

An Eight Country Study of Reform Practices in Teacher Education: An Outline of the Problematic

Educational reform has been the constant object of state action in industrial countries since the end of World War II, and the issues that pertain to schooling have moved to the forefront of public discussion at many governmental levels and sites, both within and across nations. Throughout this period, the focus of reform has been on problems that arise in modernizing economies and in producing a cultural consensus through schooling. For the most part, the strategies adopted have been intended to rationalize educational systems in ways that would align them with changing national goals and economic structures and provide flexible responses to fiscal concerns and cultural pressures that emanate from national and international sources.

In contrast to the late worldwide school reform movement that arose during the 1960s, current reform proposals grow out of a more comprehensive focus on the interrelationships among the different institutions that are involved in the educational sector. The current reforms maintain and extend elements of previous national reform movements; however, the most recent reforms emphasize the work of teachers and teacher education. To this end, discussions about teacher accountability, professionalization, and competency have been organized internationally by such intergovernmental agencies as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); United Nations agencies, in particular, UNESCO and the World Bank, with respect to the so-called Third World issues; the Council of Europe, through its Council for Cultural Co-operation, which, among other things, channels the decisions of the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education; and the European Economic Community, through its recently created Task Force

on Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth.

The studies in this book share an appreciation for the fact that current reform movements embody forms of regulation that produce substantive changes in the arenas of education. Our focus is on teacher education, an arena of educational reform that has risen to prominence in the second half of the 1980s. This focus on teacher education makes it possible to consider how governmental and professional agencies have created new mechanisms to assess, certify, and monitor institutional patterns and teacher practices. These changes entail, among other things, new legislation that governs teacher education, the creation of new agencies and certification patterns, and the establishment of research agencies and organizational competencies that can be used to define teaching. At a different level, our concern is with the social regulation that is contained in the reform categories and distinctions that are used to define practice. The regulatory implications of the reform practices are the ways by which the different publics that are involved in schooling measure success and engage in self-monitoring. In this context, the dual meaning of regulation, to borrow from Michel Foucault (1979), lies in the interrelation of institutional patterns with the cognitive framing of sensitivities, dispositions, and awarenesses that govern what is permissible in practice.

While similarities in public debate and strategies occur cross-nationally, little attention has been given in cross-national studies to the links between reform practices in teacher education and patterns of power in society—which can be conceived as having multiple overlapping and intersecting sociospatial networks (Mann, 1986). It is a key assumption of the case studies in this volume that current national reform efforts are a part of and help to shape power relations and regulations that occur within and across societies. In particular, the case studies explore the changing relations of control among educational institutions and the state.

The substantive context for this exploration is provided by educational reforms in teacher education that are being formulated in eight countries: Australia, Finland, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These countries belong to the “developed” world; but from north and south and differ in their political and social histories, levels of industrialization, and patterns of educational practice. They also differ in more subtle ways that are evident when research

does not confine its treatment of the state to the legal and administrative elements of government. Thus, the case studies in this volume consider how regulation results from the merging of professional agencies both in and out of government (Badie and Bumbaum, 1983). The studies delve into the historical relationships that exist between specific national patterns of regulation and interactions that occur in teacher education.

THE MAKING OF OUR COMPARATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT

Only one of the chapters in this volume, the Swedish case, written by Kallós and Selander, contains an explicit treatment of the methodology that has been employed. They concede that comparative studies are fruitful but complicated endeavors, and they observe that there is a misguided tendency to attach the label "comparative study" to generally descriptive works that contain some comparisons. Kallós and Selander, then, make the case for theoretical concepts that permit us to relate specific phenomena and their importance in one context to analogous phenomena in other contexts.

This conception is, in outline, the one that orients both this volume and the work of the six meetings that preceeded this volume. Given this orientation to the phenomena of reform, one of our first objectives in this project is to explore the current international status of teacher education in the light of our theoretical, methodological and practical assumptions about comparative studies.

Comparative Education and Teacher Education: A Missing and Weak Link

Published works on the comparison of policies or systems in teacher education follow, in broad terms, a style that is characteristic of the comparative practice in education. They are frequently descriptive studies, and they lack consistent frameworks for analysis that include information and useful experience, typically a loose theoretical approach is offered—when it exists in an explicit way—to describe the situation of teacher education in the chosen national educational systems. Many studies focus on a great number of systems; and the same countries are studied repeatedly, in a manner of providing factual information and descriptions of the historical evolution of teacher education in those countries (Lomax, 1976; Busch, et al., 1978, Blat Gimeno and Marín Ibañez, 1981; Goodings, Buyram, and McPartland, 1982; Benejam, 1986; Gumbert, 1989; "Teacher education: Per-

spectives from abroad," vol. 13, no. 3 [1991] of *Action in Teacher Education*; more elaborate works are Dove, 1986, Murray Thomas, 1990). Other studies merely collect miscellaneous topics concerning teacher education. (Mallison, 1980, chap. 8; Debesse and Mialaret, 1982; Hopkins and Reid, 1985). Finally, the reports that are presented by the representatives of countries and institutions at official conferences generally describe or review existing systems of teacher education and pertinent research, and offer some reflections about future trends and "challenges." (Petráček, 1983; Neave, 1987; Wilson, 1989).¹ Comparative studies in education are also closely related to political and didactic treatments of history. They tend to depoliticize its subject as the present is assumed the natural and its organizationally defined characteristics instrumentally evolving (Schriewer, 1982).

Broadly considered, this literature has a long tradition in the field of comparative education, even though its format and intellectual horizon are not, of course, exclusive to it. They respond to a logic that is deeply rooted in the field from its constitution as an academic subdiscipline. The questions and problems have a normative orientation and are closer to the fulfillment of specific political needs than to the general advance of knowledge.

Too often, this approach is a vehicle by which the "foreigner" constructs arguments that legitimates policies and reforming practices, rather than as a systematic study of practice and social actions. The foreigner legitimating national policy is explored by Bernard Zymek in an important investigation in the history of comparative education. Zymek maintains that the foreigner was used consciously and systematically among politician and reformers in discussions of educational reform that took place in Germany between 1871 and 1952. International reports and papers, which were quoted in German educational magazines, were put into the service of the interests of schooling policy at the time. A wider, international, compendium of arguments justified the political educational positions but avoided the label of "partisan" or "inconsequential" (Zymek, 1975, 1977).

This discursive practice is not peculiar to the educational field but common to others, both in the past and in the present. More than ever before, politicians are today calling for comparisons as a basis for decision making. Bureaucrats as well make extensive use of national and international statistics for comparisons, and industry and business are constantly comparing the social context of national and foreign markets (Øyen, 1990, p. 2).

The tendency towards an instrumental and evolutionary knowledge consolidated when the field of comparative education became established, expanded, and formalized in universities and research centers after the Second World War. It benefited from the increasingly dominant modernization and human capital theories, in a time marked by the vertiginous educational growth tied to the political consensus connected to the notion of Keynesian social democracy (Hüfner, Meyer, and Naumann, 1987). The aim was, and still is, to achieve a direct empirical and free from theory access to reality (cf. Schriewer, 1982).

We can understand the legitimating quality of comparative education by considering the relation of social and educational sciences and the modern nation state. The state legitimates its authority and actions through *reflexive ways of social monitoring* and by controlling issues that have to do with social reproduction rather than by coercion or violence (Giddens, 1985). Comparative research, at a more subtle level, consolidates its social position by the production of knowledge to solve problems, to lessen tensions and social conflicts, to make reforms admissible, and, as is characteristic of much comparative research, to be "useful" in predicting results about educational practices through comparison with other educational phenomena. The assumption of "useful" forms a weighty but unsteady substratum of comparative research. Yet, as Cowen argues,

Comparative education is not . . . "Useful" in the simple ways that some politicians and many busy decision-makers might prefer. However, when it is performing its classic task of identifying similarities and differences between national educational policies and practices, comparative education upsets local definitions of what is taken as a problem and what is being taken as a solution. Like other modes of academic reflection on education, it is useful as a Cassandra voice: in casting doubt on conventional wisdom. But comparative education does not, and probably should not attempt to, speak in the voice of prophecy and advocacy. (Cowen, 1990, p. 46)

One way to overcome the assumption that comparative research has a directly useful role has been to develop analytical explanations of the uses of the comparative research. In the field of education, research usually is given a high degree of prestige, respectability, and credibility, as it is perceived as "scientific." When the research is directed toward state reforms, the rhetoric of science preserves the image and enhances the legitimacy of the

state as a concerned, rational, and, therefore, believable agent; far less important in comparative studies are experimental evaluations and educational research that occurs prior to educational reforms. They are hardly of any significance when the time comes to take effective political decisions. This latter phenomenon is recorded at different levels of political action, not only nationwide, but also transnationally.²

A central reason for these different sets of educational research derives from the symbiotic relationship between knowledge and power in modern society: a relationship in which power legitimates both knowledge—and modes of knowledge—and its production and utilization, while knowledge tends to be used to legitimate existing arrangements for the exercise of power (Eliason et al., 1987, p. 256). When we take for granted that teacher education as a national institution closely tied to controlling national authority, this hinders interpreting its assumptions and social patterns.

The routinization of comparison in educational and social research has intellectually limited comparative, cross-cultural, and cross-national methodologies and the comparative method in general—although it was, in the origin of the social sciences during the second half of nineteenth century, the social sciences' research method par excellence (Block, 1954, 1979; Hampl and Weiler, 1978; Mandelbaum, 1984; Nisbet, 1986, pp. 54-57). Even today, when comparison is enjoying a revival in social theory, and particularly in historical sociology (Bonnell, 1980; Skocpol, 1984; Ragin, 1987; Wacquant and Calhoun, 1989, pp. 48-52; McMichael, 1990; Kiser and Hechter, 1991), the weaknesses of comparative research are apparent. Comparative "practices" in social theory are innumerable; theories of comparison are insufficient. There is no historiography of comparative practices—a corpus of the social practices of research that explains the way they have been lived and put into practice by the work of researchers from antiquity to the present (Busino, 1986). What is available is a kind of intellectual folklore that usually goes with comparative research.

**Avoiding the Rhetoric of Artificial Devices:
Comparing Consists of Interpreting and
Explaining, Not Just Comparing**

We think that a clarifying example of the intellectual folklore of comparative research stands explicitly in the label "compara-

tive." This word surnames traditional academic disciplines such as *Comparative Politics* or *Comparative Government*, but these fields have not actually been *comparative*: their academic work has focused on the study of one single foreign political system (Zelditch, 1971, p. 270). Also numerous articles, studies and papers labeled "comparative" are simple monographs on one single case or, at best, edited studies that are merely juxtaposed, not even comparatively analyzed in the introductory chapter. (This statement applies to comparative education; see, e.g., Koehl, 1977; Ramírez and Meyer, 1981).

Comparative education research "mostly has been (and still is) 'comparative' in a peculiar way. The standards of comparison are usually implicit and with diffuse conceptions of modernity: broad intellectual foils of interpretation influenced by the great political and philosophical themes of the time. Such has been and continues to be the background for the dominating case-study or issue-focused type of comparative education research" (Hüfner, Meyer, and Naumann, 1987, p. 192).

This limitation of comparative social research is largely due to (at least) three types of related analytical issues. Firstly, most research considers comparison to be an unproblematic mental operation. Although sometimes discussed, little attention has been paid in the past to the distinction between comparison as a universal human mental activity and comparison as a social-scientific methodology that "does not consist in relating observable facts but in relating relationships or even patterns of relationships to each other . . . closely connected with, and structured by, hypothetical assertions or conceptualized problems formulated within a framework of more comprehensive theories" (Schriewer, 1988, pp. 33-34).

Secondly, alternative and oppositional methodological strategies need to confront the previously described enduring "practices" of comparison. Instrumental and empiricist qualities define the purpose of study as explaining how particular components of existing structures can be made to function effectively. The central problem of comparison was believed technical and not *theoretical* (Scheuch, 1990; Ward, 1987). Ironically, the standardized comparative social research has furnished a confused and fragmented image of the social world because most researchers generally lack comparative epistemologies (Chekki, 1987, p. 32). The lack of theoretically adequate self-reflection has been evident as researchers have lost the genuine sense of comparative

research, which consists not of comparing but explaining—by understanding which characteristics or problems in particular cultures, societies, economies, or political systems affect patterns of behavior within them (Przeworski, 1987, p. 35).

Thirdly, while it is appropriate to assert that comparison is a theoretical problem, theory alone does not solve a key issue of comparison. The instrumental qualities of much comparative research derives from a structural-functionalist outlook; but, clearly, that is not an adequate theory. We should answer questions such as what "theory" is about, what kind of "theory" is useful for comparison, and, in particular, what "theory" informs a project.

We are not going to discuss here the meaning of "theory," a highly controversial notion both in current philosophy of science and in empirical social research; instead, we endorse the claims that there are different "styles of theorizing" about social reality and that theory construction is a pragmatic enterprise (Nowak, 1977; see also Popkewitz and St. Maurice, 1991). We have designed this project with a concern for "the problem of specifying and defining adequate 'theoretical entities,' that is, the problem of defining classes of objects, events, processes, or properties in a way that corresponds to the principle of general uniformity" (Nowak, 1989, p. 53). We wished to avoid the misconceptions of "instrumental positivism," in which epistemological categories of social-scientific practice of knowledge are based on implicit nominalism, the accumulation of knowledge through induction, verification and incrementalism, and the presumption of value neutrality. Here, the careful collection of facts, and the use of refined statistical techniques, and large-scale team research groups become the *sine qua non* of science itself (Bryant, 1985, chap. 5).³ "Theory," in this empiricism, is not much more than a few general and basically abstract assumptions about society explicated through inadequately defined concepts or vague and disconnected ahistorical propositions—the historical referentiality is basically reduced to aggregates that are framed by a synchronic or "instantaneous" vision of research issues (Coenen-Hutter, 1984; Platt, 1986; Huaco, 1986). As judged by one caustic critic:

Although there are today alternative research practices in the field of comparative education, this kind of empiricist approach knows since the last decade a shining renaissance in the field through projects such as those of the I.E.A. (International Asso-

ciation for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement), generously financed by the World Bank, or of the recently founded Board on International Comparative Studies in Education (BICSE), sponsored by the National Research Council with financial backing from the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the U.S. Department of Defense (Bradburn and Guilford, 1990).⁴

A different critic argues that so much comparative research proceeds on the basis of a low-level specification of a problem rather than a problematic. This is then followed by low level "hypotheses" which carry no logical necessity because they are not derived from higher order, more general propositions. International meetings are called to create common "instruments," procedures of standardization, and to "iron out" the "bugs" arising out of the translation of the instrument into twenty-five languages. Over the next three years there is a series of meetings to "monitor" the research; finally the "data" is discharged from each local computer and enters the Consolidated International Correlational Matrix. Volumes are published, the first of which contains a chapter on the difficulties of comparative research. Unfortunately, the above is not a parody, much comparative research in education is based upon those methods. The "instrument" destroys any possibility of understanding the form the problematic takes in different societies; indeed it ensures that the question is never the object of study. (Bernstein, 1977, pp. 15-16).

In the process of making our project, we explore the problematic of "regulation" in each of the countries, while remaining conscious of the structural complexity and potentialities of comparative social research as issues of regulation are explored. Our research embodies methodologies that are drawn from the cross-fertilization of three fields, epistemology, history of science, and sociology of science, in recognition of the relation between natural sciences and qualitative or subjective social science (Gregersen and K ppe, 1989). In this regard, we conceive of scientific inquiry as a social activity that is more than its epistemological body or logic; the cognitive rules of science are historical constructions of reality which are apprehended as an active process that reconstruct a rational genealogy of ideas within time and patterns of history.

The organization of these case studies involves "theoretical entities" that were the result of a dynamic analysis that progresses empirically and historically, with historiography contributing a prominent empirical component. We worked out our

interpretation, bearing in mind a series of specific problems or preexistent questions—instead of a collection of data—to which we hope to suggest answers. These questions related, both to the social networks in which teacher education reforms occur, and to the power relations, as regulatory practices, that are embodied in these patterned practices. The culmination of the answer—or of the answers—are the result interpretations as we constructed and built upon one another through interrogations of each others' texts and the theories that guided them.⁵ As things stand, the "theoretical entities" of the studies offer us criteria to explore the complexity of relations in teacher education in different places.

We will use "theoretical entities" such as "power" and "regulation" to construct a comparative methodology for analyzing the case studies. These entities are concretized and located by teacher education as an "arena," a metaphor in which the relations and institutional interactions of actors are dynamically produced and reproduced. Also, different chapters use other "theoretical entities" in order to build their analytical frameworks. (For example, the Spanish case uses Hans Weiler's concept of "compensatory legitimation" in order to explain educational policy of the reconversion of teachers taking place in Spain in the last decades; the Finnish case uses the concept of "corporatism" for analyzing the welfare state as an actor in the field of education, etc.)

We have sought to prevent these "entities" from becoming a procrustean bed into which our ideas, sources, and facts must be fit. They provide a flexible frame to allow an interaction between the phenomena under scrutiny and our theoretical interests. (Kocka, 1982.) Such a frame, however, rejects an eclectic intellectual attitude of the kind Robert Mangabeira Unger properly labels "flaccid eclecticism," which fails to adjust its theoretical instruments to its original aim: "It . . . use[s], in more fragmentary fashion, all the conceptual strategies that betrayed thought to false necessity. Because these strategies no longer belong to a cohesive and deliberate theoretical project, they stop . . . being mistakes" (Unger, 1987, p. 137).

Issues in the Construction of Case Studies

While all of the contributors to this book view the particular practices and events of teacher education as historically and socially situated, there was no agreement upon a specific social

theory, paradigmatic option of research, or, more concretely, specific sets of operational concepts that should be used to describe these relations. In this way we did not work with a previous comparative scheme, although we share some fundamental ideas about the "theoretical entities" that should organize the case studies that follow. This introductory chapter, then, extracts some central comparative ideas and issues concerning the nature of the case studies that are included in this volume.

We felt that pursuing a particular methodological rigor in defining concepts would distort the cases by imposing a single set of logical criteria on historically various phenomena. As such, we sought to prevent ourselves from falling into the trap that has been aptly described by the British social historian Alfred Cobban (incidentally, a defender of some kinds of theoretical history); he has warned of the dangers of research that is "largely concerned with packing its bag (or even with working out a general theory about the way in which a bag should be packed) for a journey which is never taken" (Cobban, 1964, p. 23). We believe, with Pierre Bourdieu, that the complexities of the ongoing world are greater than any theory. While the residues of "instrumental positivism" would have many believe that truth comes with empirical rigor, that view is empirically incorrect and analytically a perversion of science itself.⁶ Such an approach to conceptual rigor in the case of this research would have reduced socially and historical complex and varied phenomena to trivial "variables."

Certainly, the sampling type of generalization, in which operational concepts are applied across sites, is possibly the weakest type of generalization. The more powerful generalizations in science are "vertical" generalizations, in which particular cases are related to each other through concepts and themes that occur when the cases are treated as wholes (Stevens, 1988). Likewise we have attempted to follow Alasdair MacIntyre's suggestion in beginning our project not "by collecting data in the hope of formulating causal generalizations . . . [but] by looking at cases where a will to achieve the same end was realized with greater or lesser success in different cultural contexts." At the end, "what we shall achieve if we study the [cases] springing from such intentions are two or more histories of these projects, and it is only after writing these histories that we shall be able to compare the different outcomes of the same intention" (MacIntyre, 1971, p. 271).

On this regard, our agreement to give coherence through a level of interpretation about institutional patterns occurred also for a number of important methodological reasons. Being our comparative research is based on case studies, we consider our "cases" as heuristic devices suitable for conceiving of generalizations and approaching middle range theory-building—and not just for confirming regularities or for testing or controlling theory (Sartori, 1991; Ragin & Becker, 1992). In this sense, we learned that in each country the epistemic qualities of intellectual life are themselves important problems in the organization of comparative work. Here the infrastructure of research and the production of knowledge in each country is important for the construction of the case studies. In part, this is evident when the cases are compared between countries that have strong state-centered analyses and those that are more concerned with the relation of civil society and government. The central role of parliament and state bureaucracies in the interpretations of Finnish, Portuguese, Spanish, and Swedish cases, for example, has as much to do with the social/historical context of a strong state as does a framework shaped by formal intellectual training in Marxist, Weberian or Durkheimian approaches.

We must also recognize the particular national "reception" of paradigmatic traditions. In some of the studies, arenas of action are interpreted through structural categories, such as the British study of changing patterns of certification in teacher education. The study focuses initially on the practices of the state to regulate and consolidate university practices; subsequently, it focuses on categories of resistance to emphasize the interactive and situational dimensions of practices as they relate to structural considerations. In other studies, institutional relations become the "actors" of teacher education. The Icelandic study, for example, considers the ways in which state actions produce increasingly rationalized teacher education—how those actions produce various institutions that complete and articulate values about schooling and society; yet, because of the smallness of Iceland's population and the continued importance of face-to-face interaction in institution-building, individuals receive a greater emphasis than in the other studies.

This historical quality in the production of knowledge is not easy to identify solely with national boundaries. All of the contributors to this volume have had experience with traditions of ideas that were developed in other contexts. This has occurred

through studies abroad, sabbaticals, and interchanges that take place in the international "markets" of intellectuals.

Differences in the construction of these studies also relate to the use of English as the language of the study. As mentioned in the preface, the formation of these studies involved six meetings in which the language of discussion was English. For those whose working language is other than English, the collaboration presented difficulties in expressing complex thoughts quickly. The collaboration also involved the problem of translating ideas that are appropriate in one context and linguistic form into a different language form.

Additional issues in the construction of studies concern the ways in which scientific narratives are constructed and the availability of data. This is evident in the Spanish and Icelandic cases. In order to study the rationalization of education and teacher education, the Icelandic contributors interviewed all of the major participants in this process, thereby reconstructing the primary sources that one would need to interpret the reforms. In contrast, the British, Swedish, and American cases have an abundance of primary and secondary interpretations upon which one can draw.

The position of the writers in studying teacher education is also important to note. The British were working within a polytechnic college when the writing was done; governmental attacks on teacher education were part of their daily lives, and they have undisguised sympathy for this institution and teacher educators as they confronted new systems of regulation. In contrast, the Icelandic study reflects processes in which the writers themselves were major participants. In addition, in a nation of approximately 260,000, each of the writers routinely acts within those educational circles that are relatively small and built with much face-to-face interaction. In the U.S. study, its author can claim neither involvement with nor first-hand knowledge of most of the actors who are treated; but there is a rich history of texts from which one can reconstruct the events.

The different social "positions" of the researchers are present in each study. One can think of the intellectual as located in fields that entail movement and shifts from face-to-face relations to those of abstract relations that define communities. This shift is itself part of the historical processes of modernization and the establishment of legitimacy and trust.

Finally, in light of the preceding discussion, we would like to emphasize the introduction of history into the analysis, in order

to overcome technical or instrumental discourses about reform and change. Our purpose is to make history a part of the understanding of the present, all the while retaining our reflective approach to the philosophy of science. Although in the various cases there are different conceptions of history, and the uses of historical sources and texts vary in profusion, extent, and analytical insight, all of the case studies consider history—and intrinsically, comparative social research as well—as *a rational attempt at analysis* (Bloch, 1953, p. 13). The histories are different from narrative or “historicist” accounts (which center on a rational understanding of history as a continuous procession of qualitative changes stressing the uniqueness of a certain cultural moment and reality as absolute and unchanging): *story* as an instrumental narrative versus *history* as a narrative where conceptual structures and knowledge are firmly set in their original context of meaning (see Ross, 1991, p. 4; Merquior, 1985, p. 71). In contrast, the histories at the heart of these case studies tend to be institutional and epistemological.

Let us provide some examples. In some of the studies, history is considered, at an epistemological and institutional level, as opposed to a chronological and action-centered view. The British and Icelandic studies are examples of this approach. The British tend to focus on the chronology of events that involve Thatcherism in teacher education. The use of ethnographic data provides a way of understanding both the complexities through which policies move into practice and the various nuances by which it is realized. The Icelandic study, in comparison, focuses on institutional relations and the long-term development of institutions as they interact with government actions. These differences introduce different notions of time and space. The institutional history tends to consider space in relation to organizational and discursive practices, decentering the person and the particular event. The Portuguese and Finnish chapters relate the formations of educational institutions with the changing epistemological structures by which educational phenomena are constructed.

CONSTRUCTING A COMPARATIVE METHODOLOGY

Teacher Education as a Focus in the Changing Regulation of Schooling

We have chosen teacher education as a point of entry into problems of regulation. The content and organization of teacher edu-

cation are central to the agenda of the state as it attempts to modernize educational institutions. Concerted efforts have been made by governmental and nongovernmental agencies to change the ways that teachers are taught and to modify the criteria of evaluation for professional programs. For example, new university certifying bodies have emerged in Great Britain; and new certification rules and university-based organizations have been created in the United States. In a similar manner, consolidation and rationalization of university-based teacher education have been part of the reforms in Finland, Iceland, Sweden, Portugal, and Spain. In each nation, new institutions to plan, organize, and monitor professional education have been created.

Each of these developments signifies changing patterns of regulation and power in teacher education. We can see this at many social and educational levels. At one level, the problems of modernization that arise within nations intrude into the reforming of teacher education. Teacher education reforms thus articulate tensions and conflicts in the economic, demographic, cultural, and political organization of the state. Issues of multiculturalism, regional autonomy, and national identity enter into the discussion of what should be appropriate pedagogical training for new teachers. The reform programs are responses to and part of the changes that occur as nations confront transformations in various sectors of social life. At another level, the national reorganization of teacher education can be seen as a response to the international (or at least industrialized, capitalistic) setting, since interstate agencies evaluate and provide categories to guide reform. This process turns out to be highly significant in the case studies that are presented in this book.

Finally, changes in societal regulation and power are evident in the intersection of universities, research communities, schools, and the state as the reform of teacher education produces new social regulation. This more subtle notion of regulation can be described in brief. Teacher training defines and transmits the permissible boundaries to pedagogical practices through its sanctioning of styles of reasoning and acting. "Foundation courses" in school history and educational psychology use distinctions and categories that both describe phenomena and produce desired kinds of practice. Styles of reasoning, definitional categories, and "accepted" practices in teacher education, all legitimate particular social interests and actions—while at the same time they omit other possibilities.

Two notions of regulation that relate power to teacher education are introduced in the case studies. One is the repressive notion of power—which prohibits and restrains. This notion of power pertains to a concept of sovereignty in which some “groups,” “forces,” or individuals make and “own” the decisions that enable one to distinguish between rulers and ruled. In teacher education, for example, there are many actors who articulate their interests, as social, cultural, political, and economic transformations occur within society. Demands that teacher education pay greater attention to teaching content, such as science or mathematics, represent one such interest of business, commercial, and professional organizations. Similarly, certification rules for new teachers respond to the interests of administrative agencies in the exercise of their power. In short, curriculum emphasis, administrative rules, and research agendas are representative of certain groups who have power to define what is legitimate and reasonable for schooling.

The production of standards, rules, and regulatory bodies have appeared to give administrative direction and steering to professional work. The parliamentary laws, new certification requirements for teachers, and regulatory agencies for universities that appear in different countries are part of this pattern of regulation. These actions are often related to national concerns about modernization, even though there are few straightforward ways that changes in the educational arena improve the economy, foster democracy, and so on. In part, the study of regulation consists of exploring the actors who produce and implement such regulations.

Reference to power-as-sovereignty helps the analyst to identify the relative position of actors in the arena of education. When power-as-sovereignty is treated subtly, attention to power reveals how competing groups enter into an arena as policy is developed and implemented, and demonstrates that outcomes are never certain. The British and Icelandic case studies, for example, compel us to consider a range of practices that redefine the formal intent of state planning.

The sovereignty notion of power, by itself, tends to encourage dichotomous thinking about the world, in which there are oppressors and oppressed—who, because they lack power, are presumed to be socially righteous. A second but related notion of power concerns the effects of power as it circulates through institutionalized practices and individuals construct boundaries for

themselves, define categories of good/bad, and envision possibilities. Power, in this latter sense, is intricately bound to the rules, standards, and styles of reasoning by which individuals speak, think, and act in producing their everyday world.

In the context of teacher education reform, this second notion of power is a function of knowledge. The ways individuals understand and interpret the world act as mechanisms of self-discipline; knowledge constrains and produces options and possibilities. What is judged to be reasonable and good in teaching, or irrational and bad, what practices we feel good or guilty about, and what are considered normal or abnormal are, in this sense of power, regulatory. The standards for teacher credentialing, the categories and distinctions of research, and the concepts that underlie the professionalization of teaching are examples of mechanisms that channel thought and behavior. We often forget to acknowledge that the language that is used to define teaching is a constraining element, since language frames and fashions thought.

Regulation has an additional meaning that is contained in the distinctions, categories, and standards that are embodied in the patterns of communication (discursive practices) of teacher education. This second notion of regulation refers to how the production of various texts about teacher education are part of the power relations in which education exists. In the various reports and the research practices in each country are definitions about what is possible to speak about, who is to speak, and what is to be suppressed. The concern of analysis is how the categories and distinctions of reform mobilize possibilities about what is to be believed and what is to be sought as teachers are to construct personal competence and practice.

Our discussion of regulation in teacher education, therefore, involves the two notions of power that were discussed above. One, power-as-sovereignty, emphasizes the actors and "forces" that are in the arena of teacher education and the interests that they represent. The other, power-as-a-function-of-knowledge, emphasizes the ways in which the standards and rules for thinking about teaching and professional education produce constraints through the construction of institutional practices. It also emphasizes the historical conditions in which certain kinds of speech prevail to organize and discipline individual perception, experiences, and actions.

The two dimensions of regulation can be examined by

addressing the mobilization of research communities. The current teacher education reforms in each of the countries that appear in this study presuppose the development of research groups that focus on teacher education. After World War II, educational reforms in Finland, Iceland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States saw the emergence of a specific, sectoral research. In each case, particular cadres of researchers were organized to plan, coordinate, and evaluate strategies of reform; although there were national differences in the relation of the state to educational arenas and the epistemologies of research (see, e.g., Whitty, 1985; Lundgren, 1989; Popkewitz, 1984). New groups of researchers who define their specialty as teacher education have appeared in the past decade in Iceland, Great Britain, Sweden, and the United States. Iceland, Portugal, and Spain have mobilized scientific educational communities whose previous influence was marginal. (Although, for the case of Spain, there was a relevant reform movement on teacher education as a leading part of a platform of social reforms during the Second Republic, at the beginning of the 1930s, the training of teachers—as well as their social status—was to be made a part of higher education even before countries such as France and the United Kingdom. These reforms were suppressed by Franco's regime, and even today their coherence and depth have not been paralleled.) In each of these research efforts, however, the duality of regulation in professional education is evident: it signals actors who are to rationalize and administratively order institutional processes, and it provides discursive practices that contain rules about what is reasonable, valid, and possible.

The sovereignty and knowledge notions of power are not oppositional categories. They are part of the social relations in which the management of schooling occurs in specific arenas, although the weaving of institutional and epistemological practices is not linear, reductive, or evolutionary. In the following discussion, the sovereignty notion of power is used to consider the arena in which teacher education occurs. In a later section, the knowledge/power relation is reintroduced through a discussion of discursive practices, in order to consider the multiple layers in which power operates.

Social Arenas

A productive way to consider the two different layers of power is to think of teacher education as a social arena in which various

social actors are located. These actors may be governmental bodies, such as parliaments, national ministries of education, national certifying boards, or subnational departments of education. They may also include institutions that affect the processes of teacher education, such as universities, colleges, and polytechnic schools. In some countries, professional organizations and unions interrelate with other actors to determine policy; in others (such as the United States) philanthropic foundations provide an important set of actors in the formulation and realization of educational policy.

The notion of social arena enables us to consider the various actors in teacher education as existing within a multidimensional space. The advantage of this conception is that it prompts us to consider how the positions and strategies of actors relate to each other. Actors interact and seek to maximize the potential of their positions within the arena. Thus, in the American "Holmes" reports (1986, 1990), deans of university schools of education can be viewed as actors in a social arena in which universities vie with governmental agencies for cultural and social legitimacy.

In this volume, when we consider teacher education as an arena, we will focus on the relations and interactions among institutions. At the same time, we will treat these patterns historically; that is, we will show how social relations are structured by past practices and how they are continually restructured and reconstituted in time and space. The arena of teacher education entails dynamic interactions, changing locations, and strategies that occur to produce regulations in teacher education. Each actor is positioned within the arena and engages a variety of strategies to maintain or to gain resources. The resources gained may be financial (for example, to hire faculty, to buy more equipment, or to gain more office space). Alternately, the resources may consist of social and cultural legitimacy—as each actor seeks to be heard as the authoritative voice concerning teacher education.

For didactic purposes, the relations in the arena of teacher education are expressed in figure 1.1. The schema is a general map that is intended to orient the reader to the social and institutional relations that are explored in the case studies. The arena is not composed of formal categories but, rather, of interrelated sites in which regulations form. For example, structural tensions that exist outside of teacher education become a part of the horizon in which educational practices occur. By horizon, we

mean that these tensions are part of the background of social conditions in which educational practices are debated and outcomes produced; sometimes they are given explicit attention in educational discourses through slogans (e.g., national security, a nation at risk, or economic competition), but they are rarely examined systematically. Global economic tensions, cultural debates among competing national groups, and demographic shifts produce "audiences" for which educational programs are formed. However, it is important to recognize that schooling is itself a dynamic in society; the regulatory practices of schooling do not "merely" respond to social forces; they are also productive in society and have implications for social formations. The various elements "stand in relation to each other and are defined by their historical position in the arena."

In offering such a schema, we hope that its advantages outweigh its limitations. In particular, we are reluctant to collapse important complexities into formal and seemingly unyielding categories. We hope that the reader will forgive our aesthetic limitations and accept the intent of the figure: to express some of the interrelationships that exist in the arena of teacher education. For each case study, the plot should help to reveal the paths that have been taken within national contexts, enabling the reader to focus upon the particular historical configurations and power arrangements that underlie emergent patterns.

Institutional Relations and "Actors"

The arena in teacher education can be described through its institutional relations and actors. We can view these institutional relations as articulating one dimension of social regulation and power. Thus, on certain issues, combinations of actors emerge to establish what is legitimate and reasonable for the conduct of teacher education. The patterns involve coalitions that form within and across institutions. For example, a particular grouping within university teacher education may align with state agencies as policy is formulated and realized.

Governmental Actors in the Teacher Education Arena

As might be expected, different state governing patterns produce different emphases and actors. For example, in the U.S., the channels in which policy is formulated and planning occurs are less than obvious, because the interrelation of federal and local state governments creates the erroneous impression of a state-