

# Gender, Research and Change in Teacher Education: a European dimension<sup>1</sup>

Inger Erixon Arreman and Gaby Weiner , Umeå University, Sweden

## Abstract

*This paper explores the factors that are at present reconstructing European teacher education, including re- and de-professionalization, inherited traditions, feminization and globalization. The authors used documentary analysis and qualitative semi-structured interviews in one Swedish university. Five overall themes emerged: gender, teacher education cultures, organizational changes, collaboration and research. The paper argues that women and men in teacher education are positioned differently with regard to change. Women teacher educators identify more with growing research and accountability imperatives than their male colleagues, who want to keep the focus on classroom knowledge and skills. The paper considers possible explanations for the findings and makes tentative extrapolations to other European sites with varying political contexts.*

Teacher education in many countries is in the process of being re-shaped by a variety of policies including: introduction of teaching standards; increased diversity of school forms; expansion of private sector; heightened surveillance and accountability; and greater emphasis on research and professional development (Furlong et al, 2000; Scott & Freeman Moir, 2000; Mahoney & Hextall, 2000; Whitty et al, 2000). Though such trends are discernible in Sweden and Europe, other influences are evident too, for example, incorporation of teacher education into the university sector (known as ‘universification’) and expanded concepts of professionalism (Buchberger, 2000; Erixon et al, 2001). Five main European influences on teacher education have thus been identified: re- & de-professionalisation, inheritances (or traditions), research, feminisation and globalisation (Weiner, 2002). It is claimed that older practices of teacher education (e.g. identification with teaching expertise, focus on method) are being challenged and displaced by developments generated by globalisation, e.g. more standardised forms of accreditation (viz. Bologna agreement), stronger research base. Differences are also visible between neo-liberal and social democratic responses to the changes (summarised in Table 1 below) for example, in conceptions of professionalisation, and the place of research in pedagogic practice.

A key issue in European teacher education is the development of teacher education as a research based discipline and how this might contribute to increased professionalism and higher standards in schools. However, discourses concerning research have taken different forms in different countries. Teacher education’s incorporation into the university sector in social democratic countries such as Sweden, has been premised on the presumption of the *creation of a research base* equivalent to other applied fields such as social work; and also that a *new body of knowledge* will be created which will support the work of schools and teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999).

In more neo-liberal countries such as the UK and USA, *evidence-based* research models developed from medicine have been more influential, following controversial criticisms of educational research as unscientific and poor-quality. The preferred approach is that of the large randomised control trial (RCT) which is seen as able to predict accurately the outcomes of specific education policies and practices (Sackett et al, 1996). However, Hammersley

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented in the symposium Gender, Politics and Teacher Education: International Perspectives, annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 2005

(2001: 550) rightly identifies the danger to democracy of this reductionist position ‘where the function of research is taken to be identifying “what works” or “what works best”’. As Simons (2001) likewise points out, evidence-based research tends to be policy-led and over-rationalistic, seeking simple solutions to complex problems and uncertainties. The status of researchers as autonomous intellectuals and as responsible for key research decisions is here under threat as responsibility for research ‘quality’ shifts towards government agencies and politicians.

**Table 1: Social Democratic and Neo-Liberal Trends in Teaching and Teacher Education (Weiner, 2002)**

Trends	Social Democratic	Neo-Liberal
Professionalism	‘Universification’; research & knowledge base, professional autonomy, dialogue	Re- and de-professionalisation, control from the outside, ‘low trust’
Inheritances	Craft wisdom, traditions, divided profession, low status, anti-intellectual	
Research	Increased research base; focus on practice; diversity of research approaches; university-led	Increased research base; focus on practice; evidence-based research; government-led
Feminisation	More women entering teaching; subject, sector and pay differentials; ‘gendered service profession’; strategies to attract men; under-theorised; ignored.	
Globalisation	Post-traditional social order; greater social reflexivity; growth of the audit society; contradictory, uneven and uncertain outcomes	

### **The Project**

The study comprised analysis of national, regional and local policy documents and fifty-seven interviews, conducted between October 2000 and November 2002 in the Umeå area in North Sweden. A life-history approach was utilised for the interviews to capture individual experiences of teacher education reforms and reorganization processes (Czarniawska, 1999). The first five interviews focused on traditions and change from a management perspective, and also included demographic data. These informed the second set of 52 interviews with a range of teacher educators, which focused on family and educational background, career choice, experience of organisational changes, reflection on work ethos, expectation of research and professional development, personal and health related issues, gender perspectives, plans for the future and other issues chosen as important by the interviewees.

Interviewees were selected on basis of age and time of entry into teacher education, department affiliation, gender, job title and subject specialism, and also to reflect the importance of subjects in national school curricula, (Statistics Sweden, 2000; Umeå University 2001; Swedish National Agency for Education, 2004 ). As mentioned, interviewees with management perspectives were considered essential to the study, as were longer-serving teacher educators with a historical overview. The sample comprised 23 men and 34 women aged between 35 and 90 at the time of the interviews, of whom 14 were retired. The majority of interviewees (45) were, or had been, members of the five departments of teacher education.<sup>1</sup> Five interviewees worked in the Department of Educational Studies, three in Modern Languages, and two in Nutrition. Three management interviewees had no formal affiliation to teacher education.

Potential interviewees were first approached by a letter, which included project information and ethical issues; if positive, interviewees were sent an interview guide prior to the interview. Interviews were generally about an hour in length, and were recorded, fully transcribed, and then returned to interviewees for comments. Transcripts were anonymised, and utterances extracted according to themes and sub-themes; and related to demographic and other key factors. Extracts categorised as key factors, were thereafter transferred into an Excel database created for the study. The themes that attracted the highest number of responses were in descending order: gender, teacher education cultures, organisational changes, collaboration and research. In the next sections of this paper we briefly document the nature of the themes

## **Research Themes**

### *i. Gender*

Interviewees were asked relatively open questions about what they considered the most important gender issue(s) in teacher education. Viewpoints differed, perhaps not surprisingly, according to the sex of the interviewees. Some acknowledged awareness of gender factors which advantage men. For example, Ernst (b. 1957) argues that being a man has considerable professional value: ‘What I say carries more weight than I really deserve. On the whole, men’s views and words are taken more seriously than women’s’. However for both Mats and Lars gender is more ‘neutral’.

There may be differences but I do not know in what respects. Our culture is supposed to treat women the same as men, as I see it. At least it seems so when you look at the situation in our department (Mats, b. 1940).

I have never thought about gender being of any importance. As teachers we have had the same conditions, the same pay, have taught the same children (Lars, b. 1935).

Others were more cautious about what they saw as an over-emphasis of ‘jämställdhet’ (gender equality) in teacher education. For example, Ulf finds it unhelpful in his work with female colleagues.

I consider this talk about gender equity as a parody. I regard myself as a person with quite a good perspective on gender issues. I want to meet you [women] in the same way as men. I do not want to make a fuss because you are a woman (Ulf, b. 1949).

Olof, however, argues that ‘jämställdhet’ actually works in favour of men in teacher education, particularly in relation to its aim of having equal proportions of men and women in each occupational category.

There have always been problems of recruitment of men into teacher education. [...] It might be an advantage to be a man where there are many women – not only in teacher education. For a long time, there has been a strong focus on the importance of “jämställdhet” in the department (Olof, b. 1936).

Overall, the men seemed rather more negative (or neutral) than positive about promoting gender equality in teacher education.

The women interviewees, however, saw gender as more important and relevant to their work as teacher educators. Most expressed awareness of the differential and negative treatment of women compared with men. For example, Pia sees the problem as a combination of being female and a teacher of young children.

Feeling insignificant within the department has something to do with one's background. It isn't something that is explicitly said, it is said in small letters, but you get the point. It's a combination of being a woman and an elementary teacher (Pia, b. 1947).

Louise identifies gender in specific regard to the dominance of male voices in meetings. In the first ten to fifteen years [of my time in teacher education] one had the feeling that what men said was of more importance than women's views. Especially in large staff meetings, 'this is only a feeling I have, but I am sure about it, and I think that all women would agree' (Louise, b. 1940). On the other hand, Eva argues that differences in the pay of male and female staff had been a key factor in raising her awareness of gender.

When we came into to the university, our salaries were investigated and the differences shown to be quite large. Men and women with the same qualifications had different salaries, the women having much lower salaries than the men. Some other women and me were put on a higher scale. [...] We did not discuss gender issues in my department, neither among staff nor with students - we maybe thought that 'all that stuff is over now' (Eva, b.1932)

Ingrid, although generally favourable, suggests that the move into research might not entirely benefit women as the new research culture is also likely to reproduce the gendered power relations of teacher education.

It would have been different if I had been a man, I'm positive. I feel it even stronger now when in research, that you live in a man's world, where men have the important positions (Ingrid, b. 1956).

Several women, however, admitted that they preferred to work with 'male' - dominated subjects and departments. For example, being a woman in science education is seen as positive by Annika, even though she consciously incorporates a gender perspective in her work.

It is positive to be a woman - I can't see there are negative sides.[...] it is so important that girls should like natural sciences. I hope that I can be a positive image for young girls in doing sciences.[...] I have tried to have girls' and boys' groups to see what comes out of it (Annika, b. 1966).

## **ii. *Teacher education cultures***

Allegiance to different teacher education cultures and the implications of this emerged as a key theme of the study. The interviewees talked about their experiences of working in teacher education, and also their views on teaching, subject knowledge, and the perceived relationship to other parts of teacher education, the university, and to students. Patterns emerge which show teacher educators as broadly associating with the three teacher education 'traditions' or programmatic areas: primary, secondary and practical-aesthetic subjects. Significantly,

interviewees draw attention to (invisible) hierarchies and the positioning of their subject area in teacher education, as well as the status of teacher education within the university and society more generally.

Interviewees referred to the low esteem of teaching school subjects with a didactic orientation held by other university departments. For example Anna-Lisa, (b. 1950) a teacher educator of languages, finds that the low status of teacher educators has had implications for the development of the area, since staff like herself do not have access to funding for the development of work related competencies:

It's quite obvious that this task is not considered to have a high status [within the language department]. Anyway, all teacher education is regarded in the same way [...] To me it feels very strange that teacher education, so important to society, can have such a low status within the academy and within a language department! [...] We can't any more apply for funding from the department for our need of competencies directed towards teacher education. You can only ask for research money, and as a junior lecturer you are not allowed to do that.

Neither is being a subject teacher valued in a department mainly concerned with pedagogy or method. Christer (b. 1959), who teaches mathematics both in the department of Mathematics and in a teacher education department, finds that these two opposing perspectives on teaching, put him in a difficult position: 'They think I'm a weird pedagogue in the academic world and a subject freak in the world of teacher education'.

A specific trait claimed by departments concerned with 'caring' e.g. pre-school, special needs, is a common culture or a code of beliefs, with staff generally sharing a caring attitude towards students (Lemar, 2001).

There are different views, but I have particularly noticed that the caring attitude - so typical for women - sticks out when we talk about our new students. We don't want them to fail [...] I think that the department as a whole has much of this attitude, that's why it's so important for us to meet others. (Taina, b. 1947)

Programmes of child-care had previously been organised together with home-economics. However, from the late 1980s, home economics became the Department of Nutrition, having to move out of teacher education in order to have greater access to research. Thus while it was argued that the previous organisation and traditions of home-economics had a influential if sometimes negative, impact on the status of teacher education, growing research activities within the department from 1995 onwards countered that perception and had important implications for staff. To exemplify this, Kristina (b. 1936) provides a vivid description of the department's struggles for respect and academic identity in the early 1990s, when particular female seminar traditions were seen as easy targets for ridicule.

From 1990s and onwards there was this conflict [on the organisation of departments], and we were called the "Meatball seminar" [...] That was how they regarded our students - as if they were not as good as other students. Later, when we moved to Campus and became a research department, it was a fantastic change! [...] I think we have an academic reputation in the university today, and I find that very satisfying. (Kristina, b. 1936)

According to her somewhat different perception of teacher education cultures, Carlgren identifies, drawing on Zeichner (1993) three clusters of sub-cultures among teacher educators: ‘cultural conservatism’, ‘progressivism’ and ‘cultural radicalism’.

- *Cultural conservatism* promotes sound subject knowledge in teachers. Accordingly, teaching is focussed on the subject and not on ‘upbringing’. Teachers have a degree of autonomy in relation to the National Curriculum.
- *Progressivism* focuses on the individual child and child-centred teaching. It also emphasizes the need of change. It is closely related to the overall ideas of the National Curriculum which is considered as the basis for teachers’ work. However, broader societal purposes are not addressed.
- *Cultural radicalism* is orientated towards broader societal purposes and democratic schooling. It is based on individual teachers’ critical analysis and interpretation of curriculum.

According to Carlgren, these sub-cultures in teacher education embrace different ways of understanding, different attitudes and dispositions to act. These are all reflected at the same time in teacher education, and are also considered as abstract ideas, which are not explicitly expressed or defined, but which are seen to take shape from a number of underlying assumptions on education and society. The different sub-cultures are also seen to represent different knowledge traditions, which correspond to different aspects of teachers’ work. The problem for teacher education, according to Carlgren, is that such differences are perceived as evidence of inconsistency rather than complementarity.

### *iii. Organisational changes*

The different forms of reorganization and reforms of teacher education and the various government bills and commissions were also an important reference point for many interviewees. In particular, the following legislation and reforms were cited as influential.

#### *1946 Parliamentary Committee*

This outlined the main aspects of post-war school reform. The introduction of a nine-year comprehensive school included new structures for primary and secondary teacher education, for which teacher colleges were established between 1956 and 1969. The importance of a research base for teacher education was emphasised and ‘Practical Pedagogy’ (and professors thereof), as a specific research mode of the discipline Educational Studies was established at the teacher colleges.

#### *1977 University Reform*

Universities, university colleges and tertiary vocational education such as teacher education, journalism, social work and nursing, were here formally incorporated in higher education, and new policy demands were made for research in vocational fields. Higher education was expanded through establishment of new colleges in an attempt to broaden social class and gender student recruitment patterns. Simultaneous to the inclusion of teacher education into the university sector, Practical Pedagogy was merged with Educational Studies; so, paradoxically, teacher education lost its main research subject and avenue into research (Ahlström & Kallós, 1996).

Despite the designated research ‘red thread’ between undergraduate and research studies, potential doctoral students from teacher education could only qualify by studying Pedagogik (Educational Studies) (or sometimes sociology or psychology). In other words, teacher education was part of a ‘binary’ system (Scott, 1996) of departments not having access to research as opposed to those which did.

### *1988 Teacher Education Reform*

The overall aim of this legislation was to abolish the traditional division of primary and lower secondary teacher education programmes, as well as their distinctively ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ parts (Carlgren 1997). An attempt was made to break with previous teacher education traditions by creating a homogeneous programme for all future teachers of the comprehensive school. Ideologically, the aim was to create both the comprehensive school as an entity, separate from upper secondary school (gymnasium), and a shared pedagogy involving future teamwork and collaboration (Askling & Jedeskog, 1994). This involved:

- Merging of different teacher education programs and orientations
- Introduction of Didaktik (didactics) as an overarching philosophical approach for all subject teaching.
- Incorporation of an ‘academic’ element into all teacher education subject areas, and
- Stimulating the development of research.

### *1992 Local Teacher Education Reform*

The outcome of this at Umeå University was the creation of new structures for teacher education, including the establishment of a teacher education research board, departmental re-organisation, move to main campus, financial support for research, and recruitment of more ‘academic’ oriented staff.

### *1993 University Reform*

This placed increased pressure on university staff to do research, and also to create new academic areas, particularly programmes in engineering, media, IT, project management and design (National Agency for Higher Education, 2003).

### *1995 Teacher Education Reform*

This was supplementary to the 1988 reform which emphasised ‘teachers as professionals’ through the introduction of an end-of-course project, to strengthen the academic components of teacher education (Ministry of Education, 1992: 10). This emphasis on academic requirements also highlighted the generally lower academic qualifications of teacher educators, particularly those working in methods and practice departments.

### *2000 Local Teacher Education Reform*

Umeå University was the first university in Sweden to establish a Faculty (Board) of Teacher Education which provided the pre-conditions for the establishment of a new research discipline, ‘Educational Work’, specifically for teacher education. The aim was to broaden the research base of teacher education to include any department engaged in research on teacher education or teachers’ work (for further details, see Kallós , 2003). A year later, Umeå University inaugurated a national post-graduate school in Educational Work, funded through a three-year government grant.

### *2001 Teacher Education Reform*

This legislation sought to establish formal access to research for teacher education in universities and colleges having undergraduate student-teacher programmes (Governmental bill, 2000).

Overall, it could be argued that teacher educators are more influenced by governance and state policy-making than other university disciplines, principally because teacher education is regularly re-formed to meet the needs of a continually changing school system. This, it seems, complicates both the continuity of the discipline and its relationship to less applied or more abstract disciplines within the university.

#### *iv. Collaboration*

Another theme which emerged as important to teacher educators in the study was the status of collaboration as a key indicator of disciplinary significance. Almost two thirds (36) of the interviewees mentioned lack of collaboration in teacher education from the 1950s until the late 1990s, arguing that collaboration had been weak at different levels; between teacher education programmes, between teacher education and academic disciplines, and also between the Department of Educational Studies (Pedagogik) and teacher education departments.

For example, a female interviewee, Lisa (b. 1933) with a doctorate, who had worked as a senior lecturer and methods teacher in both primary and secondary teacher education programmes, maintained that the general lack of collaboration before the 1988 reform had been due to the strict boundaries between different teacher education groups:

There was no collaboration whatsoever [...] We had the same director, but we had no meetings in common, neither between the two groups of primary teacher educators nor between the programs for subject teachers and primary teachers [...] Indeed, there were clashes between different cultures.

Subject specialisation and social factors such as class origins or being the 'wrong' sex also created pockets of isolation. A retired female ex-teacher educator of physical education, Helen (b. 1917) reflected on the potential of collaboration from her position as a female teacher educator of a so-called practical subject:

[Until 1968] those of us who were teachers in physical education, music and drawing, were only allowed to sit at special small tables in the staff room, away from the director. [...] There was no collaboration whatsoever, and at times I have thought about that. I have also thought about the social status of my husband [caretaker]. Of course he wasn't good enough, [...] and I was only a teacher in physical education [of female students]. [...] The situation didn't change in the teacher college [after 1968] [...] A male colleague [...] wanted to stay to watch a lesson. He came in, but didn't understand what was happening and made fun of me and the students and ridiculed us.

Helen's feelings of isolation and differential treatment on the basis of social class, might have been more marked because of her own upper-class origins and later marriage into a lower social segment. Thus for her, subject specialisation, social class and sex were seen as constituting a triple barrier to collaboration. Her low professional status was linked to pay differentials and increased workload, and also to feelings of disrespect from the leadership, and from male colleagues in her own subject, as well as from colleagues in other subject areas.

In the development of new course profiles in the 1980s, difficulties also emerged in the construction of joint subject areas between teacher education and subject departments. For Anton (b. 1930), a natural science teacher educator and later, departmental administrator, collaboration between teacher education and subject departments was complex:

We tried to collaborate with the university [department of chemistry] but of course things did not go smoothly [...]. They were used to educating chemists in courses of 40 to 60 credits, and by then [the 1988 reform] they were supposed to teach only 20 credits in the subject to future teachers.

For those based mainly outside the teacher education departments, identity was also problematic. For example, teacher educators working in the Department of Educational Studies had a double responsibility to teacher education *and* to Educational Studies. In teacher education, they had little or no access to institutional research resources; neither were they 'real' members of Educational Studies. This "double connection" led to a confusion of professional identity, expressed by Eva (b. 1932), in the following way:

We had this double connection. As a teacher in Educational Studies, I was a member of two departments, Educational Studies and pre-school teacher education. So that's why it was always difficult to know... And the teachers in Educational Studies at the teacher college had the same problem. (Eva, b. 1932)

Interviewees also mentioned lack of collaboration between academic disciplines. Disagreement over the content of undergraduate teacher education courses meant that staff who wanted to improve their academic qualifications often faced obstacles from the regulations of different disciplines. For example, an interviewee with a primary teacher qualification, who wanted to extend his studies (to degree level) was compelled to take the same statistics course four times; in Mathematics, Educational Studies, Sociology and Psychology respectively.

Relatively few interviewees (eight of the overall sample of 57, and exclusively among the older group), identified positive examples of collaboration. But they did exist. For example, it was recalled that in the early days of the teacher college, lecturers from the Department of Educational Studies sometimes gave staff development sessions on methods teaching. Nevertheless, it was also recalled that any collaboration, where it existed, was likely to be organisational rather than intellectual or educational.

#### **v. Research**

The development of a research culture in teacher education was a 'hot' issue at the time of the interviews for the reasons given at the beginning of this paper. Interviewees were therefore encouraged to comment on their experiences and viewpoints on this matter. Most were positive: however the most passionate responses came from those who saw research as a threat to their professional status and expertise, among which were a significant minority of the men, who stressed what they saw as the diminished value of teacher educator as practitioner. Both Ulf and Anton, for example, see research as an isolating, antisocial activity which takes people away from the day to day work of the school.

Most teacher educators who entered teacher education at the same time as me were good practitioners. In a short time, this quality [of being a good teacher] will be of no value to teacher educators. [...] I do not want to go into research. I

do not wish to shut myself behind closed doors for four years [doing doctoral research]. I need the meetings, the relationship, the contacts (Ulf, b. 1949).

I have sometimes felt that research narrows the perspectives. You don't study the reality but you create a new one. [...] The colleagues who carried out research distanced themselves from teacher education and schools. It was not a means of bringing knowledge back to school, but a way to get away. If you had an educational interest in maths you went to the department of education studies and became a lecturer there (Anton, b. 1930).

Erik focuses on the fact that just being a good teacher is no longer good enough, which, he suggests, produces feelings of guilt which are both unproductive and de-motivating.

There has been pressure from outside [since the 1980s] and this pressure has continued [...] I have interpreted this as a means of giving teacher educators a bad conscience for not doing things we have less competence in. [...] We were good teachers but we were supposed to feel bad about this and about not doing research (Erik, b. 1936).

Per's explanation for such hostile responses to the attempted creation of a research base for teacher education is that any change is likely to be seen as threatening to the seminary, practice-oriented tradition of teacher education.

[In the beginning of 1990s] people felt their position threatened by the talk of research. The most usual words were, "I have never heard anything like it during my twenty-five years of career." [...] They didn't want change (Per, b. 1937).

In contrast, the women seemed more positive about research, expressing less concern about changes in the researcher/practitioner divide. More women than men had completed doctoral studies and fewer had withdrawn before completion. A female interviewee (in her sixties) expressed regret that she had not had access to research opportunities and most seemed interested and excited about the possibility of doing research. For example, Anne-Marie sees research as a way of linking practice to theory.

My ambition is to do research.... When I look at my practice and link it to theory I find that we need both parts - ... in order to raise teacher education and to develop it into a qualitatively good education (Ann-Marie, b. 1950).

Cecilia indicates that she is well-motivated to do research, even if recently, pressure had mainly come from her department.

It is not only a question of pressure and importance of doing research but there is also motivation to do so. To begin with I felt happy about being able to go on studying. Recently, I think that the pressure and the demands on staff to do research have increased. You are not in a secure employment position if you do not have a Masters, so we have been told (Cecilia, b. 1953).

### **Analysis**

Overall, the findings relating to the five themes explored above – gender, teacher education culture, organisational changes, collaboration and research – indicate certain expected patterns

but not others. For example, differences were apparent in interviewees' perceptions of the sexual politics of teacher education, with, not surprisingly perhaps, women exhibiting more interest and identification with gender issues. Older, more experienced women drew attention to the 'voice' of male management, and gave evidence of pay differentials. Younger interviewees seemed less aware of gender-based differences in their treatment, though as a hidden gender dimension, younger women expressed more concern about the quality of their work with students than their male equivalents. The most frequently raised gender indicators were pay differentials, the predominance of male management perspectives and whose 'voice' was loudest in meetings.

Significantly, longstanding teacher education cultures seemed hard to break, and perhaps were one cause of the difficulty of teacher education's integration in the university. A unified 'caring' culture in one part of teacher education jarred with and challenged more competitive, non-caring culture of another or in other part of the university. Memories and experiences of organisational changes suggest that teacher education was and continues to be more regulated than other university disciplines, because of its relationship to the reform of the school system. Inability to attract collaboration proved an indicator of the low status of teacher education. Once its status improved, collaboration was seen as more possible and desirable by others.

The gender dimensions of the 'fledgling' research culture show the importance of social and cultural factors. Men more frequently identified with the practitioner model of teacher educator, while women were more likely to view research as a necessary extension and enhancement to their practice and career. Thus, while men were more likely to define themselves as 'good teachers' within the confines of a 'traditional' teacher education, women claim a space as continually developing professionals in a climate of change and opportunity. Thus, following Connell (1987), the concentration of some of the male interviewees on their role as educators and practitioners rather than as researchers and academics, is of significance. Their positioning as practitioners alongside their rejection of both research and gender equality as progressive forces for change, indicate an unwillingness to give up powerful practices rooted in masculinity. Among other things, such positioning has enabled them, as 'expert' (male) practitioners, both to maintain power over students and to sustain long-standing teacher education (gender) regimes and practices. No women expressed this viewpoint. It could be argued therefore that male value systems are under greater threat because men have tended to benefit from unquestioned systems of power and conventional gender relations. Women, in contrast, see the new research culture as a means of disrupting older patterns, which in the past denied them access to power and/or to career advancement. They also seem more aware of seemingly persistent inequalities in the wider society, and the consequent constraints on their own practice, of various institutional gender regimes.

### **Implications for European and Swedish Education**

We suggest that while the study reported in this paper concerns one teacher training provider, albeit a big one, in North Sweden, the themes emerging mirror many of the changes going on in Europe and elsewhere. Regarding Weiner's five trends in teaching and teacher education mentioned earlier in this paper, we can see that Swedish teacher education, as in other countries, has been affected by the heightened discourse of *professionalism* which has taken the Social Democratic form of incorporation of teacher education into the university sector and pressure to do research. The Swedish study shows that the normal school or seminar *inheritances* (or traditions) live on despite vigorous and continuous governmental attempts to dismantle them. Further, that they were more influenced by local programmatic structures than by Carlgren's ideological forms. Moreover, the study found a gender dimension in the

responses of teacher educators, with men much more ready to defend old practices while women saw greater opportunities in the new university era. A, perhaps *the*, key finding of the study was the increased pressure on teacher educators to do *research* with a particular orientation to their own practice or practice in schools, and the struggles surrounding the ownership of a research subject for teacher education. The Swedish study also showed, as in other countries, the over-representation of women (or *feminization*) in teacher education, both as staff and students, and the implications this has had for the status and access to research of teacher educators compared to other professional areas and university disciplines. The impact of *globalization* and the post-traditional order of accountability and uncertainty are less visible in the Swedish study than in other more neo-liberal countries, although increased pressure on teacher educators to publish in international academic journals and publications and the beginning of a league-table culture suggest that the impact of the global is not far away.

Contact:

Inger Erixon Arreman and Gaby Weiner, Dept of Mathematics, Technology & Science Education, Umeå University, 901 87 Umeå, Sweden: tel. 0046 90 786 6470/7185 ; fax. 0046 786 6671; email [inger.erixon.arreman@educ.umu.se](mailto:inger.erixon.arreman@educ.umu.se)/ [gaby.weiner@educ.umu.se](mailto:gaby.weiner@educ.umu.se)

## References

- Ahlström, K-G. & Kallós, D. (1996) Recent Research on Teacher Education in Sweden. Problems and Issues in a Comparative Perspective, in D. Kallós & I. Nilsson (Eds) *Monographs on Teacher Education and Research*, 1 (Umeå, Umeå University), pp. 5-46.
- Askling, Berit & Jedeskog, Gunilla. (1994). *Some notes on the Teacher Education Programme in Sweden. A Background Report to OECD/CERI Teacher Education Quality Study: The Teacher Education Review*. Linköping: Linköping University. Department of Education and Psychology.
- Buchberger, F., Campos, B.P., Kallos, D., & Stephenson, J. (2000) *Green Paper on Teacher Education in Europe*, Umeå, Sweden, TNTEE
- Carlgren, I. (1997). Professional Sub-cultures in Teacher Education: Complementary or Inconsistent Professionalisms? In I. Nilsson & L. Lundahl (Eds.), *Teachers, Curriculum and Policy. Critical Perspectives in Educational Research*,. Umeå: Umeå University, pp. 117-132
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Czarniawska, B.(1999). *Interviews, Narratives and Organizations*. GRI-report 1999:8. Göteborg: Gothenburg Research Institute.
- Erixon P., Frånberg G-M., & Kallós D. (2001) *Some aspects of the role of postgraduate studies and research in current teacher education in the European Union*, paper presented at the ENTEP seminar, Umeå University, Sweden, June
- Furlong J., Barton L., Miles S., Whiting C. & Whitty G. (2000) *Teacher Education in Transition: re-forming professionalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Hammersley M., (2001) On 'Systematic' Reviews of Research Literatures: a 'narrative' response to Evans and Benefield', *British Educational Research Journal*, 27, 5, 543-554
- Lemar, Signild (2001). *Kaoskompetens och gummibandspedagogik. En studie av karaktärsämneslärare i en decentraliserad gymnasieorganisation/ Chaos competence and elastic band teaching: a study of subject teachers in the decentralised upper secondary school* . (diss.)Umeå: Department of Education, Umeå University
- Kallós, D. (2003). Teachers and Teacher Education in Sweden. Recent developments. Paper presented at the International Meeting *La formazione iniziale degli insegnanti in Europa. Percorsi attuali e futuri*, organized by C.I.R.E. (Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerche Educative), Università di Bologna, 24 January. <http://tntee.umu.se/archive/bologna2003.pdf> Accessed 2004-05-01
- Mahony P., & Hextall I., (2000), *Reconstructing Teaching*, London, Routledge-Falmer

- Ministry of Education (1999). *Att lära och leda. En lärarutbildning för samverkan och utveckling /To Teach and to Guide. A Teacher Education for Collaboration and Development*. SOU 1999: 63. Stockholm, Ministry of Education .
- Ministry of Education (2000). *Regeringens proposition 1999/2000:135. En förnyad lärarutbildning./ Governmental Bill. A New Teacher Education:* Stockholm: Ministry of Education.
- Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M. C., Muir Gray, J. A., Brian Haynes R. B., & Scott Richardson W. (1996) Evidence-based medicine: What it is and what it isn't. *British Medical Journal*. 312, 71-2
- Scott, A. & Freeman Moir, J. (Eds.) (2000) *Tomorrow's Teachers: International and Critical Perspectives on Teacher Education*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Scott, P. (1996) Unified and Binary Systems of Higher Education in Europe, in: A. Burgen (Ed) *Goals and Purposes of Higher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers), pp. 37-54.
- Simons H., (2001), Reinterpreting Evidence-Based Practice: a narrative approach, paper given at the Classroom Action Research Network conference, London, May
- Statistics Sweden (2000). *Statistiska meddelanden*, UF 23 SM 0001. [Statistics information] Stockholm: SCB
- Swedish National Agency for Education (2004). *Grundskolan. Timplan*. [The Comprehensive School. Courses and timetables]  
<http://www3.skolverket.se/ki03/front.aspx?sprak=SV&ar=0405&skolform=11&infotyp=2&id=11> Accessed 2004-10-14.
- Umeå University (2001). Local staff list. Unpublished.
- Weiner, G. (2002) Uniquely Similar or Similarly Unique? Education and Development of Teachers in Europe. *Teaching Education*. 13, 2, 273-288.
- Whitty, G., Furlong J., Barton L., Miles S., & Whiting C. (2000), Training in turmoil: researching initial teacher education in England in the 1990s. In: A. Scott & J. Freeman Moir (Eds.) *Tomorrow's Teachers: International and Critical Perspectives on Teacher Education*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.11-23.
- Zeichner, K. (1993). Traditions of Practice in U.S. Preservice Teacher Education Programs. *Teacher & Teacher Education*. 9, 1, 1-13.

---

<sup>i</sup> Five interviewees from the teacher education departments had also at one time worked in the Department of Education.