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Abstract

Certain common elements can be identified regarding teacher education development in advanced knowledge-based economies. One of these is the attempt, up until relatively recently, to develop a solid foundation of scientific professional knowledge for what Basil Bernstein called the teacher education Trivium: roughly speaking, pedagogical sciences: approximately the psychology, sociology and philosophy of education. Another more recent development is to reverse this trend through a returning emphasis on academic subjects. The present article is based on an analysis of this policy trajectory in Sweden.
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Introduction

Professional groups play a key role in the development of new knowledge and form an intermediary in a triangle of relations between science, professions and citizen-consumers in wider society (Brante, 2010). Three questions can be posed in relation to this triangle. Brante (2010) expresses them roughly as follows:

(i) What is the relationship between the profession(s) and scientific knowledge?
(ii) What characterises how professions organise their various practices?
(iii) What characterises different professions as bearers of tradition and innovation?

The present article relates to the first question and, as such, therefore to the relationship between scientific know-why and professional know-how (Brante, 2010). In Sweden this relationship is usually attended to in higher education, based on the recognition in the Swedish Higher Education Act of 1977 that the scientific study of professions should be a university activity as should the communication of this knowledge. This principle is also recognised by the British sociologist of education Basil
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Bernstein (1990, 2000). Bernstein described this form of knowledge as the defining component of a Regional Mode of knowledge. It is formed when vertical scientific discourses, concepts and methods meet practical activities and their connotative and more horizontal forms of communication (Beach, 2005). Bernstein regards medical science as the classic example of this.

The present article looks at teacher education policy developments with respect to this kind of content knowledge over the past 60 years with a particular focus on the concept of education science in Swedish teacher education. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon countries, the education science subject has only been present during the last decade or so.

The concept of education science in Sweden

_Education science_ is a double term that refers firstly to systematic efforts to develop an individual’s or group’s knowledge or skills (education) and then to systematic knowledge about this process (science). It is thus systematically developed (scientific) knowledge about systematic attempts to teach or develop the skills and knowledge of individuals or groups. In simpler terms, it is a science of teaching, learning and their outcomes and this is how the education science subject is often projected nationally and internationally (SOU 1999: 63, SOU 2008: 105).

The need for such knowledge has long been expressed in many countries, including Sweden. But the education science subject can still seem unnecessary there from several angles. First, as presented above, it shares the definition of a prior university subject (pedagogy/in Swedish “pedagogik”). This subject was established in the 1700s at the University of Halle in Germany and has been part of Social Science Faculties in Sweden for almost a century. It has a disciplinary culture and a scientific syntax and grammar, albeit a somewhat weakly classified and framed one. This is in contrast with education science, which as a subject in Sweden has no established faculty traditions or disciplinary identity.

The emergence of education science as a university subject: LUK 97

The teacher education inquiry committee called LUK 97 and the publication of its recommendations in SOU 1999:63 is often regarded as founding education science as a university subject in Sweden. However, this is not really the case, firstly, because the committee was actually trying to stake claims for founding a formal research area rather than a new subject and, secondly, because the idea of an education science for teacher education was actually born much earlier, in a series of teacher education inquiries from the 1946 National School Commission’s Teacher’s College Delegation (“Lärarhögskoledelegationen”) onwards.

LUK was appointed by the government in the wake of a series of quite far-reaching reforms in the school sector in Sweden. These reforms included: decentralisation and curriculum reforms; the introduction of new forms of governance and criterion-
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referred national grading; the independent schools act; the inclusion of pre-school and school-day care in the education system and the development of curricula for these sectors; and the introduction of quality auditing and school inspectorate services. These were each and collectively believed to place new requirements on teacher competence and teacher education (Fransson & Lundgren, 2003), and it became LUK’s responsibility to outline the objectives and principles for this education and to make suggestions about its content and scope.

The LUK members concentrated some energy on changes in the funding procedures for academic research in the country, which they expressed needed to more surely than before guarantee teacher training institutions access to scientific research support. They recommended the establishment of a new research area (education science) to these ends and as a means to provide direction and scope to research needs (Askling, 2006). These were aims that even previous Commissions had suggested should be attended to, but within existing faculty and subject structures. However, according to LUK the measures introduced had been unsuccessful and the committee strongly criticised previous pedagogical research within the universities for this. Referring in particular to Gran’s (1995) work, LUK indicated that, although pedagogical research had dominated research for teaching and teacher education for many years, it had not developed a research base that served teachers’ needs or produced sufficient PhDs to fill lecturer posts in teacher education (Fransson & Lundgren, 2003). Both of these things had been the intentions of the Higher Education Reform Act in 1977, when teacher education formally became part of the higher education sector (Ds 1996:16). LUK’s critique was also taken up in the subsequent Government Bill 1999/2000:122 for renewed teacher education. However, the government did not endorse LUK’s proposal to set up a new research area (Fransson & Lundgren, 2003; Askling, 2006). Instead, it created a special education science committee (Utbildningsvetenskaplig kommitté: UVK) within a new organisation for research funding called Vetenskapsrådet (the Swedish Research Council: VR). This suggestion was concretised in a White Paper a year later (Government proposition 2000/01: 3) in which the government wrote about the importance of educational science in a knowledge society. It gave the Educational Science Committee (UVK) the task to promote the development of educational research and research training in close proximity to teacher education and directly relevant to teachers’ professional needs.

From TCD 60 to LUT 74: Pedagogy as a scientific base for teacher education

In addition to LUK 97, four other teacher education inquiries have been commissioned in Sweden in the post-war period. These are the 1946 School Commission Teacher College Delegation, the 1960 Teacher Education Expert Committee, the 1974 Teacher Education Investigation (LUT 74) and, most recently, HUT 2007 on Sustainable Teacher Education (SOU 2008:105). All of these investigations made
extensive statements about a scientific knowledge base for teaching and teacher education. The earlier ones did this in relation to existing faculties and subjects. The latter wanted to establish a “new” research area which subsequently became a subject (LUK) – education science – and then change the content of the subject and shift the research base of teacher education back towards academic subjects and a kind of subject didactics (HUT).

The Teacher College Delegation

The Teacher College Delegation (TCD) was established under the National School Commission in 1946. Among its recommendations were proposals for a common scientific knowledge base for all teachers, to improve common understandings of the purpose of schooling and co-operation between different teacher categories and to provide a foundation for the implementation of school development projects in the context of the ongoing educational reforms related to the realisation of society’s latent pool of ability. According to the TCD, this required new dimensions in teacher education and teacher competence through deeper studies in pedagogy and psychology for a more progressive school. The argument was that teachers needed to be more familiar with the contribution these disciplines could make, and that this had not been attained previously.

As part of this, another recommendation was to bring research closer to teacher education delivery by establishing professorships in teacher training institutions to develop more applied research. The School Commission wrote that this research would mainly be focused on scientific investigations of general pedagogical questions. However, as with Gran’s evaluation 30 years later (Gran, 1995), what was also pointed to were better conditions for a full scientific study of teaching method as potentially extremely valuable for many teachers. The value of this new education was described in terms of developing insight into modern scientific pedagogy and psychology so teachers could distinguish between those principles and practices that have gained wide acceptance and those that are still experimental or merely passing fancies: i.e. there was an intention to develop analytical skills. Such knowledge was described as crucial to the design of future teacher education.

The 1960 Teacher Education Expert Committee

The 1960 Teacher Education Expert Committee (TEEC 60) submitted its recommendations for teacher education in 1965 (SOU 1965:29) and, like the TCD, it critiqued pedagogy’s value for the scientific knowledge base of teacher education as potentially too abstract toward and far-removed from teaching as praxis (Beach, 1995). However, this criticism was clearly tempered since it was also argued that the criticism that says that pedagogy is too theoretical had missed the heart of the problem. The TEEC report said that the subject must be theoretical but must also rest on empirical foundations that give the methodological elements meaning. The TEEC stressed...
that it was impossible to distinguish where pedagogy ends and where methodology begins and that method in the absence of a theoretical pedagogical backbone does not provide a rational whole.

This argument formed a basis for the direction that the TEEC believed the scientific knowledge foundation of teacher education should be taking. In support, the TEEC wrote that pedagogy can be defined as the science of how to teach but should not be narrowly limited to teacher behaviour only and that research on teaching can branch into many fields, particularly psychology and sociology, but that the key fields are the teaching process and its objectives, conditions and results. Two approaches to pedagogical research were outlined later in the TEEC report. As with the TCD recommendations, one of these was for general pedagogical research and one for research related directly to teaching methods.

**LUT 74: Teachers for a school in transition**

Nine years after the TEEC a new commission was appointed, LUT 74 (SOU 1978:86), to re-examine teacher education objectives, structure and content for a school in transition (Askling, 2006). The commission's recommendations were published in November 1978 and formed the basis of Proposition 1984/85: 122 for a teacher education for the comprehensive school (Beach, 1995). In the recommendations LUT wrote extensively on research in and for teaching and teacher education (Beach 1995) and stated that, although one view of the function of research in society is that it must be highly specialised and oriented toward technological and economic progress and that schools should teach research-based-knowledge of this kind, another position is that research is also a natural part of professional activities like teaching and has a value beyond the above benefits. On these grounds the LUT commissioners recommended that training in systematic analysis and in developing constructive criticism of prevailing societal and professional conditions should become part of teacher education (Beach 1995, 2000; Fransson & Lundgren, 2003; Eriksson, 2009).

Here the idea of the teacher as a researcher and of teachers as critically reflective socially and politically conscious agents emerges even more strongly than in the recommendations of the TEEC, and LUT wrote about stimulating a meaningful research-career-connection and added that this is valuable in that much of the work carried out in professional activities also has a research character in terms of the systematic recording, monitoring and analysis of observations. LUT 74 expressed the idea that all teacher education should lead to possibilities for studying a research degree. Again, two different orientations were described: one for general pedagogical studies and one in subject pedagogy and methods. Entry requirements were set at the 60 credit level (90 ECTS credits) in pedagogy (approximately 18 months of full-time study) obtained through initial teacher education and in-service courses. As with previous committees, LUT 74 spoke of these developments within the existing disciplinary structures of academia.
HUT 07: A forward or backward step?

Some common features can be identified in terms of teacher development in relation to the policy texts that have been discussed so far. Yet these traits are not only a national phenomenon. They can also be recognised from a number of other countries that have a high level of dependence on knowledge production and communication for economic stability. They have been mentioned earlier and are based on the recognition that facts and principles derived from systematic theoretical and empirical disciplinary investigation and analysis (scientific knowledge) of formal education and the role of teacher education are essential for good professional development and the smooth running and effectiveness of schools. This was already expressed in TEEC 60 and also reaffirmed subsequently in the recommendations from LUT 74 and even LUK 97, albeit with different emphases there.

Among others, these ideas have been described internationally by Bernstein (1990, 2000), Apple (2001), Darling-Hammond (2006), Gore et al. (2004) and Zeichner (2010) and are also reflected in the aforementioned evaluation by Bertil Gran (1995), as well as the European Commission’s 2010 recommendations for initial teacher education. They concern teachers as institutional communicators who can conduct research, develop new knowledge and take an active role in school development (European Commission 2010) in collaboration with colleagues, parents and others (Sjöberg, 2011). However, it is possible that recent developments may have turned against this mission (Ahlström, 2008; Sjöberg, 2011; Kallós, 2009) they entail a shift in the scientific part of the professional knowledge base for teachers from this kind of “agentic” knowledge (Apple, 2001; Zeichner, 2010) back toward an emphasis on academic subjects, i.e. frozen knowledge and technical skills related to how to choose and effectively communicate this knowledge to students. In other words, the research-based knowledge foundation has shifted (back) toward subjects and a kind of subject didactics. As HUT states (SOU 2008:105 p. 375):

In its simplest terms teacher education is seen as consisting of two parts: first knowledge in the subjects ... and second knowledge on how teaching is shaped in relation to pupil learning... These two parts have different research conditions. School subjects are not abridged copies of scientific disciplines (but) should be built on this scientific knowledge... This has implications for how teacher training should be designed.

Here we see a noticeable shift of the scientific knowledge base in teacher education from knowledge about research and perspectives in relation to teaching and learning (from the TCD, the TEEC and LUT), to one that primarily stresses the value of research products (science-based content) in relation to school subjects on the one hand, and research-based teacher behaviour in relation to pupils’ subject learning on the other. A little later in the HUT recommendations (p. 376) this shift and what it means for how teacher training should be designed is made even more visible:
One can see teacher education as containing four elements. Besides the above, teachers need to have knowledge of how a given subject affects the conditions for learning ... and knowledge of the social and administrative nature of teaching, i.e. they need to be able to manage conflicts, assessment demands, evaluation and so forth. Teaching requires both knowledge of the subject, knowledge in education science and in these different interdisciplinary areas.

At first glance, it might seem as though HUT broadens the scientific knowledge base of teacher education by also including scientific knowledge about teaching and learning specific subject knowledge (Ahlström, 2008). This is to a degree also the case. However, as teacher education has not been generally lengthened, this happens at the expense of other content areas and particularly that of political, sociological and philosophical knowledge about teaching and learning. It is competence-oriented knowledge that is emphasised concerning teacher behaviour and a functionary knowledge base as opposed to critical thinking (Sjöberg 2011). Ball et al. (1994), Apple (2001), Zeichner (2010) and Garm and Karlsen (2004) have recently pointed to similar developments in the UK, the USA and Norway. They argue that scientific content about education as a political and sociological object of knowledge has been removed perhaps just at a time when other changes in the educational landscape may also make such knowledge more valuable and necessary than ever before (Zeichner 2010).

**Using Bernstein’s analysis of pedagogical discourses to understand developments**

Bernstein’s (1990, 2000) discussions of teacher education and teacher education pedagogic discourse can be a useful tool for analysing the “developments” described above. Bernstein distinguishes between two fundamentally different forms of discourse in relation to university content that reflect a dichotomy between academic and everyday knowledge (Beach, 2005; Eriksson, 2009). The first discourse is a horizontal discourse. It is embedded in everyday language and expresses common-sense knowledge related to practical goals (Beach, 2005). It is also often oral and context-bound according to Bernstein, who also suggested that this “generic” form of knowledge has been gaining ground in recent years.

The second form of discourse is called a vertical discourse. It develops in specialised fields (such as academic disciplines) to form a hierarchically organised conceptual structure with a robust grammar and specialised syntax that is expressed through a very esoteric language (Bernstein, 2000, pp. 170-171). This is characteristic of the regional form of knowledge that has been presented as aimed for previously in relation to the professional knowledge base of teacher education, as well as for the academic mode. According to Bernstein, it is represented in subjects like physics, mathematics and history on one hand (academic mode) and medicine and law (regional mode) on the other. Schools and universities select content from these subjects and areas according to Bernstein (2000) and act as *arenas of re-contextualisation* of the knowledge
produced there, with a significant degree of autonomy from economic production and the political superstructure (Brante, 2010).

The differences between horizontal and vertical discourses are important (Bernstein, 1999). Horizontal discourse is based on and expresses knowledge that is usually bound to a specific practical context and its associated everyday actions. Such a discourse is less formal and generally lacks a meta-professional hierarchy based on socially (academically) proven and qualified expertise in a meta-profession (Brante 2010). This is not insignificant at the present time when the teacher is being increasingly exposed to influences from governments and other organisations outside the academic world (Beach, 2008). Horizontal (tacit) knowledge is not created primarily through scientific analysis and is not anchored within specialised communication with a specialised syntax and grammar. It therefore lacks autonomy in respect of social relations outside of academia and is often shaped in practical (even economic) relationships. The knowledge that is developed in one context can therefore often bear very little relationship to what is acquired in another (Bernstein, 1999, p. 160). [1]

A horizontal discourse on its own gives a very poor basis for developing reflective professional practice for the above reasons. A vertical discourse is also needed, in the form of a robust system of concepts (Brante, 2010) that can be used by teachers and student teachers to help them describe, model and theorise from empirical situations less shackled by social and political steering and constraint, in a way that helps them to understand and speak collectively about what good education is and how it might be affected by proposed and ongoing political, ideological and economic changes (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Eriksson, 2009). According to Apple (2001, p.195), such knowledge is important for determining whether students in and after teacher-training will be able to understand the ideological and political restructuring that is going on around them and deconstruct the forces involved, in terms of their impact on working conditions and the content and meaning of professional labour (Beach, 2005, 2008). It provides, in other words, a tool of the kind highlighted in TEEC 60 and LUT 74 for analysing trends and thinking critically and strategically in order to better serve pupils in school (Apple, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner, 2010).

Bernstein (1999) describes a structure of specialist language with specialised criteria for the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge as an example of this kind of knowledge. And it was this kind of knowledge that was aimed for and described between 1946 and 1999 and suggested in the evaluation of teacher education by Bertil Gran, with the notion of scientific knowledge for the teaching profession in Sweden. However, similar developments can also be seen in several other European countries such as England and Wales, Scotland, Norway, Finland, Spain and Greece (Mentor et al., 2004; Goodson, 2008). Unfortunately, like Garm and Karlsen (2004) and the recent political developments in Sweden and other countries suggest (Fur-long 2006, Kallós 2009, Sjöberg 2011), teacher education now seems to be heading towards a narrower focus on measurable skills and puts less emphasis on sociological,
philosophical, political and ideological issues (Zeichner, 2010). This is quite clear with respect to HUT. Technical professional knowledge and skills, together with a focus on results and external control, is becoming increasingly dominant.

**Discussion: Turning the clock backwards?**

As well as horizontal and vertical knowledge discourses, Bernstein (1990) also discussed other content transformations in teacher education, which he saw as structurally homologous with the knowledge organisation in medieval universities. He used the terms teacher education *Trivium* and *Quadrivium* with respect to this organisation to show a shift between the two different historical components. These were on one hand a general component similar to that highlighted by Gran (1995) and the 1946 School Commissioners, TEEC 60 and LUT 74 as general pedagogical knowledge. This component is related to internal control and the development of thinking skills and attitudes toward teaching and learning processes and their outcomes. The second component (Quadrivium) is related to the “external” independent subjects or disciplines that students will be expected to teach in schools as teachers. Bernstein believes the organisation and communication of content, forms of communication, the relative distributions and relations between these areas have varied over time (1990, p. 158).

Five stages are identified. These are stages where:

1. The same lecturer covered both the Trivium and the Quadrivium.
2. Lecturers were specialised in one side or the other of this dislocation.
3. Education studies became specialised in e.g. the philosophy, sociology, psychology and history of education.
4. A new body of re-contextualised knowledge emerged between the discourses of education studies and school subjects that was, Bernstein (1990) suggested, in part “technical in focus and probably in aspiration” (p. 158): curriculum theory (Anglo-Saxon systems) or didactics. This subject became increasingly technical in terms of its relationship to school subjects.
4. The specialised disciplines of educational studies become weakened as “political, cultural and academic sites” (p. 161) in a manner that left psychology as the only remaining education specialisation. This specialisation is taught in combination with subject knowledge, curriculum studies or didactics and a professional training dimension through apprenticeship-like-learning in schools.

All these stages are represented in the recommendations and propositions I have discussed. But stage five is dominant in HUT (SOU 2008: 105). This is clear not least in the form of descriptions of the common core of scientific knowledge at the heart of teacher education and the relationship between this core and the subject theory and subject didactics specialisations. Recommendations for the size of the common core
have fallen dramatically compared to this content and is also arranged horizontally over
no less than eight different thematic and 18 sub-thematic areas, which can all be traced
back to initiatives and interests outside of disciplinary subcultures. On page 17 of SOU
2008:105, the “common education science core” is described as follows:

The commission’s understanding is that certain components of knowledge and skills are
essential for all teachers... These are grouped in the following eight areas:

- education organisation and preconditions, democracy’s foundations;
- curriculum theory and didactics;
- theory of science, research methods and statistics;
- learning and development;
- special education;
- social relations, conflict resolution and leadership;
- grading and assessment; and
- evaluation and school development.

This common educational science core should comprise 60 ECTS (40 points). Content can
be easily adapted to fit different specialisations.

Thus, it is the content of the Trivium and its relationship with the Quadrivium that
have been changed significantly. From being a specialised content with a vertical dis-
course in relation to education and learning, the Trivium has lost its direct connection
to an established discipline (pedagogy) and been given a new name (education science)
that has no established faculty and no specialised scientific practices or language. This
happened through LUK 97’s recommendations. Since LUK, and based heavily on the
HUT 07 recommendations, the new subject area has been emptied of scientific content
(except psychology and brain-based theorisation) and replaced with profane knowledge
(Sjöberg, 2011). The consequence of this is that the academic subjects have once again
become the main vertically anchoring research-based pillar of the scientific knowledge
base for teachers, linked to professional practice by research-based technical knowledge
about how to teach it, while there is now actually no scientific research base at all for
other teacher categories. On page 17 of SOU 2008:105 we can read:

A professional teacher should have a thorough knowledge of subjects. The commission’s
proposals strengthen subject knowledge in several ways. The focus of the education for
elementary teachers (grundlärate) is on basic reading, writing and mathematics learning
but also, depending on the focus, even expertise in other relevant disciplines. For subject
teachers there is a significant reinforcement of subject instruction compared to the current
situation. Teaching practice will also no longer be counted in the subject content. In this
way subject studies for student teachers will be more equivalent to that of other students.

I believe “re-traditionalisation” can be used to describe the development we can see
here, and this trend is contrary to recommendations for teacher training in interna-
tional research (Darling-Hammond, 2006, Gore et al., 2004). All you need to know
to be a secondary school teacher since HUT and Government Bill 2009/10: 89 is the subjects taught, knowledge and skills of how to teach them and the skills and courage to grade student performances and maintain classroom discipline and order (Sjöberg, 2011). Bernstein (2000) discusses this sort of teacher education as a form of knowledge organisation that is closest to a horizontal discourse. This kind of knowledge has a direct link to a practical context and a focus on teacher behaviour. It is a kind of knowledge that the TEEC 60 members pointed out cannot form a coherent whole. Moreover, it is also a kind of knowledge that can develop direct linkages and relationships to a concrete material (and even economic) base (Apple, 2001; Mentor et al., 2004; Goodson, 2008; Eriksson, 2009; Zeichner 2010). Such knowledge can often be more easily influenced by business and even religious and ideological interests.

Subject teachers in secondary schools may feel that they benefit from the developments taking place. The emphasis on academic subjects seems to give them status in relation to other teachers and there is support for such changes from professional organisations such as the National Association of School Teachers (Lärarnas Riksförbund). But this lift may need to be rethought as the changes proposed will leave subject teachers less prepared for defining, assessing and, if necessary, responsibly adjusting their teaching to improve learning for all students in the rapidly changing and complex social, cultural and linguistic conditions of today’s multi-lingual, multi-cultural society (Sjöberg, 2011) and unable to understand how their conditions of work and employment in schools and other institutions are likely to change. As these changes appear in a period of (increased) economic privatisation and exploitation, it is well worth thinking about in whose interests they are likely to operate (Apple, 2001; Zeichner, 2010; Beach, 2008).

It is here that a vertical scientific (Trivium) discourse of the kind suggested by the TCD, TEEC 60, LUT 74 and Gran’s evaluation in 1995 could be of great value. The purpose of a vertical discourse is to (a): provide important tools for thinking about how today’s schools can work in a class-based, hierarchical society (Ball et al., 1996; Apple, 2001; Beach, 2005); and (b) help teachers not only begin to reflect on, but also systematically examine, critique and understand how formally approved educational goals of integration, independent learning and the development of a democratic foundation for a broader concept of education for all can be compared with present ideas about entrepreneurial attitudes and personal responsibility (Lundahl, 2002). As suggested by Beach (2005), without a vertical knowledge discourse teachers become like the prisoners in Plato’s cave, tied to horizontal communication in everyday discourse that may leave them severely limited by common-sense experience and less able to deconstruct the forces acting on and through their actions (Zeichner, 2010).

**Conclusion**

The reintroduction of a horizontal knowledge discourse seems to be a main point with recent teacher education policy recommendations from HUT 07 onwards (Sjöberg, 2011). But with the help of Bernstein’s analysis, one can see how student teachers need
access to a vertical discourse because it can provide them with mechanisms to generate new knowledge and challenge reactionary forms of traditionalism on one hand and the economic exploitation of their labour power on another (Beach, 2005, 2008). This is especially important today for the lower grades of formal school and kindergarten. Post HUT and through Proposition 2009/10: 89, these teachers will begin to work without a vertically developed and systematically grounded scientific element for their professional knowledge base in their undergraduate studies, at the exact same time as the activities they are working with and within are being systematically opened up by other government policies to economic governance through new public management and economic development through privatisation and the extraction of profit. The effects of these processes have already been identified in relation to the teaching profession in a number of European countries and globally (Garm & Karlsen, 2004; Apple, 2001; Codd, 2005; Goodson, 2008; Beach, 2008). They have also begun to show up more clearly in the Nordic countries (Lundahl, 2002, 2006, 2008; Antikainen, 2010).

Notes

This is very relevant to what might be being encouraged in the professional knowledge base of teaching through developments like those recommended by HUT 07 (Sjöberg, 2011) where specialised content concerning the sociological, political, philosophical, economic and ideological dimensions of professional knowledge (from, for instance, LUT 74) has been blown away and replaced by something less profound (Ahlström, 2008; Kallós, 2009). Moreover, this is happening precisely at a time when private organisations are entering into education “ownership” and delivery on a larger scale than before, and also with a profit incentive behind their investments, in a manner that has had extremely negative consequences in other national contexts (Codd, 2005; Zeichner, 2010). However, my argument here is not that horizontal knowledge has no positive value as a basis for professional knowledge. On the contrary, there is always tacit knowledge and a horizontal communication of this knowledge within a profession, and such processes and the knowledge carried by them are both valuable and necessary. My point is that of TEEC 60, that there is a danger when such knowledge is in complete ascendancy, as in HUT’s recommendations, since the knowledge to be transferred can no longer form a rational whole and can become both segmented and discontinuous (with strong local and regional variations) in a way contrary to the idea of a scientific teaching profession with a shared professional knowledge component (Garm & Karlsen, 2004; Kallos, 2009).
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