Nordic Journal of Educational History
Vol. 4, no. 1 (2017), pp. 53–81
ISSN (online): 2001-9076
ISSN (print): 2001-7766

From Seminar to University: Dismantling an Old and Constructing a New Teacher Education in Finland and Sweden, 1946–1979

Björn Furuhagen
Janne Holmén

Abstract • In the 1970s, Sweden and Finland abandoned the system of seminars for folk school teachers and incorporated all teacher education into the system of higher education. The visions behind the new education, as well as the original plans for its structure, were similar in both countries, but the outcomes were different. Finland managed to a greater extent to implement an academic teacher education located at universities, while the Swedish solution was deemed unsatisfactory by many actors, leading to several new reforms in the following decades. This can be explained by the different nature of the conflicts surrounding the reforms in Sweden and Finland. In Finland, the early 1970s was a period of intense left-right polarisation, followed by attempts to depoliticise teacher education. In Sweden, the vision of an academic teacher education met successful resistance from regional actors, resulting in the preservation of much of the old seminar system under the guise of small teacher education colleges.

Keywords • teacher education, educational reforms, Finland, Sweden

Introduction

Finland and Sweden are two countries that have in many ways developed along similar paths, including in the field of education. However, their systems of teacher education have turned out quite differently, despite similar initial ambitions and ideals. The roots of the differences can be found in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, when Finnish and Swedish educators and politicians alike were faced with questions of how to construct a teacher education for the new comprehensive school system, how to gain support for the reforms, and what to do with the network of seminars which had educated teachers for the old folk schools (*folkskola*, *kansakoulu*). The aim of this study is to compare how Finland and Sweden prepared and implemented a new university-based teacher education from the late 1940s until the 1970s, with a focus upon how the interactions between different actors affected the outcome of the reform process.

A comparison between the two countries' teacher education provides new perspectives on the development of the Finnish as well as the Swedish systems. The many similarities make it easier to discern the particular characteristics of each country's development, and facilitate explanations of how and why teacher education has changed. The comparative perspective also illustrate that the development

Björn Furuhagen is an Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer at the Department of History, Uppsala University, Sweden.
Email: bjorn.furuhagen@hist.uu.se
Janne Holmén is an Associate Professor at the Department of History, Uppsala University, Sweden
Email: janne.holmen@hist.uu.se

and the outcome in each country was not predestined, but was affected by a number of contingent factors.

Ideas and actors

The school system is generally considered of great importance for the future development of society, since it shapes the worldviews, knowledge, and skills of the coming generations. Since reforms of teacher education have been seen as a necessary prerequisite for school reforms, it has developed through a struggle between actors with different views and ideologies regarding its purpose and design. Such ideologies have been labelled "orientations" in earlier research, which has primarily focused upon the United States but also to some degree on Sweden. The number and description of the orientations might vary between different researchers, but the main points are similar, exemplified by Andersson's description of orientations – although she called them paradigms – in Swedish teacher education:

1. A vocational orientation focusing upon knowledge and skills in educating according to present traditions, in order to prepare students for work in the contemporary school.
2. A progressivist orientation, where teacher education aims at renewing the school with new pedagogics or methods, democratic values, critical attitudes, etc.
3. An academic orientation that focuses upon subject knowledge, subject didactics, and university studies.
4. An orientation of personal development that emphasises the future teachers' psychological and personal development as a foundation for the teaching profession.

Although Andersson's analysis is based upon the Swedish teacher education reform of 1988, the orientations she identifies are also applicable to our period of research. However, an important difference is that in the 1950s and the 1960s in Sweden, the progressivist orientation was closely connected to a belief in the ability of the pedagogical and psychological sciences to transform teaching, similar to what Feyman-Nemser called technological orientation and Zeichner described as inquiry-orientation.[1] Another difference is that the Finnish academic orientation was more focused upon the value of university education per se, and less upon its content, than was the case in Sweden.

In order to analyse how these orientations have been used in actual struggles re-

1 Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Traditions of Practice in U.S. Preservice Teacher Education Programs," *Teaching and Teacher Education* 9, no. 1 (1993); W. Doyle, "Themes in Teacher Education Research," in *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, ed. W. Robert Houston, Martin Haberman, and John Sikula (New York: Macmillan, 1990); Sharon Feiman-Nemser, "Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives," in *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, ed. W. Robert Houston, Martin Haberman, and John Sikula (New York: Macmillan, 1990); Peter Rennert-Ariev, *Interrogating Coherence in Preservice Teacher Education: A Case Study* (College Park: University of Maryland, 2002); Bob Adamson and Paul Morris, "Comparing Curricula," in *Comparative Education Research: Approaches and Methods* 19, ed. Mark Bray, Bob Adamson, and Mark Mason (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, 2007); Catharina Andersson, *Läras för skolan eller skolas att lära: Tankemodeller i lärarutbildning* (Uppsala: Diss. Uppsala universitet, 1995), Ingrid Carlgren, *På väg mot en enhetlig lärarutbildning? En studie av lärarutbildares föreställningar i ett reformskede* (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1992).

lating to educational policies between actors from the educational system, academia, and the political sphere, they have to be analysed with the help of a theoretical framework focused on agency.

Sociologist Margaret Archer claims that educational systems are shaped by the aims and needs of the actors who control education and wield power over it. Archer based her model on studies of the nineteenth century transformation of the educational systems in France and England. These systems changed through a process where an existing structure – education as private enterprise – was modified through interactions between agents competing for educational control, whereby a structural elaboration took place, in her case resulting in the emergence of state educational systems.[2]

We argue that in a twentieth century Nordic welfare society, where education is a central concern for the state and the object of extensive long-term planning, Archers three step model (structure–interaction–structural elaboration) has to be replaced by the four step model: structure–planned structural elaboration–interaction– implemented structural elaboration. In the short section "Historical background," we describe the pre-existing structures of teacher eduction in Finland and Sweden, which closely resembled each other. Our investigation is centred on three questions that are answered in separate chapters where the two countries are compared. First, the planned structural elaborations are described in "Visions, ideologies and structural plans," where we investigate the dominating visions of school, teaching, and pedagogy among leading actors behind the reforms of teacher education, and what changes in the content, values, structure, and organisation of teacher education they considered necessary in order to reach their objectives. Second, in "Conflicts" we describe the interactions that unfolder when aspects of the proposed changes caused conflicts between different actors. Thirdly, in "Outcomes" we investigate the implemented structural elaborations. When plans were transformed into actual political decisions, what was the outcome of the reform process? What did the reformed teacher education in Finland and Sweden look like at the end of the 1970s when teacher education had become a part of the university system in both countries?

Comparative research on reforms of teacher education

Although comparative education is a growing research field, there have been few comparisons of the development of teacher education. The existing studies stress the importance of understanding the national cultural context in the compared countries. For example, in a study of teacher education in Norway and Great Britain, Stephens, Tønnessen, and Kyriacou claim that comparative educational research highlight the importance of national contexts for the implementation of decisions. Thus, British education focused on practical teaching skills and the maintenance of order in the classroom, while Norwegian teachers were expected to learn pedagogical theory and value transmission.[3]

Similarily, Blömeke and Payne stress the importance of taking into account cultural factors and values when conducting comparative studies. For example, in Tai-

2 Margaret S. Archer, *Social Origins of Educational Systems: University Edition* (London: Sage, 1984).

3 Paul Stephens, Finn Egil Tønnessen and Chris Kyriacou,"Teacher-Training and Teacher Education in England and Norway: A Comparative Study of Policy Goals," *Comparative Education* 40, no.1 (2004).

wan only the best students of mathematics are admitted to teacher education, which is strikingly different from the case of the United States.[4]

Large comparative studies of teacher education have been conducted in Europe[5] and in the Pacific region.[6] However, these reports are inventories and evaluations and generally lack a broader comparative approach and a longer historical perspective. *Traditions and Transistions in Teacher Education* from 2003 does give a historical perspective on the developments in Canada, Iceland, and Sweden, but it is a collection of case studies by separate authors rather than a comparative project.[7]

Research on reforms of teacher education in Sweden

The history of Swedish teacher education up until the 1980s has been described by several scholars, but only Linné and Marklund have considered conflicts between actors. Linné has studied the education for folk school teachers from the 1800s until 1968, and reveal that some of the conflicts found in our analysis of the 1950s and 1960s, in terms of the future of the seminars, were already visible in the 1930s. Proponents of the non-academic, vocational seminar education of folk-school teachers claimed that it was an important route to education for young people without secondary schooling. Over time, this traditional view was challenged by the notion that the education of folk-school teachers should rely on academic principles and be based upon a secondary school exam. From the 1930s, the folk-school teachers' trade unions were important actors in propagating this change, as an academisation of folk-school teacher education would raise the status of the profession.[8]

Marklund describes the entire reform process from the 1940s to the 1970s in detail based on official reports, bills, and parliamentary decisions. However, he has not analysed parliamentary sources, which can reveal conflicts between political parties and politicians.[9]

Linné points out that the reform process was characterised by an ambiguous hesitation. From the end of the 1940s, official reports and bills advocated a new teacher education, and a parliamentary decision along these lines was taken in 1950. However, this and many following decision were vague and without a binding schedule. Thus, tangible progress was slow, and teacher education was not reformed until 1968.[10] This was six years after the introduction of the comprehensive school in 1962, and Marklund argues that a faster introduction would have been possible. According to him, the hesitation and delay was caused by the resistance of some actors to

4 Sigrid Blömeke and Lynn Payne, "Getting the Fish out of the Water: Considering Benefits and Problems of Doing Research on Teacher Education at an International Level," *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, no. 8, (2008).

5 E.g. Theodor Sander, et al. eds., *Teacher Education in Europe: Evaluation and Perspectives* (Osnabrück: SIGMA, 1996); Tema Nord 2009:505, *Komparativt studium af de nordiske læreruddannelser* (København: Nordisk ministerråd, 2009).

6 Paul Morris and John Williamson, eds., *Teacher Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: A Comparative Study* (New York: Falmer Press, 2000).

7 Sandra Acker and Gaby Weiner, eds., Theme: Traditions and Transitions in Teacher Education, *Tidskrift för lärarutbildning och forskning*, no. 3–4 (2003).

8 Agneta Linné, *Moralen, barnet eller vetenskapen: En studie av tradition och förändring i lärarutbildningen* (Stockholm: HLS, 1996).

9 Sixten Marklund, *Skolsverige 1950–1975, 6: Rullande reform* (Stockholm: Liber, 1989).

10 Linné (1996), 315–20.

the core principles of the new teacher education. While Marklund specifically mentioned the seminar teachers,[11] our analysis of parliamentary print shows that they were supported by other actors.

Research on reforms of teacher education in Finland

Esko Kähkönen has described the development of teacher education in Finland from 1958 to 1978, while Joukko Vuorenpää has investigated the period from the 1970s until the early 2000s. Veli Nurmi has studied the development of Finnish teacher education from 1863 until the 1970s, focusing on the seminars.[12]

Kähkönen describes how the religious-national upbringing which had permeated the seminars disappeared when the seminars were closed in 1974. In his opinion, the political left used the concept of scientificity to counteract the religious and conservative value-base that dominated the schools and teacher education. With scientificity, many on the left intended to promote Marxist philosophy, but the concept was interpreted differently by others. Thus, scientificity became a central concept in the Finnish teacher education reform of the 1970s, and it has since further increased in importance, as illustrated by Säntti et al.[13]

Although there is significant Finnish research about the period, it rarely mentions actors trying to influence teacher education or conflicts between them. Nurmi mentioned one conflict in the nineteenth century – between male and female seminar students – and used it to illustrate that conflicts were not unique to his own time, but did not elaborate upon the nature of the contemporary conflicts. The fact that none of the previous overviews mention the role of The Society for Support of Free Education (*Vapaan koulutuksen tukisäätiö*, VKTS) might be explained by the fact that its existence was first made public in 2004. Nurmi was certainly aware of its existence, since he, like many other high ranking officials at the Finnish Board of Education (*Kouluhallitus/Skolstyrelsen*), was a member. However, membership was strictly confidential, and the organisation was not discussed in public until its existence was revealed in 2004.[14] Probably influenced by the closeness in time to the politically polarised 1970s and the fact that the authors themselves took part in the process, earlier research have bypassed some of the main conflicts which led to the Finnish teacher education of today.

Sources

Our main sources are committee reports and parliamentary proceedings. These documents provide a picture of how different actors sought to influence the renewal of teacher education. Important interest groups were represented in the committees

11 Marklund (1989), 251–55, 301.

12 Esko I. Kähkönen, *Opettajankoulutus Suomen koulunuudistuksessa v. 1958–1978: Yleissivistävän koulun opettajien koulutuksen järjestelyt ja tavoitteet* (Oulu: Oulun yliopisto, 1979); Joukko Vuorenpää, *Yliopistollisen opettajankoulutuksen kehittyminen Suomessa 1970-luvulta 2000-luvulle* (Turku: Turku University, 2003); Veli Nurmi, *Opettajankoulutuksen tähänastinen kehitys* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1979).

13 Kähkönen (1979), 133–34; Janne Säntti et al., "Bowing to Science: Finnish Teacher Education Turns its Back on Practical Schoolwork," *Educational Practice and Theory* 36, no. 1 (2014), 21.

14 Jari Leskinen, *Tulevaisuuden turvaksi: Sotavahinkoyhdistyksen ja irtaimiston sotavahinkoyhdistyksen sotavahinkovakuutustoiminta 1939–1954: Sotavahinkoyhdistyksen säätiö ja sotavahinkosäätiö 1954–2004* (Jyväskylä: Sotavahinkosäätiö, 2004).

and the viewpoints of the political parties are revealed in parliamentary debates. Although our efforts to conduct a balanced comparative study are facilitated by the similarities of the countries' committee systems, some differences do exist. In Finland, actors who disagreed with the general conclusions of the committee published objections at the end of the committee reports. In Sweden, dissenting voices is instead captured in the summaries of referrals published together with the propositions in parliament. While these summaries might have gone through a process of selection in order to support the viewpoints presented in the proposition, they still illustrate which actors were supporting and which were opposing the proposition in question.

Historical background – teacher education for folk schools and grammar schools in Finland and Sweden

A parallel school system developed in Finland and Sweden in the nineteenth century, with grammar schools for the elite and folk schools for the majority of the population. In Finland and Sweden, folk-school teachers and grammar-school teachers followed separate educational paths of entirely different characters. From the middle of the nineteenth century, folk-school teachers were trained in "seminars" with no connection to the universities. Seminar education was more vocationally oriented than the academic education of grammar-school teachers who took a bachelor degree in their university subjects, after which they—from the mid-1800s—received some pedagogical instruction and practical teaching training in schools.[15]

The legacy of these two teacher-education traditions, one vocationally and the other academically oriented, continued to play a role in both Finland and Sweden during the period examined in this present article, the 1940s to the 1970s. Teacher education was gradually reformed and reorganised in a way that brought these forms of training closer to one another, for example by the introduction of teacher-training colleges, but the old and new forms coexisted for a long time. The comprehensive school – planned in Sweden in the 1940s and 1950s, in Finland in the 1960s, introduced in Sweden in 1962 and in Finland in 1972 – was a driving force of teacher-education reform. As a result of this development, teacher education finally became a part of the university system, in 1977 in Sweden and in 1974 in Finland, where it was elevated to masters' level in 1979, a year which marks the end of this study.

Visions, ideologies, and structural plans

Sweden

Since the late nineteenth century, Swedish social democrats and liberals had envisioned a comprehensive school which would provide a common basic education for all children regardless of social background. The aim was not only to provide better education for the individual, but also to create a more democratic society. In this ambition, the aims of progressivist pedagogues and Social Democrats coincided. The Social Democratic Party, which with the exception of a few months in 1936 was in government from 1932 to 1976, dominated Swedish educational policies. During our period of research, liberals and conservatives did not have an alternative vision

15 Emil Bertilsson, "Lärarutbildning," in *Utbildningshistoria: En introduktion* 2nd ed., ed. Esbjörn Larsson and Johannes Westberg (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2015), 191–95; Kähkönen (1979), 23.

for education, but either supported the aims of the social democrats or objected to mere details.

The school commission of 1946 aimed at redrawing primary and secondary education in Sweden. It consisted of politicians from different parties, but was dominated by Social Democrats. Among them was sociologist and politician Alva Myrdal, minister of education Josef Weijne, and Stellan Arvidson who later became a well-known school politician. The commission published its main report in 1948, containing a chapter on teacher education, and in 1952 a second report, prepared by a group of experts and high officials.[16]

The commission proposed a move towards a comprehensive school system, which required a new teacher education that could bridge the gap between folk and grammar school teachers. It considered the old seminars a mere school education, lacking academic foundations and mixing theory and practice to an unacceptable level. Grammar school teacher education had too strict a division between the two, and a weak linkage between theoretical studies and school reality. Both forms of teacher education contained too little psychology, pedagogy, and preparations for the nurturing role of teachers.[17]

The comprehensive school should not only provide pupils with knowledge and skills, but also, in a progressivist spirit, develop their personalities and raise them to be good democratic citizens. Old methods of teaching were therefore considered obsolete.[18] It was important to convince student teachers that teaching should no longer be based upon lectures, home work, and tests. "New Education" (learning-by-doing), where pupils worked and searched for information independently, were considered central. The old authoritative teacher role should be transformed into one of cooperation between teacher and student.[19]

The school commission proposed that the future teacher education should take place in a new kind of institute for higher education – the teacher-training colleges. These were to be more academic than the folk-school seminars, and special training schools would be attached to them. A professor in pedagogy at each teacher-training college would be responsible for the research, partly in nearby experimental schools. Lecturers in methodology would ensure that the student teachers would receive scientifically based knowledge about methods adapted to specific age groups.[20] Thus, the commission believed strongly in pedagogy, psychology, teaching methodology, and in improving teaching methods through research.[21] However, since this emphasis on science was closely linked to an ambition to reform school and society, it should not primarily be interpreted as academically oriented. Rather, it reflected the heavy reliance on psychology and pedagogy present in the Swedish progressivist orientation.

16 SOU 1948:27; SOU 1952:33.

17 SOU 1948:27, 361–75; SOU 1952:33, 3, 22.

18 Berit Askling, *Utbildningsplanering i en lärarutbildning: En studie av läroplansarbete i den decentraliserade högskolan* (Stockholm : Stockholms universitet, 1983), 180–81; Hannu Simola et al., "Changes in Nordic Teaching Practices: From Individualized Teaching to the Teaching of Individuals," in *The Finnish Education Mystery: Historical and Sociological Essays on Schooling in Finland*, ed. Hannu Simola (New York: Routledge, 2015), 178–203.

19 SOU 1948:27, 351-55; SOU 1952:33, 22.

20 SOU 1948:27, 19, 354, 409–15; SOU 1952:33, 19, 22–40.

21 Ibid.

The teacher-training colleges should be large and located in university cities to enable coordination of education and research. The report of 1948 suggested that in cities without universities, some seminars could be transformed into "small" teacher-training colleges, exclusively providing education for folk school teachers.[22] The report of 1952 abandoned this idea in favour of placing all teacher-training in university cities, granting folk-school teachers contact with the academic world.[23] However, the small colleges would later return as an important issue in the debate.

The commission also launched a detailed plan for the first teacher-training college in Stockholm, intended as a blueprint for other colleges to follow. It should provide vocational training for teachers from grade one of comprehensive school up to secondary-school level in pedagogy, psychology, teaching methods, and social issues. Common training would bring different groups of teachers closer to one another. Grammar-school teachers should complete their subject studies at university, after which they spent one year at teacher-training college, while folk school teachers would get all their instruction, including subject studies, at the college. All student teachers would complete a vocationally-oriented aspirant training.

Following the school commission's proposals, Sweden's first teacher-training college opened in 1956 in Stockholm. However, this was not connected to any binding decisions regarding the establishment of more colleges or the future of the seminars. Instead, teacher education changed gradually in the following decade. Three more "large" teacher-training colleges for education of both folk and grammar-school teachers were established in university cities in the early 1960s.[24] However, the seminars and aspirant-year grammar schools were left in place.

After the parliamentary decision in 1962 to implement the comprehensive school reform, the teacher education experts of 1960 (*1960 års lärarutbildningssakkunniga*, LUS) was assigned to investigate the adaptation of teacher education to the comprehensive school system.[25] It was initiated by the Social Democratic government, but consisted of experts and high officials, among them Torsten Husén, professor of pedagogy and a comprehensive school expert. The unions of class and subject teachers were represented by a member each. The only politician was the Social Democrat Stellan Arvidsson, but as a former teacher and headmaster, he was also an expert.

LUS mainly pursued the progressivist aims of the school commission: it wanted to closely align folk and grammar-school teacher education, and highlighted the problems with both the old seminar education and the academic education of grammar-school teachers.[26] LUS also emphasised the importance of education and research in the behavioural sciences, especially pedagogy, and displayed a strong belief in methodological instruction and research as well as experimental schools.[27] According to LUS, the student teachers should adopt a scientific and critical view, but in their own teaching they should remain neutral in matters of politics and religion.[28]

22 SOU 1948:27, 377–415; SOU 1952:33, 1–3, 7–9, 19–20.

23 SOU 1952:33, 236.

24 Marklund (1989), 255-57.

25 SOU 1965:29, 18–30.

26 SOU 1965:29, 16, 189, 192–94, 638, chapters 8 & 9.

27 SOU 1965:29, 95–102, 137–38, 535, 569–70, 583, chapter 24.

28 SOU 1965:29, 89–91, chapter 23.

According to LUS, the student teachers should be willing to re-evaluate and re-structure their work in schools. A reformed teacher education was thus seen as a necessary for the implementation of the comprehensive-school reform.[29] The school commission had declared that schools should no longer simply transmit knowledge and skills, but LUS went even further, stating that the school's *main objective* was to develop pupils' personalities. Traditional class instruction should give way to more individual forms of study that would encourage independence and responsibility.[30] This emphasis on ideology, pedagogy, and methodology meant that LUS had a progressivist orientation but showed comparatively little interest in a core concern of the academic orientation: subject education. Only one out of twelve objectives of teacher education mentioned by LUS was related to subject knowledge.[31]

The main proposal of LUS' final report in 1965 was that the teacher-training colleges should take over all teacher education from seminars and aspirant-year grammar schools, which should be closed. This required two further teacher-training colleges established, like the existing four, in university cities. Thus, the idea of "small" teacher-training colleges, exclusively for class teachers and disconnected from universities, was abandoned.[32] However, LUS considered it better to organise the teacher-training colleges as part of the school system, under the Swedish National Board of Education (*Skolöverstyrelsen*), rather than under the universities, since teacher education shared so much with the school sector.[33] One member, Stellan Arvidsson, objected to this and proposed that the colleges should be organised as part of the university system. According to Arvidsson, this was necessary in order to make teacher education fully academic with a scientific foundation.[34] LUS also suggested that all teacher education should be based upon the matriculation exam, both for folk and grammar-school teachers.[35] Issues regarding the matriculation exam and whether teacher education should be part of the school or university system would later cause heated debate and conflicts.

Finland

As in Sweden, the need for teacher education reform in Finland was linked to the introduction of comprehensive schools. In 1963, the parliament voted in favour of a comprehensive school system, a decision that was implemented in the course of the 1970s. Since Finland moved later than Sweden towards a comprehensive school reform, the need for a renewed teacher education also arose later. Unlike Sweden, the early initiatives for a reform of teacher education came from professors of pedagogy, not from the political sphere.

Professor O.K. Kyöstiö at Jyväskylä College of education considered it a failure that the seminars were kept in place when the education of folk school teachers was

29 SOU 1965:29, 102, 636.

30 SOU 1965:29, 77, 79, 98, 101–3.

31 SOU 1965:29, 101–2.

32 SOU 1965:29, 597–600, 630–32.

33 SOU 1965:29, 489.

34 SOU 1965:29, 653–54.

35 SOU 1965:29, chapter 4, 10, 637.

reformed in 1957.[36] He became the most fervent opponent of the seminars, and formed a committee at the department of pedagogy in Jyväskylä that in 1963 suggested the seminars should be replaced by a three-year academic education. Characteristic of the academic orientation among Finnish professors of pedagogy, the committee placed little emphasis on the content of the education, assuming that academic studies would create a mentality that enabled teachers to follow the constantly changing body of knowledge.[37]

In 1965, students of pedagogy from Jyväskylä and Oulu published an open letter to the Ministry of Education, demanding an extension of teacher education by two years, enabling teachers to graduate with academic degrees. They favoured more studies in pedagogy, psychology, and languages at the expense of practical subjects such as handicrafts, music, and home economics.[38]

From the mid-1960s, the government appointed a series of committees with the purpose of reforming teacher education. The teacher-training committee (1965–1967) consisted of experts, headed by Professor Matti Koskenniemi, who together with his colleagues Kyöstiö and Martti Takala were responsible for the basic outline of the committee's report. The other members of the committee were mainly from the Finnish Board of Education.[39]

Professor Kyöstiö fervently opposed the old teacher ideal, while a representative from the Board of Education, without success, defended the idea of the teacher as a moral role model. Although the committee acknowledged that teachers needed to understand the importance of ethical and aesthetical norms, it claimed that teachers had previously represented middle-class values, and that the teacher's role was no longer to embody certain values, since the plurality of beliefs in society made value consensus impossible.[40]

"Pluralism" had been adopted by the youth organization of the conservative National Coalition party, the main opponent of the leftist student movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The concept came from Karl Dahrendorf's theory about the institutionalization of class conflicts in post-industrial society, which in Finland was used to integrate communists into democratic society. The young conservatives also propagated critical dualism, the separation of values from facts.[41] Finnish committee reports from the late 1960s and early 1970s combines pluralism and critical dualism. Whether or not directly influenced by the young conservatives, this provided the committees with a way forward when old values had lost their appeal and no consensus could be reached about new ones.

According to the teacher-training committee, teaching should not be based solely on opinions and experiences, but also upon research. Teachers should learn to follow

36 Kähkönen (1979), 32.

37 Kähkönen (1979), 45–46, Oiva Kyöstiö, Veli Nurmi, and Annika Takala, "Eräs opettajanvalmistuksen uudistamista koskeva suunitelma," *Kasvatus ja koulu* (1963), 11–23.

38 Kähkönen (1979), 47–48.

39 FCR 1967:B101, 1; Kähkönen (1979), 55.

40 FCR 1967:B101, 14; Kähkönen (1979), 60.

41 Paavo Kärenlampi, *Taistelu kouludemokratiasta: Kouludemokratian aalto Suomessa* (Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1999), 163–64; Pekka Suvanto, *Konservatismi: Ranskan vallankumouksesta 1990-luvulle* (Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1994), 311, 315; Laura Kolbe, *Eliitti, traditio, murros: Helsingin Yliopiston Ylioppilaskunta 1960–1990* (Helsinki: Otava, 1996), 425.

the development of teaching methods.[42] The committee wanted to raise teachers' general level of knowledge, but acknowledged that teachers could no longer be expected to beknowledge banks. Since knowledge ages and changes with time, teachers needed continuous education, and should be allowed to develop personal goals.[43]

In 1960, the committee for the teacher-seminar legislation listed desirable qualities of teachers: ability to guide the personal development of students, pedagogical skills, and subject knowledge. However, in 1968 the curriculum committee for teacher education no longer listed personal development as the first criteria, but instead emphasised knowledge of the needs of society, today and in the future. The 1968 report also recognised the plurality of values in society and did not, as the 1960 report, mention values which should be held in high regard.[44] This reflected a shift away from an orientation of personal development. The mentioning of the needs of society reflects a certain progressivist orientation, but the emphasis on value pluralism counteracted the ideological ambitions of progressivism that were so prominent in Sweden.

The 1968 report claimed that all student teachers needed more knowledge of both pedagogy and the school subjects, with class teachers focusing upon the former and subject teachers upon the latter. In addition, teachers needed scientific training in order to become critically thinking and capable of experimentation. Free scientific thinking would also counteract earlier tendencies to lock student teachers into certain pedagogical practices.[45]

While the discussions about the content of Finnish teacher education were slow and inconclusive, rapid advances were made regarding the structure of the education. In 1964, a group of parliamentarians motioned for a quick renewal of teacher education. They referred to the 1860s, when the education of folk school teachers at Jyväskylä seminar had preceded the opening of the first folk schools.[46]

The Board of Education reacted by arguing that all teacher education should be conducted in teacher-training colleges under its own control: although a university education might be more desirable for the students, teacher-training colleges were better for the schools, since schools and teacher-training should not be distanced from one another.[47]

The teacher-training committee (1965–1967) suggested that all teacher-training should take place in cooperation between universities and colleges of pedagogy, the former providing the students with subject knowledge and the latter pedagogical skills. However, opinions within the committee differed regarding the fate of the old seminars. Kyöstiö wanted to abandon all seminars and concentrate teacher education at the universities, arguing that small teacher-training units far from universities would remain mere seminars. Koskenniemi and Takala were less radical and wanted to preserve two seminars as subsidiaries of colleges of pedagogy. The committee's secretary, Veli Nurmi, claimed that the attitudes of the teachers, not location,

42 FCR 1967:B101, 14.

43 Ibid.

44 FCR 1968:B100 12–13, FCR 1960:7, 7.

45 FCR 1968:B100, 13–15, 19–20.

46 Kähkönen (1979), 49; Valtiopäivät 1964 Liitteet I-XII A, 608–9.

47 Kähkönen (1979), 51.

decided whether seminars became isolated or not. Backed by teachers, the Board of Education suggested a network of institutions covering the country, utilising many existing seminars.[48]

Nurmi, Koskenniemi and Takala were also members of a working group at the Ministry of Education that produced a similar proposal. In August 1968, it was decided that four seminars were to be closed, while the rest were preserved for use in the new teacher education.[49]

Nurmi also chaired the curriculum committee for teacher education, the other members mainly representing practical experience from teaching and teacher education. No professors of pedagogy were present, since it was feared their uncompromising attitudes would obstruct decision-making. However, they continued to criticise the seminars in their role of experts.[50]

In order to expedite the reforms, the committee of comprehensive-school teachers was appointed in November 1968. The closing of the seminars was a sensitive issue for the Minister of Education, Johannes Virolainen (Centre), since it had a negative impact on regional policies. He therefore wanted a thorough investigation by a committee including members of parliament.[51]

In the committee, Koskenniemi argued for a complete renewal, burning the bridges to the old system. The committee report claimed that small teacher-training colleges might remain mere seminars, and that larger units were more effective. It recommended that class and subject teachers should be educated for four years at universities, and teacher-training colleges attached to them, leading to a bachelor degree. Addressing concerns raised by representatives of practical teacher education, the report stated that the instruction must not be too theoretical and that the skills expected of teachers who taught the lower classes had to be taken into consideration.[52]

Six seminars were to be closed and the rest would incorporated into the new organisation. Kyöstiö was appalled that some seminars would be used in the new organisation, while the closures, especially the two in Lapland, prompted heavy criticism in parliament. However, in December 1969 the parliament approved the suggestion.[53] The basic academic structure of the future teacher education was thereby decided, while its content was still open to discussion.

Conclusions

Reformers in Sweden and in Finland shared a vision of a teacher education for the comprehensive school system that would be detached from old values and based on science and new pedagogical practices. In that sense, the planned structural elaborations were similar in the two countries. In Finland, it was believed that these changes would occur automatically if the seminars were closed and teacher education moved

48 FCR 1967:B101, 211–15, Nurmi (1979), 231, Kähkönen (1979), 63.

49 Kähkönen (1979), 63–65.

50 FCR 1968:B100, Opettajankolutuksen opetussuunitelmatoimikunta, NA 540:212:1, Kähkönen (1979), 68.

51 Nurmi (1979), 232; Kähkönen (1979), 72–73.

52 Kähkönen (1979), 74; FCR 1969:108, 76–77.

53 Kähkönen (1979), 76; Valtiopäivät 1969, Pöytäkirja II, 2282–87, 2320–25.

to the universities. Finnish reformers claimed that in a modern pluralistic society, it was impossible to prescribe which methods teachers should use and on what values they should base their education. Instead, the academic environment should train student teachers in thinking independently regarding questions of methods and values.

In Sweden, politicians had an important role in formulating the progressivist visions of teacher education. There was also a greater belief in determining methods and values centrally than was the case in Finland. While the divided political field in Finland necessitated pluralism in values, the dominance of the Social Democrats in Sweden allowed for a vision of teacher education dominated by progressive values and pedagogical practices.

Both Finnish and Swedish reformers propagated a scientific teacher education. However, the Swedish progressivist and centralised interpretation of scientific teacher education allowed for the possibility that research results and best practices could be established centrally and then implemented at all teacher education units, all of which did not need to conduct research themselves. In the Finnish academic orientation, scientific teacher education was equated with education taking place in a university environment. The small differences in the visions of Finnish and Swedish reformers would come to have important consequences for the structure of teacher education.

There were striking similarities between the structure of teacher education proposed by the Finnish and Swedish committees. The network of seminars should be closed down and teacher education should become academic and moved into universities or, in the case of Sweden, to teacher-training colleges. In Finland, the rationale behind this was clearly academically oriented, as university studies were considered to be beneficial per se, regardless of the education's content, which was initially given little consideration. Although the Swedish plans also placed teacher education at institutions of higher learning, the progressivist content of the teacher education took centre stage, and was specified in great detail.

Conflicts

Sweden

Following the school commission's first report in 1948, most voices from folk and grammar schools, from the universities, and the folk-school teacher unions embraced the school commission's ideas.[54] Neither was there much parliamentary debate or opposition to the principles of the new teacher education.[55] Only a few parliamentarians sought to preserve the seminars.[56] This consensus was likely partly due to the vagueness of the bill brought forward by the Social Democratic government, which merely proposed a gradual establishment of teacher-training colleges without binding details.[57]

54 Prop. 1950:219, 79–82.

55 Särskilda utskottets utlåtande nr 4 1950; Protokoll första och andra kammaren, torsdagen den 7 december 1950.

56 Motion 601 andra kammaren 1950; Motion 507 första kammaren 1950; Inlägg av hr Wahlund riksdagsdebatten första kammaren 1950.

57 Prop. 1950:219.

Thus, in 1950 the parliament unanimously decided to establish teacher-training colleges, but without deciding how and when.[58] The earlier decision to form a comprehensive-school system – which was the cause behind teacher education reform – was also a decision-in-principle without timetable or commitments, explaining why the teacher education decision was similarly vague.[59]

In 1952, the school commission's second report, proposing the establishment of the first teacher-training college acting as a model for future colleges, was welcomed by all teacher unions.[60] However, the report received heavy criticism from many seminars and the aspirant-year grammar schools. Given that the report suggested a concentration of all teacher education to colleges in the university cities, dismantling the seminars and aspirant-year grammar schools, it is not surprising that these institutions claimed the proposition was too centralising. The seminars considered the report demeaning towards seminar-based teacher education, and some suggested that the idea of teacher-training colleges should be abandoned in favour of seminar-based instruction.[61]

Despite this criticism, there was little resistance in parliament to the Social Democrat – Agrarian government's bill in 1954 that proposed the establishment of Stockholm teacher-training college in 1956.[62] By not specifying when other colleges would follow, the bill left the main controversy – what to do with the old seminars and aspirant-year schools – unresolved. The lack of precision in the decisions also led to other problems, since it lengthened the reform process.[63]

In 1965, LUS completed its report about the adaptation of teacher education to the new comprehensive-school system. The ensuing conflicts had a decisive effect on the final design of teacher education. Three issues were in focus: the organization of the teacher-training colleges, the requirements for admission to class teacher studies, and the future role of the seminars.

In their referrals regarding LUS' report, different actors displayed conflicting opinions. The universities, the union of grammar school teachers, and the existing teacher-training colleges favoured including the colleges in the university sector in order to strengthen the scientific connection. On the other hand, the National Board of Education (*Skolöverstyrelsen*) and other actors from the school sector supported LUS' suggestion to leave the colleges as part of the school system under the direction of the National Board of Education. The board also opposed LUS' proposal to base all teacher education on the matriculation exam. Instead, it believed that completed vocational school (*fackskola*) would suffice as entry requirement to class teacher studies.[64]

Many actors – primarily the union of grammar school teachers, the student organisation, and the Swedish Higher Education Authority (*Universitets- och hög-*

58 Riksdagens skrivelse 404, 1950; Marklund (1989), 249.

59 Gunnar Richardson, *Svensk utbildningshistoria: Skola och samhälle förr och nu* (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2009), 119–25.

60 Marklund (1989), 254.

61 Prop. 1954:209, 21–25; Marklund (1989), 253–55.

62 Statsutskottets utlåtande nr 189, 1954; Protokoll fk och ak, 8 december 1954; Riksdagens skrivelse 393, 1954.

63 Marklund (1989), 249–45.

64 Prop. 1967:4, 52–61, 149–54.

skoleämbetet) – supported the proposal from LUS of placing all teacher education at the teacher-training colleges, thus closing the seminars and the aspirant-year grammar schools. The seminars pleaded for the continuation of small, local seminars, claiming that teacher-training colleges could become impersonal education factories.[65]

The National Board of Education and some County Boards of Education (*Länsskolnämnder*) also wanted to maintain the seminars temporarily, since they were needed to cover the significant demand for teachers. For the same reason, other institutions wanted a slower dismantling of the seminars than suggested by LUS. Regional interests, county education boards, and County Administrative Boards (*Länsstyrelser*) tried to place the proposed branches of the teacher-training colleges at existing seminars within their regions.[66] The seminars were particularly critical since they faced closure if the reforms were implemented.[67]

The National Board of education, the seminars, and the regional actors formed a strong alliance, and managed to influence the Social Democratic government. For example, delegates from the seminars were lobbying intensively in Stockholm in order to preserve the seminars in their region.[68] The Government's bill in 1967 was clearly in line with these actors' demands, and therefore it did not follow all of LUS' proposals. The admission requirements for class teachers were lowered in the bill, from a complete matriculation exam to vocational school exam. This was supported by the powerful national labour union (*Landsorganisationen*, LO), closely connected to the Social Democratic Party.[69] However, the education for subject teachers still required a matriculation exam. The most important change was the reintroduction of the "small" teacher-training colleges, first suggested by the school commission in 1948. In the bill, most of the existing seminars were transformed into "small" teacher-training colleges for class teachers.[70]

Actors in favour of radical change and a complete closure of the seminar network combined a strong progressivist orientation with ingredients from the academic orientation, stressing the importance of university education based on the matriculation exam. Those in favour of preserving the seminars in the new organisation were maybe more influenced by vested interests than by ideology, but expressed opinions in line with a vocational orientation.

Out of 30 members in the parliamentary committee on education (*Utbildningsutskottet*) that prepared the bill, ten were against the idea to lower the admission requirements for class teachers, arguing that it contradicted the idea of a unified teacher education. They all represented liberal or conservative parties, but lost against the Social Democratic majority that supported the bill.[71]

However, some Social Democrats in the parliament also turned against their party and their Minister of Education, Ragnar Edenman, who had initiated the bill.

65 Prop. 1967:4, 202–15.

66 Ibid.

67 Marklund (1989), 307–9.

68 Ibid.

69 Prop. 1967:4, 52–61, 124–33.

70 Prop. 1967:4, 124–30, 228–37.

71 Statsutskottets utlåtande nr 51 1967, 42–43.

Among them was Stellan Arvidsson, who objected to the preservation of the seminars as small teacher-training colleges and to lowering the admission requirements for class teachers. Arvidsson thought that these proposed measures would undermine the academic qualities in teacher education, especially for class teachers, who would become separated from the subject teachers. Thereby, Arvidsson supported the original ideas of the school commission and the LUS committee, of which he had been a member.[72] Arvidsson's opposition to the party line illustrates the different views on the education of folk-school teachers that existed within the labour movement.[73] Thus, the divisions in parliament cannot be reduced to a conflict between Social Democrats and the centre-right.

However, the development took another course than Arvidsson desired. In 1967, the parliament – where the Social Democrats had a majority – decided to implement a new teacher education, accepting most of the proposals in the bill.[74] This meant that most seminars remained as so-called small teacher-training colleges, that the admission requirements for class teachers were lowered to a vocational school exam, and that the teacher-training colleges remained part of the school system under the control of the National Board of Education.

Finland

Finland also experienced some controversies regarding the structure of teacher education, which had caused so much conflict in Sweden. Still, in Finland the question was settled comparatively early in the reform process through the decision to close the seminars and move teacher education to the universities, codified in the law of teacher education in 1971. The Finnish reform of teacher education and the conflicts between different actors that it caused was relatively free from ideology in the 1960s. However, in the early 1970s, the emergence of influential actors with a progressivist orientation on the educational field caused massive ideological conflicts. The left-wing of the Social Democratic Party, including the young minister for education, Ulf Sundqvist, and the new head of the Board of Education, Erkki Aho, attacked the bourgeoisie hegemony in the schools.

The comprehensive-school reform was permeated by progressivist ideology, intended to create a society of equal opportunities. In Finland it was supported by SKDL (a leftist coalition), the Social Democrats, and the Centre Party. The fiercest opposition to the reform was presented by the conservative National Coalition Party. The comprehensive school reform in Finland coincided with the student movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Progressive politicians tried to shift power within the grammar schools from the conservative teachers to the supposedly more radical pupils by extending school democracy, but the attempt was stopped by two organisations founded in 1973, VKTS and the teacher union *Opetuslan ammattijärjestö*, OAJ.[75]

VKTS (1973–1991) was founded by business leaders and people from the cultural

72 Statsutskottets utlåtande nr 51 1967, 31, 46–48; Motion 860 av Stellan Arvidsson, andra kammaren 1967.

73 Linné (1996), 309.

74 Riksdagens skrivelse 143, 1967.

75 Kärenlampi (1999).

and academic worlds, and soon started to attract politicians from the right and centre. It became a secret weapon in school politics of the business think tank *Elinkeinoelämän valtuutskunta* (EVA), its primary funder. VKTS's supporters were united by concerns about the leftist offensive in the field of education, and the organization attracted many civil servants from the Board of Education and the Ministry of Education. The existence of VKTS did not become public knowledge until 2004.[76]

An arguably even stronger actor in the field of education was the teacher union, OAJ, which was formed through the amalgamation of three smaller unions. According to Hannu Simola, since the 1970s no major decisions have been taken in Finland regarding educational policies without the consent of OAJ.[77] The fact that Finnish politicians tried to implement the comprehensive-school reform with the support of pupils, rather than as in Sweden where folk-school teachers were used as allies against the more conservative grammar-school teachers,[78] eased the formation of a unified teachers' union in Finland.

The rapid polarisation in the field of education also affected teacher education. In 1973, the Ministry of Education appointed a teacher education commission to establish the general objectives of class and subject teacher education and prepare regulations, exams, and curricula.[79] The commission published a preliminary report in 1974 and a final report in 1975.[80]

According to the commission, education should transmit the central content of cultural heritage to students and safeguard its further development. Thus, teachers and teacher educators needed to be able to not only conduct education but define its goals and evaluate it. The teacher should understand society as well as the education system's role within it, and also change society by raising the educational level of the population and promoting educational equality.[81] Thus, school should change society through the standard and equality of education, not through the transmission of values.

The committee also planned for the continued renewal of teacher education. It should take place on three levels: 1) development of the goals of teacher education, 2) strategical planning, and 3) operational planning. The responsibility for strategic planning should be transferred from the central administration to the institutions involved in operational planning.[82] That effectively meant a decentralisation of power from the political level to the institutions providing teacher education.

The committee also stressed that student teachers had to become optimists regarding children's ability to learn.[83] This part of the report was heavily influenced

76 Sakari Suutarinen, "Vapaan koulutuksen tukisäätiö: Koulukasvatuksen, opettajankoulutuksen ja tutkimuksen näkymätön vaikuttaja 1973–1991," *Kasvatus & Aika* 2, no. 2 (2008), 29–30.

77 Hannu Simola, "Educational Science, the State and Teachers: Setting up the Corporate Regulation of Teacher Education in Finland," in *The Finnish Education Mystery: Historical and Sociological Essays on Schooling in Finland*, ed. Hannu Simola (New York: Routledge, 2015), 75–77.

78 Åke Isling, *Kampen för och emot en demokratisk skola, 1: Samhällsstruktur och skolorganisation* (Stockholm: Sober 1980), 357.

79 FCR 1975:75, 3–5.

80 FCR 1975:75, 25–56.

81 FCR 1975:75, 52–54, 63–76.

82 FCR 1975:75, 290–91.

83 FCR 1975:75, 69.

by committee member Yrjö-Paavo Häyrynen, professor of psychology at Joensuu University, who had published a book about educability in 1973.[84] Educability was an essential ideological prerequisite for the comprehensive school.

In the preliminary report of 1974, the committee's most radical members, Yrjö Engeström, Häyrynen, and Kalevi Rantanen, wrote a reservation asking for more precise formulations about the attitudes that this education sought to instil in the pupils. By leaving these formulations vague, the committee was, according to the three radical members, evading its moral responsibility. Instead they should have emphasised peace, friendship between peoples,[85] improvements in the conditions of workers, and democratic rights. In a possible reference to the VKTS, they also warned that international and national right-wing forces and capital owners mobilised in order to stop the democratisation of schools.[86] There was agreement within the committee that national ideology could no longer be the foundation of the Finnish school system. While the radicals wanted to replace it with socialism, the majority supported pluralism, claiming it was no longer possible to reach ideological consensus.

This also explains their view that the organisation of teacher education should be decentralised, with little room for political intervention. Although the commission acknowledged that the general goals of teacher education had to correspond to general societal goals, they suggested that these goals should be objects of research at the new research-based teacher education institutions.[87] Rather than presenting a rigid plan structured by political objectives, the commission outlined a self-renewing teacher education that could develop on its own for decades without interference from the political level.

Pluralism thus functioned as a way to reduce the influence of political – most importantly socialist – ideology, while scientificity helped reduce the direct control of politicians. These developments seemed attractive to many after the turbulent and politicised first half of the 1970s, which contributed in strengthening the academic orientation of teacher education.

The radical suggestions of Engeström, Häyrynen, and Rantanen were not included in the final report. Häyrynen left the committee at the end of 1974, while Engeström and Rantanen did not participate in the spring of 1975 and, remarkably, did not sign the final report.[88] Thus, the report which laid the foundations for Finnish teacher education for decades to come was less influenced by progressivist left-wing ideology than the committee's original composition suggested.

In the spring of 1975, the political tides had already turned against the radicals. On 12 December 1974, in a meeting instigated by VKTS, the teacher union OAJ forced the head of the Board of Education, Erkki Aho, to sign a secret contract that

84 Yrjö-Paavo Häyrynen and Jarkko Hautamäki, *Ihmisen koulutettavuus ja koulutuspolitiikka* (Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, 1973).

85 In Cold War Finland, "Friendship between peoples" signaled support of the official policy of friendship with the Soviet Union.

86 FCR 1974:101, Eriävä mielipide, 2–3.

87 FCR 1975:75, 275, 290–91.

88 FCR 1975:75, x; Kähkönen (1979), 99.

effectively undermined radical school democracy in Finish grammar schools.[89] From this point on, the progressivist offensive on the education system was undermined, and an academically oriented backlash ensued.

Already from its beginnings, VKTS showed significant interest in teacher education. In this area, they cooperated with The Research Foundation of Higher Education and Science Policy (*Korkeakoulu- ja Tiedepoliittinen Tutkimussäätiö*), which, like VKTS, was funded by EVA and other business organizations. Through its extensive networks in academia, administration, and politics, VKTS tried to counteract the radicalisation of teachers by influencing the selection of student teachers and teacher educators as well as the content of teacher education.[90]

The project which implemented the reform of university exams in in the field of teacher education 1979 was called *Kasvatusalan tutkinnonuudistus*, KATU. A project member , Markku Andersson from Jyväskylä, told VKTS that he could influence the reform of teacher education already in the planning phase.[91] VKTS's main concern was that student teachers were exposed to socialist impulses early in their education at the point where they were most easily influenced, for example by educational history described in terms of class struggle.[92] In the KATU-project, Jyväskylä had responsibility for the introductory general studies in the education of comprehensive-school teachers.[93] Thus, Andersson exerted real influence over the very part of the programme that VKTS considered problematic.

Although VKTS certainly intended to influence the school system and teacher education, and it supported the strengthening of its academic orientation that took place, it is difficult to assess to what extent VKTS caused these changes. The mere fact that they managed to mobilise such a vast network across the political and educational fields illustrates that many important actors strongly opposed the policies of the left. These actors would probably have put up resistance without the existence of VKTS, but it is likely that the coordination it provided strengthened the conservative cause.

Since the support for VKTS's agenda was so strong, it might seem strange that the organisation worked in secrecy rather than fought its battles in the open. However, VKTS can only be understood as part of a tradition of Finnish clandestine Cold War anti-communist organisations, some of which had earlier tried to influence the field of education.[94] During the Cold War, Finland's official foreign policy prescribed friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, and the primacy of foreign policy limited what could be said in the public debate. This atmosphere of "Finlandisation" culminated in the early 1970s. The fear that educational reform was part of a communist takeover today seem exaggerated, but were real to some of the founders of VKTS at the time.

89 Kärenlampi (1999), 183; Suutarinen (2008), 30.

90 Suutarinen (2008) 35–36, Jaakko Aho, "Vapaan Koulutuksen Tukisäätiö – Suomalaisen koulutuksen pelastus vai rapautuma?" Suomen Kouluhistoriallisen Seuran yleisöseminaari 10. joulukuuta 2010. Jaakko Ahon alustus, http://www.kasvhistseura.fi/dokumentit/1108211033_jaakko_aho.pdf, 9.

91 Suutarinen (2008), 36.

92 Suutarinen (2008), 37.

93 Vuorenpää (2003), 141.

94 Jarkko Vesikansa, *Salainen sisällissota: Työnantajien ja porvarien taistelu kommunismia vastaan kylmän sodan Suomessa* (Helsinki: Otava, 2004), 284–87.

Conclusions

Although the conflicts regarding teacher education were fought with arguments originating in the progressivist, academic, and to some extent vocational teacher-education orientations, wider societal interests worked in the background. In Sweden, the vested interests of actors benefitting from the new and old systems played a major role, since the main conflict concerned the structure of teacher education, especially the status of the education of class teachers and the future of the seminars. The conflicts were partly political, but not a simple clash between left and right, since they divided the labour movement. An academic wing of the Social Democratic Party wanted to raise the academic standard of class-teacher education, thus closing the seminars, and they were supported by liberals and conservatives. Other forces within the labour movement, such as LO, opposed the academisation of teacher education. Just as important were the non-political actors who wanted to preserve the seminars, above all the seminars themselves but also regional actors. Another powerful actor was the National Board of Education that supported the seminars and opposed academisation.

In Finland, the main conflicts erupted after decisions had been made regarding the structure of teacher education. They were more ideological in nature than in Sweden, and connected to a left-right polarization that permeated Finnish educational policies and Finnish public life in the early 1970s. The conflicts began when young, radical, and progressively-oriented Social Democrats challenged what they perceived as the bourgeois hegemony in the education system. The attack was effectively countered by academically-oriented actors within academia, schools, and administration, supported by the teacher union OAJ and the secret business-funded organisation VKTS. The academic orientation of the latter organisation did not, as Finnish professors of pedagogy, emphasise the virtues of university education, but the value of subject knowledge. From the mid-1970s, a period of de-politicisation followed. Thus, the interactions between important agents in the educational arena unfolded differently in Sweden and Finland, paving the way for divergent outcomes.

Outcomes

Sweden

In 1967, the parliament decided to implement a new education for comprehensive school teachers. Thus, an ordinance for the teacher-training colleges was issued in 1968.[95] With this reform, both "large" and "small" teacher-training colleges were established. The so-called "large" teacher-training colleges educated both primary and secondary school teachers, and had resources for research with a professorship in pedagogy. The large colleges were located close to the universities in order to facilitate academic contacts. In addition to the existing four colleges, two more were opened in 1967–68 in cities where universities were newly established or planned.[96] The "small" teacher-training colleges, which only educated class teachers for primary schools, had no professors and no research resources. Through this reform, nine of the folk-school seminars, situated all over Sweden in towns without universities, were converted into small teacher-training colleges. In fact, no regular

95 SFS 1968: 318, *Kungl Majt: s stadga för lärarhögskolorna, given Stockholms slott den 28 maj 1968*.

96 Marklund (1989), 250; SOU 1978:86, 54; SOU 1965:29, 525–30.

folk-school seminars were closed, but only those educating teachers for grades 1-2 (*småskollärarseminarier*). The teacher-training colleges became part of the school system, under the National Board of Education.[97]

The ordinance of 1968 initially stated that the teacher-training colleges should train and educate teachers on a "scientific basis". The larger teaching-training colleges were to conduct research of importance for schools. Both large and small teacher-training colleges should conduct pedagogic experiments and promote development in the school sector. The colleges should teach pedagogy and pedagogy research methods, and the students should learn to develop teaching methods based on new research. Methodology was also emphasised in the ordinance, as were practical teaching skills.[98]

It was firmly stated again that teachers and teacher students are instruments of change and development in the compulsory-school system, as had been stated earlier by the school commission and the LUS committee. Another reappearing idea was that schools should promote personal development and student teachers should be trained to fulfil this duty. However, the ordinance said little about teacher students' subject knowledge and nothing about knowledge transfer in schools.[99] Thus the reform was dominated by a progressive orientation.

Marklunds and Linné have concluded that the Swedish reform of 1968 was a compromise and partly a failure. Far from the original plans and visions in the school commission, non-academic traditions and practices from seminars continued to dominate the new teacher education, especially in the many small seminars turned teacher-training colleges where former seminar teachers remained in office.[100]

The teacher-training college organisation was altered through the university reform of 1977, which brought most education of a vocational nature into the university system. Teacher education became a full university education, and it was organised as part of the university system under the Swedish Higher Education Authority, instead of the Board of Education. The "large" teacher-training colleges were reorganised as faculties or departments in the universities in each city. The "smaller" teacher-training colleges became important parts of the newly established regional university colleges. In practice, the objectives, content, and design of teacher education did not change significantly as a result of this reform.[101] As before, the subject student teachers completed a bachelor degree and then attended one year of vocational courses and school practice. However, class teachers did not write a thesis equivalent to a bachelor's degree. Although the progressivist orientation of all teacher education was strengthened through the reform, the basic division remained

97 SFS 1968: 318; Prop 1967:4, 124–30, 228–37; Marklund (1989), 250; SOU 1978:86, 54; SOU 1965:29, 525–30

98 SFS 1968: 318.

99 Ibid.

100 Linné (1996), 309; Marklund (1989), 306–9.

101 Erik Blix and Gerhard Arfwedson, eds., *Lärarhögskolan i Stockholm 1956–1996* (Stockholm: HLS, 1996), 74–78; Askling (1983), 3; Torbjörn Carle, Sven Kinnander, and Sven Salin, *Lärarnas riksförbund 1884–2000: Ett stycke svensk skolhistoria ur fackligt perspektiv* (Stockholm: Informationsförl., 2000), 215; Sven G. Hartman, *Det pedagogiska kulturarvet: Traditioner och idéer i svensk undervisningshistoria* (Stockholm: Natur och kultur, 2005) 151–52; Hans Albin Larsson, *Mot bättre vetande: En svensk skolhistoria* (Stockholm: SNS förlag, 2011), 79–78.

between a more academically oriented subject teacher education and a more vocationally oriented class teacher education.

Finland

In contrast to Sweden, Finland did achieve the ambitious goals for structural reform envisioned by the various teacher-education committees, and in fact exceeded them. The 1971 legislation on teacher education caused relatively little debate, since it rested upon familiar principles accepted through the work of several committees.[102] The reform was implemented in 1974 and teacher education was limited to seven units. An eighth unit was founded 1979 in Lapland. The educational programme included practical training in ordinary schools as well as in state-run training schools attached to each teacher education unit. Training school teachers held high standards and were, after seven years of employment, allowed one sabbatical semester for further education.[103] The training schools were less independent than their predecessors, the normal schools.

From 1974, all Finnish teachers studied for four years at university. Class teachers took a bachelor in pedagogy, and subject teachers studied for a bachelor in their main subject. The teacher education commission of 1973 had originally suggested a unified exam in pedagogy for both class and subject teachers, but this suggestion was met with opposition from the subject departments at the universities.[104]

When the bachelor degree was removed from the system of higher education in 1979, teacher education was upgraded to a five year masters' programme, although no committee had suggested a higher level than bachelor.[105] It has been suggested that the education was elevated to masters "by accident" as an unintended consequence of the general reform. However, according to the recollections of Jaakko Numminen, permanent secretary at the Ministry of Education between 1973 and 1994, the elevation of teacher education to masters' level was consciously and actively pursued by officials at his department.[106]

The KATU-project's report was based upon the recommendations by the teacher education commission of 1973, but by reducing the number of specialisation subjects from three to two, leaving room for more studies in each subject, it took a step away from the relatively low emphasis on subject knowledge originally envisioned by the professors of pedagogy in the 1960s and early 1970s.[107] The initially firm academic orientation of the new Finnish teacher education was thus strengthened by changes and adaptations in the late 1970s.

Conclusions

The reforms resulted in significant differences in implemented structural elaboration between the two countries' teacher-education systems, despite similar planned structural elaborations. In Sweden, the school commission and the LUS commission

102 Kähkönen (1979), 88.

103 Kähkönen (1979), 89; Vuorenpää (2003), 93.

104 Vuorenpää (2003), 104.

105 Kähkönen (1979), 100–1, Vuorenpää (2003), 127.

106 Interview with Numminen 14.11.2016.

107 Kähkönen (1979), 100–1.

wanted to bring class and subject teachers closer to one another, but the reform of 1968 did not bridge the gap between the two teacher-training traditions. The establishment of two categories of teacher-training-colleges maintained the old separation between grammar and folk-school teachers and made the education of class teachers less academic than the education of subject teachers. Furthermore, entry requirements were lower for class teachers, of whom no matriculation exam was required. The foundations of the 1968 reform remained unchanged when Swedish teacher education was incorporated into the university system in 1977.

In contrast, in 1974 Finland reformed the teacher education thoroughly by incorporating it entirely into the university system. The seminars were closed or used within the university organisation. Thus, the academic attachment became stronger and more equal for class and subject teachers than it was in Sweden. There was no division between small and large seats of learning, and both class and subject teachers took bachelor degrees. Finland managed better than Sweden in bridging the gap between the two teacher-education traditions. When Finnish teacher education was upgraded to masters' level in 1979, the differences in quality and status compared to Sweden was pronounced.

The basic plans for teacher education reform in both Finland and Sweden mainly stemmed from two orientations: the progressivist idea of creating a teacher education for a school for all children, the comprehensive school, and the academic idea of elevating all teacher education to university level. However, regarding the outcomes, the academic orientation came to be much more prominent in Finland than in Sweden, where it initially barely influenced class-teacher education at all, and where progressivism instead had the upper hand.

From seminar to university

In the mid twentieth century, the Swedish and Finnish systems of teacher education resembled each other closely, and the initial plans for a new teacher education were also similar. However, thereafter the reform processes took different directions in the two countries. This can be understood in the light of Margaret Archers model of educational change (structure–interaction–structural elaboration, but only if we recognise that in a 20th century planned welfare-state, it must be modified in order to differentiate between planned and implemented structural elaboration. Despite similarities in initial structure and planned structural elaboration, the implemented structural elaboration of the Swedish and Finnish systems of teacher education differed significantly. This is explained by the interactions between the involved agents, and the national political circumstances under which these interactions took place.

In Sweden, the pedagogical aims and visions from the school commission and LUS-commission were approved by parliament, but not the basic structural changes of the education that both commissions had considered necessary in order to achieve these visions. Representatives of the seminars and regional actors managed to prevent all teacher education from moving to academic institutions. The postponement of the Swedish decision on the structure of teacher education until the late 1960s also helped preserve the dispersed network of seminars. It coincided with a new government policy of decentralisation, prioritising regional centres at the ex-

pense of big cities, which were believed to have expanded too quickly.[108] This might explain why teacher education was maintained in former seminars transformed into "small" teacher-training colleges, located at regional centres. Regional actors actively lobbied for this solution and successfully managed to persuade the government.

Spatially, the reformed Swedish teacher education was more decentralised than the Finnish, dispersed as it was in small teacher-training colleges all over the country. It was, however, initially under the National Board of Education. The Finnish teacher education was concentrated in universities, but they had an old tradition of relative independence from government and central administration. Thus, the Finnish reforms meant spatial centralisation, but decentralisation of power from central government agencies to the universities. Swedish teacher education took place in a network of smaller institutions where the aims and content of teacher education were centrally regulated. Finnish teacher education took place in the universities that were largely free to conduct education as they pleased, since the reform was based upon the assumption that academic studies per se would have a benevolent influence on teachers' critical skills.

The fact that the structure of Finnish teacher education was decided upon early, and that it stipulated a long education without clearly specifying what it would contain, created space for the later heated debates about the specifics of what student teachers should be studying during their many years in academia. The implementation of the reform took place following the student revolt, which in Finland gravitated towards Soviet communism as it coincided with the period of most intense Finlandisation, and the role of Marxism within teacher education became a pressing issue. While progressivist reformism had a dominant position among professors of pedagogy in Sweden, their Finnish colleagues displayed a wider range of attitudes, some being academically oriented while others became outright revolutionaries in the polarised political climate of the early 1970s.

The political turbulence in the early 1970s might also have contributed to the fact that the members of the teacher education commission of 1973 envisioned a teacher education with significant autonomy for the teacher education units: they were even going to conduct research about the goals of teacher education, thereby leaving little room for politicians to influence its development. This is undoubtedly an important explanation for why the Finnish teacher education system of 1974 has survived for so long without major reforms.

Another reason is that most stake-holders are generally satisfied with the system. For the teacher union, it ensured a high status for their profession. The progressivists on the political left and in the Centre Party achieved the aim of ensuring that all pupils in Finland receive equal instruction by well-educated teachers, regardless of their regional, domestic, or social background. Academically-oriented actors, stressing the importance of subject knowledge, have appreciated the maintenance of academic standards in teacher education. The Finnish professors of pedagogy did not achieve the total annihilation of the old seminars that they envisioned, but in comparison with Sweden much less of the seminar institutions survived into the new system. The importance of pedagogy in teacher education also increased compared to the old system, especially for subject teacher who now wrote a masters' thesis in

108 Bo Malmberg, *Befolkningsutveckling och välfärd*, rapport 8 (Stockholm: Fritzes, 2000), 59–62.

pedagogy, but also for subject teachers. The fact that Finnish teacher education became a five-year masters' degree programme is probably an important prerequisite for the general feeling of contentment. Since there was more space on the curriculum than any committee had envisioned, it was easier to accommodate all competing wishes of what should be included in the new education. In contrast, the Swedish step towards an academic teacher education in the 1970s was not entirely satisfactory to anyone and became a compromise. The only winners were the seminars that managed to survive the threat of being closed.

Some actors have criticised Finnish teacher education, especially in the 1990s, but the alliance of strong actors in support of the system, first among them the influential, unified teacher union OAJ, has ensured that its basic structure has remained unchanged since the 1970s. In Sweden, many actors have had an interest in changing teacher education, and each new reform (1988, 1992, 2001, 2011) has been the result of an alliance of interests between the politicians in power and one or more actors in the educational field, leaving other actors in the educational arena dissatisfied.

References

Abbreviations

SOU Statens offentliga utredningar.
SFS Statens författningssamling.
FCR Finnish committee reports.

Finnish national archives

Opettajankolutuksen opetussuunitelmatoimikunta, FNA 540:212:1.

Finnish official print

FCR 1960:7. *Seminarilainsäädännön uudistamiskomitean mietintö: Kansakouluseminaarin opetussuunitelmat*.
FCR 1967:B101. *Lärarutbildningskommissionens betänkande* (= 1967 A2).
FCR 1968:B100. *Betänkande avgivet av lärarutbildningens läroplanskommission*.
FCR 1969:108. *Grundskollärarkommitténs betänkande*.
FCR 1974:101. *Vuoden 1973 opettajankoulutustoimikunnan välimietintö*.
FCR 1975:75. *Betänkande av 1973 års lärarutbildningskommission*.
Valtiopäivät 1957, Pöytäkirjat III. Helsinki 1958.
Valtiopäivät 1964, Liitteet I-XII A. Helsinki 1964.
Valtiopäivät 1969, Pöytäkirja II.

Swedish official print

Motion 507 Första kammaren 1950. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll höstsessionen 1950, 3 saml, C 17.
Motion 601 Andra kammaren 1950. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1950, 4 saml, C19.
Motion 860 Andra kammaren 1967. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1967, 4 saml, C19.
Proposition 1950:219. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1950, 1 saml, C12.
Proposition 1954:209. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1954, 1 saml, C 17.
Proposition 1967:4. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll, 1 saml, C5.
Riksdagens protokoll 1950, höstsessionen första kammaren den 7 december, A.
Riksdagens protokoll 1950, höstsessionen andra kammaren den 7 december, B.
Riksdagens protokoll 1954, höstsessionen, första kammaren den 8 december, A.
Riksdagens protokoll 1954, höstsessionen, andra kammaren den 8 december, B.
Riksdagens skrivelse 404, 1950. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1950, höstsessionen 5 – 11 saml, C 2.
Riksdagens skrivelse 393, 1954. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1954, höstsessionen 5, 10, 13 saml, C 2.
Riksdagens skrivelse 143, 1967. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1967, 11-13 saml, C 28.
SFS 1968: 318. *Kungl Majt: s stadga för lärarhögskolorna, given Stockholms slott den 28 maj 1968*.
SOU1948:27. *1946 års skolkommissions betänkande med förslag till riktlinjer för det svenska skolväsendets utveckling*.
SOU 1952:33. *Den första lärarhögskolan*.
SOU 1965:29. *1960 års lärarutbildningssakkunniga*.

SOU 1978:86. *Lärare för skola i utveckling*.
SOU 2008:109. *En hållbar lärarutbildning*.
Särskilda utskottets utlåtande nr 4 1950. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1950, höstsessionen, 5, 11, 14 saml, C 2.
Statsutskottets utlåtande nr 189 1954. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1954, 5-10, 13 saml, C 2.
Statsutskottets utlåtande nr 51, 1967. Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1967, C 21.

Interviews

Numminen, Jaakko, 14.11.2016.

Other references

Acker, Sandra and Gaby Weiner, eds. Theme: Traditions and Transitions in Teacher Education, *Tidskrift för lärarutbildning och forskning, Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, no. 3–4 (2003).
Adamson, Bob and Paul Morris. "Comparing Curricula." In *Comparative Education Research: Approaches and Methods* 19, edited by Mark Bray, Bob Adamson, and Mark Mason. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong, 2007.
Aho, Jaakko. "Vapaan Koulutuksen Tukisäätiö – Suomalaisen koulutuksen pelastus vai rapautuma?" Suomen Kouluhistoriallisen Seuran yleisöseminaari 10. joulukuuta 2010. Jaakko Ahon alustus. http://www.kasvhistseura.fi/dokumentit/1108211033_jaakko_aho.pdf (Accessed September 4, 2014).
Andersson Catharina. *Läras för skolan eller skolas att lära: Tankemodeller i lärarutbildning*. Uppsala: Diss. Uppsala universitet, 1995.
Archer, Margaret S. *Social Origins of Educational Systems: University Edition*. London: Sage, 1984.
Askling, Berit. *Utbildningsplanering i en lärarutbildning: En studie av läroplansarbete i den decentraliserade högskolan*. Stockholm : Stockholms universitet, 1983.
Bertilsson, Emil, "Lärarutbildning." In *Utbildningshistoria: En introduktion*, 2nd ed., edited by Esbjörn Larsson and Johannes Westberg. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2015.
Blix, Erik and Gerhard Arfwedson, eds. *Lärarhögskolan i Stockholm 1956–1996*. Stockholm: HLS, 1996.
Blömeke, Sigrid and Lynn Payne. "Getting the Fish Out of the Water: Considering Benefits and Problems of Doing Research on Teacher Education at an International Level." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, no. 8, (2008).
Carle, Torbjörn, Sven Kinnander, and Sven Salin. *Lärarnas riksförbund 1884–2000: Ett stycke svensk skolhistoria ur fackligt perspektiv*. Stockholm: Informationsförlaget, 2000.
Carlgren, Ingrid. *På väg mot en enhetlig lärarutbildning?: En studie av lärarutbildares föreställningar i ett reformskede*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1992.
Doyle, W. "Themes in Teacher Education Research." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by W. Robert Houston, Martin Haberman, and John Sikula, 3–24. New York: Macmillan, 1990.
Erixon Arreman, Inger. *Att rubba föreställningar och bryta traditioner: Forskningsutveckling, makt och förändring i svensk lärarutbildning*. Umeå: Umeå universitet, 2005.

Feiman-Nemser, Sharon. "Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by W. Robert Houston, Martin Haberman, and John Sikula, 212–19. New York: Macmillan, 1990.

Hartman, Sven G. D*et pedagogiska kulturarvet: Traditioner och idéer i svensk undervisningshistoria*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur, 2005.

Häyrynen, Yrjö-Paavo and Jarkko Hautamäki. *Ihmisen koulutettavuus ja koulutuspolitiikka*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, 1973.

Isling, Åke. *Kampen för och emot en demokratisk skola, 1: Samhällsstruktur och skolorganisation*. Stockholm: Sober, 1980.

Kolbe, Laura. *Eliitti, traditio, murros: Helsingin Yliopiston Ylioppilaskunta 1960–1990*. Helsinki: Otava, 1996.

Kyöstiö, Oiva, Veli Nurmi and Annika Takala. "Eräs opettajanvalmistuksen uudistamista koskeva suunitelma." *Kasvatus ja koulu* (1963), 11–23.

Kähkönen, Esko I. *Opettajankoulutus Suomen koulunuudistuksessa v. 1958–1978: Yleissivistävän koulun opettajien koulutuksen järjestelyt ja tavoitteet*. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto, 1979.

Kärenlampi, Paavo. *Taistelu kouludemokratiasta: Kouludemokratian aalto Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1999.

Larsson, Hans Albin. *Mot bättre vetande: En svensk skolhistoria*. Stockholm: SNS förlag, 2011.

Leskinen, Jari. *Tulevaisuuden turvaksi: Sotavahinkoyhdistyksen ja irtaimiston sotavahinkoyhdistyksen sotavahinkovakuutustoiminta 1939–1954, Sotavahinkoyhdistyksen säätiö ja sotavahinkosäätiö 1954–2004*. Jyväskylä: Sotavahinkosäätiö, 2004.

Leskinen, Jari. *Kohti sosialismia! Pirkkalan peruskoulun marxilainen kokeilu 1973–1975*. Helsinki: Siltala, 2016.

Linné, Agneta. *Moralen, barnet eller vetenskapen: En studie av tradition och förändring i lärarutbildningen*. Stockholm: HLS, 1996.

Malmberg, Bo. *Befolkningsutveckling och välfärd*, rapport 8. Stockholm: Fritzes, 2000.

Marklund, Sixten. *Skolsverige 1950–1975, 6: Rullande reform*. Stockholm: Liber, 1989.

Morris, Paul and John Williamson, eds. *Teacher Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: A Comparative Study*. New York: Falmer Press, 2000.

Nurmi, Veli. *Opettajankoulutuksen tähänastinen kehitys*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1979.

Rennert-Ariev, Peter. *Interrogating Coherence in Preservice Teacher Education: A Case Study*. College Park: University of Marryland, 2002.

Richardson, Gunnar. *Svensk utbildningshistoria: Skola och samhälle förr och nu*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2009.

Sander, Theodor, Friedrich Buchberger, Anthony E. Greaves and Daniel Kallós, eds. *Teacher Education in Europe: Evaluation and Perspectives*. Osnabrück: SIGMA, 1996.

Simola, Hannu. "The Finnish Miracle of Pisa: Historical and Sociological Remarks on Teaching and Teacher Education." *Comparative Education* 41, no. 4, 2005.

Simola, Hannu. "Pedagogy, the State and Teachers: Setting up the Corporate Regulation of Teacher Education in Finland." In *The Finnish Education Mystery: Historical and Sociological Essays on Schooling in Finland*, edited by Hannu Simola, 69–94. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Simola, Hannu, Ingrid Carlgren, Kirsti Klette, Sigurjon Myrdal, and Karsten Schnack. "Changes in Nordic Teaching Practices: From Individualized Teaching to the Teaching of Tndividuals." In *The Finnish Education Mystery: Historical and Sociological Essays on Schooling in Finland*, edited by Hannu Simola, 178–203. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Skog-Östlin, Kerstin. *Pedagogisk kontroll och auktoritet*. Mamö: Gleerups, 1984.

Stephens, Paul, Finn Egil Tønnessen, and Chris Kyriacou. "Teacher-Training and Teacher Education in England and Norway: A Comparative Study of Policy Goals." *Comparative Education* 40, no. 1 (2004), 109–30.

Suutarinen, Sakari. "Vapaan koulutuksen tukisäätiö. Koulukasvatuksen, opettajankoulutuksen ja tutkimuksen näkymätön vaikuttaja 1973–1991." *Kasvatus & Aika* 2, no, 2 (2008), 29–52.

Suvanto, Pekka. *Konservatismi: Ranskan vallankumouksesta 1990-luvulle*. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1994.

Säntti, Janne, Jukka Rantala, Jari Salminen, and Petteri Hansen. "Bowing to Science: Finnish Teacher Education Turns its Back on Practical Schoolwork." *Educational Practice and Theory* 36, no. 1 (2014), 21–41.

Tema Nord 2009:505. *Komparativt studium af de nordiske læreruddannelser*. København: Nordisk ministerråd, 2009.

Vuorenpää, Joukko. *Yliopistollisen opettajankoulutuksen kehittyminen Suomessa 1970-luvulta 2000-luvulle*. Turku: Turku University, 2003.

Zeichner, Kenneth M. "Traditions of Practice in U.S. Preservice Teacher Education Programs." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 9, no. 1 (1993).

Vesikansa, Jarkko. *Salainen sisällissota: Työnantajien ja porvarien taistelu kommunismia vastaan kylmän sodan Suomessa*. Helsinki: Otava, 2004.