as the existing, alternative possibilities:
If the student does not have a broader framework about different didactic emphases, educational traditions, alternative possibilities for teacher education, the relationship between the school and society, s/he is completely dependent on the crumbs s/he is given. (Niemi 1986: 57*).

What would seem to be suggested in the above is, first, that teachers should be provided with a certain amount of knowledge in order for them to be conscious of the existence of different alternatives concerning educational thinking and practice; and secondly, they must also be aware and informed of the culturally specific context in which they teach. This line of thought would seem to suggest that, in this way, teachers will not be unconscious actors dependent on instructions given from elsewhere. In terms of the school curriculum that teachers are involved in designing and implementing, this consciousness is perceived as implying an understanding of culturally specific values that have affected the articulation of specific curricular goals and aims:

To understand why certain aims and goals are in the curriculum, one must know the arguments behind the statements. Knowing the arguments is the same as acting freely without commitment. If we go behind the aims and goals to the problem of the origin of values, the students must become familiar with the different philosophical trends and with the premises on which their systems are based. During this process, the student learns to consider the possible alternatives and perhaps sees the relativity of the values in our society. (Kansanen 1991: 257).

What would seem to be implied in such thinking, as articulated by both Niemi and Kansanen above, is that, at a general or universal level, there exists an array of different philosophies and their related worldviews and values; each specific cultural and national context assumes the philosophical positions that are natural to that nation. Thus the perceived ‘relativity of values’ refers to an understanding according to which philosophies and values are natural in one culture while other philosophies and values might be more natural elsewhere. The task of the autonomously thinking and acting teacher, then, is envisioned as not merely teaching according to the ‘inner form’ of the nation as embodied in the curriculum and aims without being aware of that inner form, but to do so consciously, aware of the underlying values. Such a consciousness is thought to free teachers from carrying out their work as mere implementers of instructions without understanding the underlying reasoning, and thus to free teachers’ action from unconscious
“commitment” (Kansanen 1991: 257). At the same time, however, and in another way, the aim is, precisely, for teachers to be committed to the curriculum they teach:

Active participation in the designing of the curriculum familiarises the teachers with the goals and leads more easily to the internalising of and commitment to the goals. (Kansanen 1993: 43–44*).

It would thus seem that the independence of teachers is rather a question of internalising specific ideals in order for teachers to truly understand what they are to teach. In this way, the intentionality of the teacher also feeds into the decision-making that they are to engage in during the didactic teaching process. The correct kind of commitment would seem to be of the kind that is based on rationality and consciousness, as opposed to commitment that is based on ignorance or uncritical devotion. Kansanen, for example, writes that, in the context of teacher education, “the examination of questions concerning educational values requires ... familiarising [student teachers] with different philosophical schools of thought” (Kansanen 1989: 105*). He further states that, during such courses, the discussion should take place in a way through which “questions are examined critically and without zeal” and thus “beyond commitment” (Kansanen 1989: 105*). What would seem to be implied is that teachers must know of the different available options in order to think autonomously, rationally and critically:

How thoroughly should the teacher know the value basis of educational goals? In my opinion, the general principle is that the more thoroughly s/he is acquainted with the value basis, the more freedom s/he has for thinking and action. If the teacher knows the assumptions of the value origins on which the

---

96 What could be detected here is how philosophy is taken up in a new way in the curriculum of scientific teacher education – a curriculum that marginalized philosophy when the dominant role of empirical sciences was assumed. Philosophy would seem to be assigned a specific role in the company of empirical educational sciences as a ‘tool’ with which students are to ‘sort out’ values and worldviews. For example, Westbury et al. (2005) state: “Likewise, the teacher is always working with the values behind the curriculum and questions around the purposes of education pose issues which require systematic analysis. Philosophical studies provide the necessary understanding for a teacher’s curriculum-making, assessment, and evaluation” (Westbury et al. 2005: 478). This is stated in a similar manner by Uusikylä (1992): “Above all, the teacher needs knowledge on teaching; didactic knowledge. Educational philosophical knowledge is also necessary for an educated teacher. S/he needs such knowledge when, for example, considering educational goals and the values behind them, analysing the educational right and responsibility of the home and the school, considering the pedagogical concept of man that prevails in the school as well as the pedagogical concept of man that frames his/her own practice” (Uusikylä 1992: 59*). Simola (1998c: 737) remarks on this “didactization” of the teacher education curriculum as one in which “philosophical elements” are “acknowledged as an emphasis on the ethical character of the teaching profession and as a request for a kind of educational ideology.”
goals are based, s/he is able to critique them independently and is able to absorb elements from different orientations. At the same time [in this way], the teacher avoids committing narrow-mindedly to one school of thought, thus making it possible for his/her to make independent decisions. (Kansanen 1993: 44*).

A kind of rational reflection or critical thinking would seem to be suggested as freeing the teacher from unconscious commitment to the underlying ideological, philosophical and moral attachments of the curriculum. The construction of teachers as reflective and critical, in this way, also makes possible the avoidance of a mode of teacher education that could be considered as “indoctrination” (Kansanen 1991: 254). Kansanen (1991) would seem to suggest that the ‘inculcation’ (my expression) of specific values is less of a process of indoctrination if student teachers are aware of this process of influencing.97 Therefore, to be free and autonomous is to be conscious of the underpinnings, to be rational and thus free of ideology, and hence to practice teaching in accordance with those underpinnings, and to do so without zeal or fanaticism.98

This logic would also seem to apply to the values, philosophies and ideologies that teachers personally might hold. While autonomous teachers must be entitled to their own views, what seems to be suggested is that these should be taken up and examined in conscious and rational ways:

If the teacher increases his/her non-ideological consciousness of reality by pursuing to lessen the influence of personal opinion, especially those of an unconscious kind, s/he is able to justify, to a greater degree, his/her thoughts through common criteria and is able to interpret the reasons behind potentially different ways of thinking. (Malinen 1974b: 9*).

In similar vein, Kansanen (1991) asserts:

97 Kansanen (1991) writes: “In the teacher education process, we try to change the prospective teachers in some way. When we describe these young people, it is common to refer to such broad concepts as personality, ideology, way of life, etc. I prefer the term personality because it is based on psychology and it is not as dependent on attitudinal, ideological, political or moral content as the others. Thus, it is also more neutral, although this may be a quasi-conclusion because in any case we try to influence the very thinking of these prospective teachers regarding central value questions. Although these are educational values by nature, this does not make a difference in principle. The whole process of teacher education may be one kind of indoctrination if the teachers of these prospective teachers do not notice this point of view” (Kansanen 1991: 254).

98 This notion is also taken up, albeit in another mode, from the emancipatory interests of teacher research: “Any teacher education approach that does not encourage student teachers to reflect critically on their own educational views is, according to Carr (1986) either conservative or dangerously doctrinal” (Ojanen 1993a: 12*).
If [the student] adopts a certain ideology, he must have gone through the philosophical arguments on which the decision is founded. The decision has been conscious, otherwise he has denied all the rational reasons for his thinking. (Kansanen 1991: 257).

In other words, it is suggested that in order for teachers to be autonomous in relation to both curricular and personal views and assumptions, what is needed is a kind of consciousness that is to be produced through rational and critical thinking. This rational and critical thinking can further be both signified as, as well as made possible, through research:

Through research, prospective teachers must clarify the ideological background that they use while also aiming to develop their non-ideological consciousness of reality. (Asunta et al. 2005: 235–236*).

Therefore, what is advocated is that, in terms of personally held views, teachers must also have a sufficient amount of self-knowledge in order to be conscious of what they think and value, and to be able to rationally justify such choices. Krokfors (2005: 73*), for example, suggests that professional development implies “being conscious of values, understanding their ethical foundations, conscious choice and the justification of the choices made.”

In this way, the autonomy of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher as researcher is fabricated and governed through the notion of ‘personal educational philosophies’ and ‘personal practical theories’ that (prospective) teachers are to construct for themselves. These personally designed philosophies and theories would seem to provide a sense of ownership and conscious, rational choice, while at the same time, a specific normativity – one that derives from a national, educational ethos – is imposed on that autonomy. Freedom is indicated by an awareness of the underlying values; to be conscious of the hidden, implicit grounds of curricular and personal statements is to be free from unquestioned dogma. What is suggested through the notion of didactic/pedagogical thinking is that to be informed and conscious of the existence of an array of alternatives, and to be provided the freedom to choose from among these alternatives, is what is to bring teachers their freedom.100

---

99 In the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education, this notion can be identified in (both implicit and explicit) accounts about research/reflection as an “exploration” or “expedition” into the self (tutkimusmatka itseen) (see e.g. Heikkinen 1999b, Syrjälä 1981).

100 Kansanen (1991) juxtaposes this notion of the ‘freedom to choose from alternatives’ with the seeming ‘lack of freedom’ he encountered on his professional visit to Poland in 1980: “I said, among other things,
5.2 Educational equality as quality

In his analysis of the changes that take place in the official state discourse on Finnish education, Simola (e.g. 1998a, 1998c) makes the observation that, at the end of the 1960s and from then onwards, the individual pupil in his/her uniqueness (as defined by, for example, learning needs, personal qualities and abilities) discursively emerges as the primary target of schooling. That is, the individualization of the official educational discourse, at the end of the 1960s, shifts the discursive focus and central concern from society’s needs to that of individual pupils and their schooling – a shift that brings to the fore the individual pupil instead of pupils as a collective group to be taught.

In the discourse of research-based teacher education, this individualization is apparent from the 1970s to the present day, and is strongly connected to the questions concerning the teacher education curriculum and its relation to both the scientific as well as the ethical. For example, Malinen writes:

In teacher education ... it is necessary to have knowledge about issues related to the teaching of pupils, such as learning difficulties, physiological features and differences as well as clinical care. (Malinen 1974b: 26*).

In accounts such as these, the psychological – even psychiatric – register is visible as a central discursive trajectory of the scientific teacher education curriculum. For example, Uusikylä (1992: 59*) suggests that (class) teachers necessarily need the knowledge provided by educational psychology, social psychology, learning psychology, as well as “special education, even expertise in child psychiatry”, the latter of which is for the specific purpose of identifying “problems” and “difference” (or divergence) among pupils.

This forceful emphasis, in the discourse, on attending to different kinds of learners constructs the scientifically trained teacher as an expert who, through scientific knowledge, is able to identify, diagnose and take into consideration each pupil’s learning abilities and personal traits:

During guided practical studies, students should meet pupils and students from various social backgrounds and psychological orientations and have that at the beginning the students become acquainted with different philosophical schools of thought. One of the Polish colleagues asked a question and wondered what I meant by the different philosophical schools. As we know, the study programmes in the socialist countries were based on Marxism-Leninism and no presentation of other alternatives was possible” (Kansanen 1991: 258).
opportunities to teach them according to the curriculum. (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen 2006: 36).

The future goal continues to be the education of multi-skilled class teachers who major in educational sciences and who are capable of multi-professional co-operation. What is required of class teachers is an accurate pedagogical eye for diagnosing different kinds of learners and their need for support in as objective and ethical ways as possible. (Mikkilä-Erdmann & Iiskala 2013: 435*).

The firmly established status of and emphasis on special education in the Finnish school system attests to this “principle of overcoming learning difficulties” (Simola 2014: 278), and could be perceived, as Simola (2014: 278) does, as a form of progressivism that emphasizes the “ethical character of the teacher’s work” (Simola 1998c: 735). Notwithstanding such a perception, the emphasis on ‘learner differences’ and ‘learning difficulties’ can also be interpreted as a discursive attempt to do away with difference and inequality as determined in more politically, historically and culturally informed terms. In their study on the changing moral orders of Finnish adult education during the last 150 years, Koski and Filander (2013) point to two historical moments or ruptures that suggest the plausibility of such an interpretation. First, their analysis shows that after the Finnish civil war in 1918, there was a need to find a new vocabulary with which to refer to subjects of adult education in politically neutral ways. Therefore, there was a turn to “psychologically defined personalities and individual adults rather than class-based categories” (Koski & Filander 2013: 590). Secondly, after the Second World War, the “highlighting” of “democratic citizenship” (through various “ideals and practices”) can be understood as an attempt to redress the still-prevailing “undemocratic class-based society” by abolishing the “social and cultural differences as well as inequalities attached to gender, locality and social class” (Koski & Filander 2013: 592). In both instances, what can be perceived is the construction of the individual as a learner who is primarily (even solely) defined and made visible through categories that escape political, cultural, and social definitions. This aim of educational equality – which Koski and Filander (2013: 592) articulate as both “institutional and individual equality” – is to create a

---

101 Whether this war should be called the ‘civil war’ or something else is still debated (see e.g. Koski & Filander 2013: 596).
population (i.e. a people or nation) that is, through the moral regulation of education, to become more civilised and cultivated.

Relating this insight to the discourse of research-based teacher education, it could be argued that the focus on individual learners, their needs and difficulties – their true selves – is not so much an issue of social justice as is it a question of the Bildung (that is, formation and cultivation) of the nation towards its true form. This could perhaps be an example of what Autio (2014: 26) has in mind when referring to the “subtly mixed discourses of nationalism and humanity” that govern teacher subjectivity in the tradition of Bildung.

A specific and illustrative example of this in the discourse of research-based teacher education can be found in a journal article by Sahi and Manning (1981). The publication provides a comparative account of the differences and similarities between Finland and the US concerning teacher education, recent educational reforms, and processes of democratization in schooling. In the article, Sahi and Manning discuss the educational reforms of the last several decades and the aims of the reforms that, in both countries, have been directed towards the democratization of schooling. In the case of the US, the reform in question refers to the desegregation of schools in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, and in the case of Finland, the reform refers to the comprehensive school reform of the 1970s that abolished the dual-track school system. The reported comparison of these two culturally, politically and historically different contexts would seem, in itself, indicative of the Finnish psychologized notion of difference. Sahi and Manning (1981) write:

Naturally, the problems [concerning the implementation of the educational reforms] in the US and Finland are different at a more detailed level, but the basic idea [in both cases] is, nevertheless, the pursuit of equality between individuals. ... In the US, a multitude of ethnic groups, racial differences and social strata make the actualisation of democracy difficult. Nevertheless, both in the US as well as in Finland, teachers encounter the same problem in their everyday work: a heterogeneous group of pupils, each member of which is entitled to schooling, education and self-development. (Sahi & Manning 1981: 394*).

102 The undertone of the article is perhaps best characterised by drawing attention to a (seemingly minute) detail: In the abstract of the article, ‘cultural behaviour’ is provided as a keyword (even though it is not used even once in the text).
103 For an account of this Finnish reform, see e.g. Simola (1998a).
In this way, the question of democracy would seem to be defined as an attendance
to heterogeneity – which, in the Finnish case, is defined solely by ‘natural’
differences in terms of personal character. This attendance to difference is to
“guarantee each child the opportunity to learn and develop” (Sahi & Manning 1981:
394*). What is suggested is that educational equality – and thus democracy – has
already, for the most part, been achieved, as the successful implementation of the
Comprehensive School Reform is perceived as testifying to. The challenges that
remain concerning heterogeneity are articulated as follows:

The only factors that continue to differentiate pupils from each other are
intellectual qualities, character and social interaction skills. In these respects,
Finnish classrooms are heterogeneous. (Sahi & Manning 1981: 394*).

What Sahi and Manning (1981: 392*) thus propose in relation to the question of
teaching and practice in teacher education curriculum is that it should enhance the
teacher’s “ability and skill to understand the needs of the child”, for achievement
of equality in education is dependent on such ability and skill. Therefore, they
suggest that the educational sciences courses that student teachers take should help
them “find generalisations and laws” in order for them to “be sensitized towards
the deviations and variations” that are to be found within a heterogeneous body of
students (Sahi & Manning 1981: 396*).

What this examination of Sahi and Manning’s account might suggest is that the
attendance to individual learners in the Finnish educational logic and ethos, first,
poses heterogeneity as a challenge for educational equality per se and thus
considers democracy as an indicator of national advancement in terms of equality,
prosperity and quality – not equality and social justice.104 Secondly, the degree to
which equality is to be perceived as challenging in a specific context comes to be
empirically evaluated through psychological and biological lenses: the challenges
to equality are perceived as greater in the US because the psychological and
biological differences (i.e. as defined by race and ethnicity) are greater than in
Finland. Thirdly, in Sahi and Manning’s piece, what seems to be implicitly
suggested is that, in terms of civilization, Finland would seem to be ‘ahead’ since
the educational reforms have taken place “peacefully”, and, despite some
difficulties, “the Finns seem to have accepted the idea of a basic and equal
education for all children” (Sahi & Manning 1981: 394*). In similar vein, Scheinin

104 Koski and Filander’s (2013) observation is insightful in this respect: “When institutional and
individual equality had been proclaimed as the aim of education, these equalities became self-evident
starting points and final arguments” (Koski & Filander 2013: 592).
(2010: 10*), for example, perceives of the success of Finnish education – and therefore of research-based teacher education – in global comparisons, such as the PISA tests, as resulting from the attendance to “even the weakest” of pupils in the Finnish education system. What is inscribed in this evaluation could be interpreted as a humanist notion of national advancement: “In Finland, [the weakest ones] are better equipped for life than anywhere else [in the world]” (Scheinin 2010: 10*).105

These observations may shed light on the position that is constructed for the scientifically trained teacher as an agent of change and reform in the Finnish context:

Teaching is important in school reform. They have practical knowledge and internalised views of good teaching and learning, which guide their work and their interaction with pupils and colleagues. (Kosunen & Mikkola 2002: 135).

The position from which the teacher is to see, think and act would seem to be one defined by a combination of psychological (at times including psychiatric) and humanist registers. This gaze is, in more recent accounts, extended to the ‘new’ question of multicultural education in Finland. That is, it would seem commonplace to relate multicultural issues in education to those of heterogeneity, where multicultural education comes to signify an extension of attendance to pupil diversity. For example, in their discussion on Finnish research-based teacher education, Niemi and Jakku-Sihvonen (2006: 41–42) consider the question of multicultural societies and intercultural learning in conjunction with different learner profiles and inclusive education (which, in the Finnish context, refers specifically to inclusive special education) with the effect of making it seem as if the teacher’s ability to attend to cultural difference was dependent on her ability to work in multi-professional school communities. The ‘new’ question of multiculturalism in schooling is thus associated with learning difficulties and made into a problem of special education:

Thus there will be many challenges for teacher education concerning multicultural aspects, problems of children with learning difficulties, the need
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105 The original sentence includes a Finnish idiomatic expression, elämän eväät, that literally translates as ‘lunchbox of life’ or ‘supplies for life,’ implying an all-round ‘provisioning’ for a growing individual in order for him/her to be equipped for life. These ‘provisions’ refer primarily to advice and ‘lessons for life’ as well as to capacities and abilities.
to be able to solve various types of conflicts in schools, etc. (Meisalo 2007: 177–178).

The purpose of this subchapter has been to examine the Finnish emphasis on the attendance to learning differences and difficulties – what Simola (2014) has referred to as a kind of ‘paternal progressivism’ – as an example of how the notion of the scientifically trained teacher is tied to the particularly Finnish notion of educational equality and inclusion that would appear to be grounded in aspirations for national advancement. It could be argued that educational inequality, in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education, is perceived as an indicator of underdevelopment of the nation, while equality – and thus quality – is purported as an indicator of a more advanced, civilized state.

5.3 National advancement through teacher education

In the mid-1960s, Kyöstiö (1965), one of the early advocates for the academisation of teacher education, expresses his concern on the quality of Finnish teacher education as follows:

International comparisons reveal the irrefutable fact that, without prompt changes, our teacher education will remain at the level of so-called developing countries. (Kyöstiö 1965: 9*).

To elaborate on his point, Kyöstiö (1965: 7) provides a chart that can be read as a developmental continuum from ‘underdeveloped’ stages to ‘developed’ stages, with the lowest level of teacher training, ‘partial seminars,’ at the lowest end and ‘university-based’ teacher training at the highest end of the continuum. Placing Finnish teacher education in-between the two ends – while stating that Finland has barely made it past the lowest stage – Kyöstiö finds the state of Finnish teacher education something of an embarrassment:

Finland is, in this matter, if not entirely a backward country then at least very close to such a thing. (Kyöstiö 1965: 7*).

The institutional contexts are thus taken as an indicator of the state of civilization of a nation (Kyöstiö 1965: 7). It must be stated, of course, that the institutional context was not, and ever since then, has not been perceived as a sufficient indicator of advancement in itself. Time and again, Finnish teacher education, in its discourse, reminds itself that it must be worthy of its academic space in other ways as well,
such as its academic curriculum, organisational structure, quality of research activities, and so on. Nonetheless, the location of teacher education is taken up as a serious question of national advancement that takes place on a linear continuum of development. Malinen (1974b: 2), for example, perceives the reforms through which Finnish teacher education is scientized as a “natural consequence” of the developmental progress of society.

What might be perceived as being embedded in this pursuit of advancement and elevation is the fear of the opposite, of being backwards and savage – and of being projected as such in the world. The pursuit for development and forwardness would seem to be visible in the ways that educational quality is conjoined with educational change:

If the teachers shared their knowledge about the most up-to-date educational literature or their own findings with the school community, including parents, they could bring about real change and have a real impact on education in primary schools. (Maaranen & Krokfors 2008: 219).

If we want to maintain our current reputation as a high quality country of education, we must continuously renew and change ourselves. (Lonka & Pyhältö 2010: 316*).

The aspiration for civilization, therefore, could be perceived as attached to a comparative mode of thinking in which the developmental stage of Finland is related to those of other nations, and in which the self-image of Finnish education (and hence, of Finland) is constructed through its comparison to other civilized societies. For example, in his historical account of the emergence of a more systematized schooling for the Finnish population during the 19th century, Tähtinen (2012: 239*, emphasis added) draws attention to the civilizing task of schools, including universities, in “raising the nation and its people to the level of other civilized European countries.” From this perspective, the Finnish success in the PISA texts can be perceived as being taken up as international affirmation of the civilized state of Finland:

The success of Finnish pupils in the international PISA tests has provided sufficient confirmation of the fact that our education system as a whole – and teacher education as a part of it – is good enough to prepare children and the youth for a globalizing Finnish society. (Kallioniemi et al. 2010b: 18–19*).
For Uusikylä (1992: 61*), academic teacher education is “the hallmark of a civilized [cultured] State”\textsuperscript{106} a model of teacher education that the rest of Europe may even be “envious of.” He suggests that the future of Finland is dependent on “how Finns have been educated and trained”, and that this future will attest the “actual effectiveness of teacher education” (Uusikylä 1992: 61*). Krokfors’ (2005) statement is another exemplar of the way in which teacher education – specifically that which is research-based – is perceived as being in direct correlation with the advancement and development of the nation:

How teachers are educated is not an insignificant question. Research-based teacher education that is based on a humanist idea of man provides itself as an opportunity for a thriving civilized state\textsuperscript{107} to build its future. (Krokfors 2005: 78*).

The Finnish faith in education that is a characteristic part of its national self-narrative (see Simola & Rinne 2011) is deeply engrained in the discourse of research-based teacher education. The humanist promise of Bildung as a process of inner growth, formation and cultivation, in the discourse, would seem to produce a redemptive narrative with intimations of both national advancement as well as hope for a troubled world:

The Finnish cultural heritage appreciates learning and schooling. The national identity has been created from substances in which the significance of education is emphasised. From its very beginning, the aims of culture [\textit{Bildung}] and education have been set high for teacher education (Valtasaari et al., 1966). The Snellmanian tradition has strongly influenced our national cultural and educational system. This system highlights the idea that a nation’s strength lies in Bildung. In a global world, we can say: the hope of humanity lies in Bildung. In this endeavour, academic teacher education is also needed. (Niemi 2010: 47*).\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{106} An accurate translation here is not possible. The original word in Finnish, \textit{sivistysvaltio}, (with \textit{valtio} referring to state) has been translated as “\textit{Bildung} state” by Heimonen (2014: 192), and “cultural state” by Arolä (2003, English abstract). One possible translation could also be ‘civilized state,’ but it would seem to be less often used. Overall, the translating of the Finnish word for Bildung, that is, \textit{sivistys}, into the word ‘civilized’ would seem to be the choice of the critical sociologist (e.g. Koski & Filander 2013), not the educational philosopher or theorist within the Bildung tradition.

\textsuperscript{107} Again, the original word used here is \textit{sivistysvaltio}. See previous footnote on the problem of translation.

\textsuperscript{108} The original text uses the Finnish word, \textit{sivistys}. The German equivalent is used in the translation in order to emphasise the prevalence of the Bildung tradition – however, the Finnish word would require
What this subchapter has aimed to draw attention to is the self-narrative of Finnish research-based teacher education through which it constructs itself as an indicator, or hallmark, of culture and civilization, and through which it positions itself at the higher end of a linear continuum of development. The discourse of research-based teacher education, in this way, embodies a redemptive theme that rests on the promise of education and schooling that is to elevate the individual, the nation, and the whole of humanity. What would also seem to be entailed, and disclosed here, is the aspiration of Finnish research-based teacher education to be recognised as ‘truly academic’ and thus as modern and highly civilised.

5.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to consider and make sense of the notions of progress and advancement that would seem to be inscribed in the discourse of research-based teacher education. This has been done by considering the legacy of the German tradition of Bildung and its effects on the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland – a tradition that, as Tröhler (2011) points out, embodies specific religious and political languages that render educational questions as questions about inner growth and cultivation in a politically indifferent manner.

In this chapter, first, the construction of the autonomous teacher as didactic/pedagogical thinker has been examined as a case of ‘harnessing’ teacher subjectivities to the idea of the nation. Secondly, the Finnish educational imperative to attend to the needs of diverse learners has been discussed as a case that makes visible the conjoined notion of ‘education and progress’ as one in which equality is primarily associated with national advancement, prosperity and quality, as opposed to social justice and inclusion. Thirdly and finally, the discourse of research-based teacher education has been analysed in this chapter in terms of how it constructs its self-narrative as a particular story of linear development from a backward to a civilized state. Through these three cases, the aim has been to tap into the social ideals that ground the aspirations for research-based teacher education in Finland and that consequently contribute to the fabrication of the autonomous teacher as researcher. These three cases also make visible the attachments of Finnish teacher education (and of Finnish education writ large) to modernist teleologies of linear
d

---
a genealogy of its own that is not possible within the scope of this thesis (see Heimonen 2014 on a brief Finnish etymology of sivistys).
development and progress, human evolution, and civilisation as defined in by the legacies of Western/Enlightenment humanism, and as critiqued by poststructural and postcolonial theories.

Together, the perspectives provided in this chapter may provide an alternative way for thinking about the aspirations for reform, change and progress embedded in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. In particular, to perceive the discourse as constructed through the primary pursuit of advancement and quality (as opposed to social justice) and through a dominant language of inner growth and cultivation (as opposed to social and political aspirations) may contribute to an understanding of the particular ways in which the internationally circulating teacher as researcher movements are mobilised in the discourse. As discussed in subchapter 4.2, the internationally circulating notions of the researching teacher, to a great extent (although not exhaustively), draw on critical traditions that advocate for social justice and emancipation. For example, Zeichner (1996), one of the most frequently cited scholar in the Finnish discourse, most explicitly argues for the critical stance of teacher reflection:

Efforts to prepare teachers who are reflective must both foster genuine teacher development and support the realization of great equity and social justice in schooling and the larger society. ... The democratization of school reform through efforts to foster teacher reflection should not be supported as an end in itself without connecting these efforts to making a better society. (Zeichner 1996: 201).

However, the arguments of Zeichner, as well as of other proponents of social justice through teacher research, would seem to be picked up in the Finnish discourse in ways that evade this critical, political stance. What can be perceived in these mobilisations, furthermore, is how teacher research may oftentimes be reduced to an emphasis on methodological competence (see e.g. Niemi 1990: 47), as well as how notions of inquiry with social and political orientations morph into notions of didactic/pedagogical thinking with orientations towards inner growth:

Research-based teacher education aims to educate inquiry-oriented teachers. Inquiry orientation in the work of a teacher means that teachers act as practitioner researchers (Zeichner & Noffke, 2001) when they solve their everyday pedagogical problems, make pedagogical decisions, and give justifications to them: In our terms, when they think pedagogically. This
inquiry orientation is an empowering way for future teachers to handle the challenges of teachers’ everyday work. (Byman et al. 2009: 90).

The analysis provided in this chapter has provided insight into how research-based teacher education in Finland is circumscribed in specific social ideals for individual cultivation as well as national advancement and civilisation as influenced by the tradition of Bildung and its legacies of German idealism and Lutheran Protestantism. The findings could be suggested as bringing intelligibility to the ways in which certain aspects of the teacher research movements would seem to be attached and mobilised to the Finnish discursive assemblage of the researching teacher while other aspects – in particular, those advocating for social transformation and critique – would seem to be evaded in the Finnish context. As will be discussed in the concluding chapter to follow, this observation may bring insight into the culturally and historically specific landscape of Finnish teacher education in terms of its engagements with and interests in philosophy and social theory, research methodology, and reflective practices.
6 Conclusion

Academic, scientific, research-based teacher education is, in the current Finnish context, a frequently mobilised notion in policy, curricula and practices concerning teacher education. The notion of the teacher as researcher is strongly attached to this organising principle of teacher education, and it is commonly evoked in conversations concerning teacher ideals and curricular-pedagogical models for teacher education. The different notions of research and the researching teacher, and hence, of research-based teacher education, in this study, have been analysed in relation to their specific emergence around the 1970s teacher education reform that unified the training of comprehensive school teachers as university-based, Master’s degree training.

The historical and discursive approach taken up in this study has been inspired and informed by poststructural theory, namely, Foucault’s theorisations and analytical strategies of power/knowledge, genealogy and governmentality. Such an approach to the writing of history – as a specific way of writing and thinking about the present – has been taken up with the purpose of making the familiar strange and problematizing the ‘truths’ that we tell and are told about ourselves; of making current practices and ways of thinking “seem less self-evident and necessary” (Ball 2006: 62). According to Foucault (1988):

A critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest. ... [Thought] is something that is often hidden, but which always animates everyday behaviour. ... Criticism is a matter of flushing out that thought and trying to change it: to show that things are not as self-evident as one believed, to see that what is accepted as self-evident will no longer be accepted as such. ... As soon as one can no longer think things as one formerly thought them, transformation becomes both very urgent, very difficult and quite possible. (Foucault 1988: 154–155).

Within this concluding chapter, subchapter 6.1 will first summarise the main findings of the study. Subchapter 6.2 will discuss the findings in terms of their potential contribution towards complicating conversations about teacher education curriculum.
6.1 Rethinking the presence of research in Finnish teacher education

The first task of this study has been to analyse how teacher subjectivities and notions of research are constructed, assembled and mobilised in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education. The analysis provided in chapter 3 has addressed this task by considering the discursive moves through which the (prospective) teacher of academic, research-based teacher education is differentiated from the teacher without academic, scientific training. The scientifically trained teacher, in the discourse, is fabricated as an autonomous teacher subject who is envisioned as being emancipated, empowered and activated through the insertion of science and research into teacher education curriculum and pedagogy. The autonomous teacher, in the discourse of research-based teacher education, is produced as a school reformer committed to change and renewal, a decision-maker committed to professionalism, an active and lifelong learner committed to continual personal-professional development, and a scientific thinker ‘by nature’ that would appear as providing further grounds for the academisation and scientization of teacher education. The binary logic through which the autonomous, scientifically trained teacher is discursively fabricated points to a modernist narrative of linear progress in which the past – that of backwardness, tradition, stagnation, the speculative – is replaced with brighter visions of the future, of forwardness, newness, rationality, consciousness. However, despite the explicit shift from the speculative to the scientific and empirical, and hence, to the rational and what might be argued as technicist, the academisation and scientization of Finnish teacher education can also be perceived as a narrative of the opposite: Academic, research-based teacher education is envisioned, in the discourse, as emancipating the teacher from technicism and subordination to inner growth and freedom. Science and research would seem to be envisioned as providers of teacher autonomy as well as evoking inner, authentic qualities of the self, thus enhancing dispositions and mind-sets of creativity, curiosity, awareness, motivation, commitment and activeness. In this way, the analysis concerning the fabrication of the autonomous teacher also points to the cultivating, civilising mission of Finnish teacher education.

The analysis provided in chapter 4 has addressed the first research task by examining particular notions of research as they are assembled with and mobilised through two distinct notions of the teacher as researcher. The two examined trajectories include the specifically Finnish notion of the researching teacher as a
didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher, and the notion of the researching teacher as constructed through internationally circulating movements of teacher research. In particular, the analysis has focused on how different notions of research come to construct the researching teacher as well as to regulate the ways in which teachers are to think, see and act – concerning their pupils, the school, the events and processes of teaching, and their very selves, including their cognition, beliefs, and values. Therefore, the presence of research in Finnish academic teacher education is perceived as an alchemy: The academic, disciplinary practice of research, in the curriculum of scientific teacher education, can be perceived as morphing into rationalities and technologies through which the (prospective) teacher is governed. That is, while research-based teacher education would, on the one hand, appear as envisioning a higher level of autonomy for teachers, that autonomy comes to be governed and regulated through the alchemy of research.

As discussed in more detail in chapter 4, the two strands of the notion of the researching teacher combine the positions of the teacher and researcher in different ways, thus suggesting different significations for teacher autonomy. While the Finnish notion of the didactically/pedagogically thinking teacher elevates scientific practices and scientific knowledge in the construction of the researching teacher, the notion of the researching teacher attached to teacher research movements is based on notions of research that demystify – and hence perhaps even trivialise – scientific, disciplinary modes of thinking and action. The tensions between the threads become apparent, in particular, in their positioning of the teacher as either one who is to take on the gaze of the empirical scientist, or one who is an organic researcher in his or her own right without reference to scientific conventions and hierarchies. In sum, the array of notions related to and mobilised through the notion of research, in the Finnish discourse of research-based teacher education, can be perceived as simultaneously evoking dispositions, inner qualities and sensations of rationality, consciousness, critical thinking, reflection, metacognition, introspection, curiosity, wonder, and community. Research would thus appear to signify not only disciplinary, scientific/scholarly, systematic inquiry, but also personal growth, learning, deep thinking, and mindfulness. The tensions between different notions of research would seem to contribute to an enforcement of research as a specific academic orientation in teacher education that oscillates
between conformity to academic standards on the one hand, and research as self-expression and ‘undisciplined,’ authentic exploration on the other hand. 109

The insertion of science and research in the curriculum of teacher education can be seen as a device not only to enhance rational thinking and professional competence in changing administrative contexts (such as curriculum decentralisation and the formation of multi-professional communities of schools) but as a technology through which the self of the teacher is administered. Research practices, as techniques of government and self-government, can be seen as the means to design and organise thought, attitudes and sensibilities; to order the conduct of conduct. The notion of research and its centrality in the discourse of research-based teacher education, therefore, is not just about academic degrees, university diplomas and scientific training; it can also be perceived as the means to fabricate particular kinds of teacher subjects and to govern ways of thinking and acting – specific ways of thinking and acting that come to be presented as the ‘evidence’ of teacher autonomy.

The analyses provided in chapters 3 and 4, together, suggests that in the same way that the ‘pedagogy of the oppressed’ can be perceived as constituting the liberator and not the oppressed at the centre of the task of emancipation (Friedrich et al. 2010), and in the same way that ‘child-centredness’ can be perceived as placing the adult in the role of redeemer at the centre of educational processes (Baker 1998), ‘research-based teacher education’ can be perceived as legitimizing the role of teacher education as a rescuer of the teacher in need of redemption and emancipation, as an invigorator who breathes life into stagnation, or, in a more graceful tone, nurtures the growth of a flower. 110

The second task of this study has been to examine the social ideals that circumscribe the aspirations for teachers as researchers and for research-based teacher education in Finland. The analysis provided in chapter 5 has addressed this task by attending to the language of Finnish education in terms of its legacies of German idealism and Hegelian philosophy, Lutheran Protestantism and the educational tradition of Bildung. Through an analysis of three separate issues – issues relating to 1) teacher autonomy in the Finnish tradition of
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109 This oscillation, in turn, would seem to relate to Finnish significations of the nature and role of the university (particularly in its Humboldtian tradition) – but this is a discussion of its own to be considered elsewhere.

110 This image is drawn from Klein’s (1998) argument: “Our desire is for a humanistic model of education where we supply the encouragement and warmth and the developing child will mature and develop like a flower” (Klein 1998: 82).
didactic/pedagogical thinking, 2) Finnish educational ‘progressivism’ and 3) the self-narrative of Finnish research-based teacher education – attention has been drawn to the politically indifferent language of education that Finnish teacher education is embedded in. The examined cases of teacher autonomy, educational progressivism and the discourse of research-based teacher education itself would seem to point to a particularly Finnish landscape of educational thinking that renders questions about education, teaching and schooling as questions about the inner growth, cultivation and civilisation of the individual and – through the individual – that of the people, the nation. Aspirations for and interests towards educational progress and social change, therefore, within a humanist framework, can be perceived as being primarily concerned with national advancement on a linear continuum of development in ways that, rather than drawing on Calvinist-influenced, politically oriented notions of social justice as inscribed in American Pragmatism, focus on the national cause of civilisation. The aspirations for social progress and national advancement can thus be perceived as aspirations for material and intellectual prosperity and quality. Social change, therefore, as aimed towards in and through education and educational research, is not driven by internal, social critique but by hopes for continual improvement. What has been brought to the fore in the analysis are the particularities and nuances of a global language of educational reform – that is, the language of change and progress through education – in a culturally and historically specific context.

6.2 Complicating conversations in teacher education

This final, concluding subchapter will consider how the findings of this study might raise new and different curricular questions for academic, research-based teacher education. Specifically, section 6.2.1 discusses the legacies of vocational teacher training that continue to shape current teacher education in spite of the 1970s reform. Section 6.2.2 considers the problems and effects of current attachments to theory and methodology in academic teacher education. Section 6.2.3 closes with a note on both the need for, as well as the potential of, rethinking the spaces of intellectual engagement in teacher education.

6.2.1 Legacies of the past in reformed teacher education

While it is reasonable and justifiable to argue that the teacher education reform of the 1970s marked a tangible change in the curricular, administrative and
institutional organisation of Finnish teacher education, the analysis carried out in
this study also points to legacies of the past that would seem to have continued their
existence into Finnish teacher education in its current form. This is not a self-
evident finding, and would seem to go against the grain of previous studies on
Finnish teacher education. Simola, for example, has suggested that the
modernisation process of the educational reforms of the 1970s shifted “the
disposition of teachers” from “the traditional vocational ethos toward a more
rationalized and science-legitimated professionalism” (Simola 1993: 168).
However, based on the analysis in this study, it might be argued that the former
‘seminar spirit’ and its educational ethos (Simola 1993: 176) characterised by
orientations towards the national and the vocational as well as towards the
cultivation of ‘teacher personalities’ continues to prevail in Finnish academic
teacher education.

The persistent endurance of the remnants of the seminar tradition that seem to
be visible in current practices, such as the school-like organisation of the everyday
doctor of teacher education, have previously been pointed out by several critics of (at least
certain aspects of) Finnish academic teacher education (see e.g. Kivinen & Rinne
1989: 419, Rautiainen 2013). Yet the argument of this study has been built in a
different mode: In this study, attention has not been drawn to the explicit practices
as such, but rather, to the underpinnings of Finnish teacher education; that is, to the
notions, ideals and imaginaries that make possible specific discursive, cultural
practices in teacher education (and in this sense, the explicit practices might well
be perceived as embodiments of the underpinnings examined here). What could be
argued through the analysis of this study is that, regardless of the reform, the
traditional vocational ethos would not seem to have been compromised despite the
insertion of a curriculum and approach to teacher training that is ‘more scientific’
and hence perceived as more rational or technical. This is not to argue against the
observation of the ‘disciplinization’ or ‘scientizing’ of the Finnish teacher’s
knowledge base, but to add nuance to the observation: The disciplines of
educational psychology, didactics and the learning sciences, together with notions
of research that are morphed into ‘scientific approaches’ of teacher thinking, can
be perceived as part of the present configurations that produce the modern Finnish
teacher through humanist aspirations and ideals that would seem to maintain the
‘seminar spirit.’

Therefore, the explicit, visible “shift from a missionary to an expert notion of
knowledge; from a German-based legacy to an Anglo-American cognitive structure
in teacher training” (Simola 1993: 178), in view of this study, can be perceived as
not having marked the decline and disappearance of the Continental legacy (as embodied in Hegel-Snellmanian and Bildung traditions) from Finnish teacher education. Rather, these two major influences – that is, the German and the Anglo-American – and the ways in which the multiple, different trajectories of the researching teacher have arranged themselves in relation to each other, may, in one sense, be an indicator of how:

Nordic countries have, in different ways and to different degrees, been both more nostalgically backward-looking and more decisively forward-looking than other European countries ... these two tendencies have co-existed locally so as to mutually enhance and reinforce each other. (Árnason & Wittrock 2012: 15).

In other words, the reform through which Finnish teacher education was made academic and research-based, could be perceived as a step towards the future through the insertion of the scientific and hence the rational. Yet at the same time, what would constantly seem to be nostalgically reached back for, in the Finnish discourse of (teacher) education, is a more wholesome notion of education, sivistys (Bildung), that can be found in the past. The training of teachers, through scientific teacher education, would appear to remain a task of cultivation against the current times of crisis and degeneration (as generated by, for example, the postmodern condition; see Heikkinen 1999a). As the analysis has made visible, the insertion of science and research into teacher education has the specific effect of fabricating and governing teachers with specific qualities, attitudes and dispositions that, as inscribed in the German-influenced tradition of didactic thinking, are to be aligned with the culturally specific context of the nation. Hultqvist’s observation would support this argument:

The Nation is as present in today’s context of governing as it was in the 19th century. The difference is that the nation now is much more tied with the individual’s self or soul and the ways that it is embodied in our own, flexible, creative and autonomous projects. An apt illustration is the organization of Teacher’s education in the shape of a set of abstract dispositions and rationalities. (Hultqvist 2006: 56).

Therefore, it could even be argued that through the alchemy of research, the academic, scientific component is incorporated into Finnish teacher education without it disturbing or destabilising the primary interest of teacher education, that of vocational training and enhancing of specific values, attitudes and mind-sets that
are embedded in modernist, humanist, nationalist ideals. Furthermore, the legacy of Lutheran Protestantism inherent in the tradition of Bildung-Didaktik explains the specific insertion of academic knowledge, and practices of research, into a kind of teacher education that evades engagements with (inter)disciplinary knowledge that would lead to internal social critique, as will be discussed in the next section.

6.2.2 Under-theorised teacher education

While the idea of having student teachers engage with theory instead of advocating for specific values and attitudes (see Pinar 2009) may seem more sustainable and productive an option – as well as more in line with the notion of an academic training – in a sense, such an approach to teacher education might go against the grain of the ethos of teacher education itself. This is not intended as a pessimistic remark, but rather, as an optimistic invitation to continue our investigations into the culturally and historically formed landscapes of teacher education and educational thinking.

What the analysis provided in this study has made visible is the ways in which ‘theory’ is taken up and mobilised in research-based teacher education. First, what theory primarily comes to signify in Finnish teacher education is scientific theory on the didactic process of teaching (currently, such theories may vary from Continental theories of teaching to theories of learning as produced in the learning sciences). Secondly, the politically indifferent language of Bildung and hence its weak social and political orientation would seem to evade engagements with (political, cultural, social) theory as a form of scholarly inquiry for social critique.

Therefore, one potential contribution of this investigation lies in the insight it brings to the relationship between academia and teacher training that has most often been characterised as difficult, uneasy and in frequent (if not constant) tension (see e.g. Elstad 2010, Labaree 2008). This relationship has, in some historical and sociological accounts, been examined as a question of raising the professional and academic status of teacher educators and/or teachers. It has also most often been considered as embodying the difficult and problematic binaries of theory–practice, academic–vocational, and scientific knowledge–lived experience (binaries that are also visible in the discourse under examination here). However, the poststructural, Foucauldian tools taken up in this study have made possible the interrogation of the relation between the university and teacher education in a different mode, thus suggesting different perspectives and problems. That is, in the context of Finnish teacher education, that the purpose of academic knowledge in teacher education
curriculum is established in a way that refutes engagements with ‘disruptive’ or ‘uncomfortable’ theory, with theory that challenges current ways of thinking and being.

The genealogical analysis of different notions of research as mobilised in the discourse of research-based teacher education in Finland sheds light on the strong emphasis on training in empirical research methodology in teacher education curriculum: The emphasis can be explained not only by the turn of Finnish educational sciences from speculative philosophy to empirical educational research during the 20th century, nor by the related attempt of educational sciences to qualify as a ‘true’ field of scientific inquiry. More specifically, the significant role of methodology in the training of teachers also relates to the tradition of didactic/pedagogical thinking that requires methodological competence in order for teachers to see, make sense of and act upon the classroom and of the process of teaching.

A problematic, practical outcome of the emphasis on methodology is an approach to educational research that is methodology-driven:

The students may choose any educational topic they wish, and these vary between theoretical, philosophical, and practical themes. In the MA thesis research process, the students develop a research idea, decide how it could be researched, into what kind of theoretical framework it fits, and, finally, conduct and submit the study as a thesis containing approximately 25,000 words. (Maaranen 2010b: 490).

If the insertion of research into teacher education is perceived in these ways, the concern about the emphasis on research at the expense of practical and vocational preparation (see Säntti et al. 2014) would seem to lose its urgency. Instead, the problem of the prevalence of research would appear as one in which student teachers, while acquiring Master’s degrees, are provided with a narrowed down view of academic, scholarly inquiry: As inquiry is reduced to a question of methodology and mostly detached from theory, research easily becomes either a rather technically accomplished academic exercise in collecting and categorising data, or a project driven by personal interests without reference to current conversations in specific disciplinary fields and scholarly, theoretical debates.

In light of the Bildung-Didaktik tradition that Finnish teacher education is embedded in, the attachment to methodology without (social, political, cultural) theory could be perceived as a safe and practical solution to the academic demands for activeness in research without having to engage with theory that might disturb
the humanist and nation-minded ethos, as well as without having to respond to a ‘foreign’ language of social critique. This might explain why, while the shift from positivist to qualitative paradigms in educational research and thus in the teacher education curriculum took place at more or less the same pace in Finland as elsewhere within the field of education, the turn to post-qualitative approaches in Finnish educational research would seem to be an arduous endeavour that is most often met with a particular kind of silence or awkwardness.\textsuperscript{111}

In sum, the academic, scientific, research-based nature of Finnish teacher education is to be perceived as of a specific kind in terms of the engagements with disciplinary debates, intellectual practices and scientific knowledge that are made (un)available to its students (and others, for that matter, such as teacher educators and teacher education researchers). The ‘scientificity’ of academic, research-based teacher education would, to a great extent, seem to rest on the assumption and confidence that competence in research (mostly qualitative, interpretive) methodology guarantees the scientific nature and quality of teacher education. It would seem ironic that the very research-basedness of Finnish teacher education through which it regards itself as academically superior to other approaches to teacher education also makes possible its detachment from intellectual rigour. However, as the opening paragraph of this section stated, these observations are intended as optimistic provocations towards rethinking and revisiting the engagements with theory and disciplinary knowledge in teacher education.

\section*{6.2.3 Thinking otherwise in teacher education}

The aim of this study has not been to evaluate the degree of success of Finnish teacher education as an academic, scientific project, nor to conclude with suggestions for the appropriate institutional location of teacher education. This having been said, in light of the findings of this study, it would seem worthwhile to address the significance and potential of making use of the academic space – and indeed, as has been pointed out in the discourse, a rare space as such – that Finnish teacher education currently finds itself in.

\textsuperscript{111} See Autio (2014: 25) on his observation of the “obvious reluctance regarding ‘post’ approaches of any kind” in the tradition of Didaktik. Ball’s (2015) more general observation would seem to resonate with this reluctance that could arguably be attributed to the Finnish discipline of education itself: “There is a wariness about giving up on embedded normativities, a reluctance to abandon the commitment to humanism and agency and resistance. We are often much happier if we know where we stand and what we think, and are very clear about what we know to be bad, rather than having to think about how we think” (Ball 2015: 312).
That is, in order for students in teacher education to move beyond individual, depoliticised and ahistorical understandings of questions around education and schooling, it would be important to think about other ways of engaging with research and academic knowledge in Finnish teacher training beyond those currently mobilised. This would, however, require a disenchchantment with current engagements with research and inquiry in order for new possibilities to emerge, and thus a rethinking of not only the possibilities and openings but also the foreclosures and limitations that the current fabrication of teachers as researchers entails. In conjunction with such a rethinking, it might be helpful to consider and interrogate the very idea of the university in which the Finnish notion of research-based teacher education is grounded. The financial and administrative crises and intellectual challenges that the university, at a global level, is currently facing, in itself, would also seem to invite academic teacher education into debates about the purposes of higher education beyond issues of scientific, professional knowledge bases to questions about the existence and the role of academia itself.

In resonance with Foucault’s thought that things are not necessarily good or bad but dangerous, the argument here is not that the presence of research in teacher education is either a good or bad idea. Rather, what the study has hoped to draw attention to is that ‘research,’ in Finnish research-based teacher education, has specific effects and consequences that those of us involved in teacher education would need to be attentive to. The danger of research may reside not only in the specific ways in which it is taken up but also in the ways in which it is evaded or disregarded.

The potential of teacher education within an academic space lies in the possibilities that engagements with disciplinary knowledge might open up about the complexities and multiplicities of education and schooling – this is the potential contribution of academia that remains to be explored in Finnish research-based teacher education. In this study, this invitation has been taken up through an engagement with a specific, poststructural way of thinking as an opportunity (among others) to consider teacher education curriculum and its history in an alternative, albeit not an easy way:

The hope is for teachers to move from seeking a certain system or a credo as the basis for beliefs about practice to welcoming openness. Openness brings forth questions to which there are no easy answers. In this regard, one pedagogical insight is that much questioning from poststructuralist views concerns aspects of social and educational life that previously have been taken
for granted. Examining the taken for granted becomes thus a particular place to begin. (Stone 2008: 74).

To suggest the need to “[increase] the levels of intellectual engagement” in order to be able to respond more responsibly to and take seriously the current, complex challenges of educational settings and social conditions (Andreotti 2010: 238) does not, however, imply (yet) another set of theoretical-methodological positions to be adopted or applied, nor a reducing of such engagement to that in a cognitive mode (see Andreotti 2011). Rather, it is to point to the multiplicity of perspectives needed to make sense of and re-organise our sensibilities concerning our (co-)existence in ways that challenge our attachments to modernity; to rethink how we might face humanity beyond humanism (Todd 2009); and hence to also defamiliarise the fabrication of ourselves in teacher education as specific kinds of teachers or researchers – or both.
Epilogue

In November 2014, I attended the Annual Meeting of the Finnish Educational Research Association that was organised at the University of Oulu. On the final day of the conference, Professor Elizabeth St. Pierre delivered a keynote, ‘Post Qualitative Inquiry,’ which was followed by a panel discussion (in Finnish), ‘Research-based Teacher Education – Bold Visions and New Openings?’ (‘Tutkimusperustainen opettajankoulutus – rohkeita visioita ja uusia avauksia?’). At the end of the panel discussion, the audience was given the opportunity to present questions and comments to be discussed by the panellists. Unfortunately, there was very little time left for the panellists to respond to the questions and comments raised by the audience. I therefore reiterate my question here as a provocation in the hopes that it might open up conversations within Finnish teacher education about its engagements with research as well as its (historical and cultural) self-understanding of the field it has constructed of and for itself – conversations that are bound to be complicated, and, I suggest, are to be embraced as such.

I have recently been studying the history of the discourse of Finnish research-based teacher education. After teacher education was scientized, so to speak, through the teacher education reform of the 1970s, what emerged in the discourse was a strong emphasis on the significance of qualitative, interpretive educational research for teacher education research and pedagogy. The new scientificity – or research-basedness – of teacher education was perceived as an opportunity for teacher education to detach itself from the traditions of positivist research, and qualitative research was perceived – and in my opinion, is still perceived – as more relevant and suitable for the professional training of teachers.

In light of Elizabeth St. Pierre’s keynote, I would like to ask the panellists: What might be the relevance and significance of the new openings in qualitative research – that is, of the ‘post’ theories that St. Pierre spoke of – for the perceptions of scientificity that are held by Finnish teacher education and teacher education research? Or, if the ‘post turn’ is not relevant [for Finnish teacher education], why not?

Olen tutkinut suomalaisen tutkimusperustaisen opettajankoulutuksen diskurssin historiaa. Kun opettajankoulutus 1970-luvulla niin sanotusti tieteellistyi opettajankoulutusuudistuksen myötä, diskurssissa oli vahvana...

Elizabeth St. Pierren keynote-luennon valossa haluaisin kysyä panelisteilta: Mitä sanottavaa, mitä merkitystä laadullisen tutkimuksen uusilla käänteillä eli St. Pierren mainitsemilla post-teorioilla voisi olla suomalaisen opettajankoulutuksen ja opettajankoulutustutkimuksen käsityksille tieteellisyydestä? Tai jos post-käänne ei ole relevantti [suomalaiselle opettajankoulutukselle], miksi ei? 112

112 The Finnish version presented here is a verbatim transcription of the original question (excluding the insertion in the last sentence that has been added for the purpose of clarity). The English version is a free translation.
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