

Martti T. Kuikka

Teachers for Secondary Schools, Especially Teacher Training in Finland 1780–1980

Introduction

The first secondary school, called the cathedral school, was established in Turku in 1389, but pedagogical training for teachers began much later, in the 1780s. At that time there were three types of secondary schools: pedagogies, i.e. preparatory schools, schools providing instruction in the trivium, i.e. grammar, rhetoric and logic, and gymnasiums. The principal aim of the schools was to educate public servants, both for the Crown and for the Church. (Kiuasmaa 1982, 657)

In my paper I will describe the development of teacher training during three periods. In the first period (1780–1827), a pedagogical institute was connected to the Academy of Turku. The second period began in the 1860s and continued until the 1970s. This period can be called the time of Normal Lyceums. The third, period began in the 1970s, with the enactment of the new Law on teacher training. According to this Law, universities were given the main responsibility for teacher training.

The first period (1780–1827)

Teachers were trained for secondary schools, after 1640, at the Academy of Turku. Their main subjects were usually studies in the Faculty of Philosophy, their studies including such humanistic subjects as classical languages and history. Teachers of religious instruction studied in the Faculty of Theology. At the Academy, pedagogical research was connected with philosophy as early as in the 17th century. Pedagogy was not an independent science. Professor Henrik Gab-

riel Porthan took notice of this problem and, wanted to reform the teaching. He worried about students who worked as tutors in homes in order to get money for their studies. Often students worked tutors for one to two years. Porthan began giving lectures in the 1780s for students who wanted to work later as tutors or teachers in secondary schools. He concentrated his lectures on basic knowledge related to the teaching of subjects, such as mathematics, Latin, and Swedish. His aim was for every student to be able to follow his lectures and to pass the examinations in pedagogy (Sainio 1953; Kuikka 1984).

But lectures were not enough. Porthan planned to establish a pedagogical institute (seminary) for the practical training of teachers for secondary schools. His initiative was later accepted by the Academy of Turku and by the chancellors of the universities in Sweden. Porthan did not live to see this institute in practice. It began three years after his death. Porthan's goal was to enhance the qualifications of teachers (Sainio 1953).

The institute, often called a pedagogical seminary, started in 1807. One of its aims was to connect the theory and practice of teaching. However, the activity of this seminary was not as successful -as generally expected- The regulations of this seminary did not reinforced practical activity. The seminary had not one lecturer whose task was to give lectures and to guide practical training in the schools in the town of Turku. More teachers [were?] needed but nobody was interested in development. At that time a teaching of career did not entice students, salaries were very low. Another thing was the length of the studies. The curriculum was very broad and it often took three more years after having studied at the Academy. It was not possible to get grants. It seems that the same trends were visible in Germany and Sweden; there was not motivation for teacher training. (Sainio 1953; Hanho 1955 I, 115–117)

The practical training consisted of the tasks for students to observe teaching and to participate in ex-tempore exercises.

This meant that a teacher candidate was given the theme for his own lesson only a half-hour before beginning. So, he had a very short time to prepare the lesson. These exercises were necessary. Every teacher had to give a so-called demonstration lessons in front of the chapter, and they decided whether to accept it. After this, teachers could apply for positions in secondary schools. These demonstration lessons were one part of the teaching of qualifications. (Hanho 1955 I, 116–117)

Porthan worked at the Academy of Turku and had close cooperation with Swedish universities as well as those in the other Nordic countries. But the political situation changed in 1808-1809. After the war, Finland was severed from Sweden and became connected with Russia. The first decade (1810 - 1820) was a time of status quo. The Czars aimed to stop, the educational reform; This era was called the time of bureaucracy. Therefore, the seminary in Turku had to close in 1827. In fact, Finns wanted to consider new solutions. Odert Gripenberg proposed the establishment of a Normal Lyceum. Professor Melartin wanted to establish a professorship in pedagogy at the university. But these plans were not accepted by the Czars. However, these remained alive in the school Commissions, which tried to initiate a new curriculum and a new structure in the Finnish school system (Hanho 1955 II, 180; Kuikka 1997, 48–49)

The second period: a era of the Normal Lyceum (1864–

T*he static time continued until 1843. when the new school decree was accepted by the Czar. The structure of secondary education changed, with the lower and upper elementary schools being made the basis for entering the gymnasium (Koulujärjestys 1843). This decision set three positive principles. It opened 2-year girls' schools for the daughters of the gentry to be instructed in housekeeping skills and the manners of polite society. Earlier, in the 18th century, and now this pro-*

cedure was extended to Finland. Another important principle was the teaching of the Finnish language as a new subject in secondary schools. The language of teaching continued to be Swedish. The third principle was physical training (sport), which was a new subject in schools. The school decree of 1843 had no new principles for teacher training. At the same time, a great discussion arose about elementary school teachers and their training. (Kuikka 1997, 52)

Docent J. V. Snellman, the Finnish philosopher and journalist, turned his attention in the end of the 1840s to secondary schools and their teachers. He criticised the results of schools and emphasized the development of teacher training; if we expect better results, we need qualified teachers. (Hanho 1955 II, 66–67, 181–182)

The year 1848 in Europe was full of political tension, which had an effect on Finland. Russian officials sought to isolate the empire from new and radical ideas. Political tension simultaneously increased in several parts of Russia. In 1850, a censorship decree was given in Finland that nearly ended all public discussion. (Kuikka 1997, 53.) Therefore, it was very interesting to see that two new posts were established at the University of Helsinki. One was a lecturership in the Finnish' language and, in 1852, a professorship was created especially for pedagogy and didactics. This was the first such post in any Nordic university. So, the initiative of J. V. Snellman was accepted, and the Czar wanted to develop the University of Helsinki. (Päivänsalo 1971, 55–56; Kuikka 1997, 57)

There was a major change in the development of the Finnish society with the new emperor in 1856. In the same year the new decree was accepted. According to this decree, there were to be three types of schools: elementary schools, secondary schools and gymnasiums. Teacher training was part of this decree. Students who wished to become elementary school or secondary school teachers had to register in the Faculty of Theology and pass one course in pedagogy, under the

Professor of Pedagogy. After that, they had practice teacher training in schools. The school decree included the personal requirements for teachers: a teacher should be good natured and live blamel ess life. His or her behaviour and thinking should awaken in the students respect for courage and an attachment with their teacher. (Asetus 1856)

All were not satisfied with the decree of 1856. A proposal to establish Normal Lyceums arose again from many quarters. In 1860, a meeting of secondary schools teachers in Turku wanted to promote this plan. At the University of Helsinki, M. Akiander and J. V. Snellman, who was appointed to the professorship in philosophy in 1856, formulated their own proposal at the same time. The chapter of Porvoo wanted to promote this reform. Later this plan was accepted by the Czar. In practice, the plan for Normal lyceum was realised with the choosing of three teachers to spend 1.5 years visiting the Nordic countries, Belgium, England, Germany and France, in order to plan the appropriate training of teachers for secondary schools. After this visit, they wrote a report and formulated guidelines for Normal Lyceums in Finland. Professor Z. J. Cleve was interested in teacher training and had visited the Nordic countries and Middle Europe. In 1864, he formulated a proposal for a decree concerning the founding of a Normal Lyceum and setting its aims. A Normal Lyceum would have two main aims. It would be a model school for others, especially its curriculum, and secondly it would be a training school for secondary school teachers. Clevels proposal was based on a teacher training college in Germany under the leadership of K. V. Stoy. This college, close to J. F. Herbart's pedagogy, had a normal lyceum too. The first normal lyceum started in Helsinki in 1864, and it was a Swedish-language school. A Finnish language department was established in connection of the Normal lyceum in 1867. It was transferred to Hämeenlinna in 1873 and back to Helsinki 1887. (Hanho 1955 II, 188–190)

The main task of the professor in pedagogy was to develop teacher training. One problem arose in the 1870s when the responsibility for the organisation of this training consisted of three parties. In Addition to the university professor and the Normal Lyceum there was also the National Board of Education, founded in 1870. The Normal Lyceums wanted to be more independent to decide on their own practical training. The role of the National Board of Education was to reinforce the status of teacher training through regulations. The responsibility of the Professor in Pedagogy was to give lectures on general didactic guidelines and principles and to concentrate on developing the studies of educational sciences at the university, both for basic education and further education. Students who aimed to work in secondary schools – after receiving an academic master's degree in the subject(s) he or she wanted to teach – participated in a one-year practice teaching program offered at normal lyceums. A university examination-in pedagogy – the lowest of three grades – was yet another requirement for a qualified secondary school teacher. The main part of practical teacher training was the responsibility of normal lyceums. For inst, demonstration lessons were now in the Normal lyceum. (Asetus 1869; Asetus 1873; Kiuasmaa 1982, 660; Kuikka 1984, 28–33)

The structure of practical teacher training remained nearly the same until the 1870s. The number of Normal Lyceums increased to 8. Normal Lyceums had special–senior–teachers who were responsible for practical training in their own specific subject. They were to guide the lessons of the teacher candidates and to hold subject meetings, which consisted of discussion about the teaching of specific subjects (Kiuasmaa 1982, 237–239, 378–379).

The practical teacher training of secondary school teachers continuously aroused critical comments. Practical training concentrated only on one or two subjects: integration did not

exist. Further education was not organised. Continuing education was only voluntary. Many teachers' unions began to organise at the beginning of the 20th century. One critical comment was the lack of research activities. Furthermore, all teacher candidates were evaluated after one-year of practical training to receive credit for their teaching skill. But what were criteria for this kind of evaluation?

According to Kiuasmaa, in the late 19th century, secondary school teachers still came mainly from the upper social classes – civil servants, clergy, wealthy burghers and yeoman. In the 1920's, however, clear signs of democratization were seen – mainly as a result of the Fennicization of cultural life. The majority of teachers, then were recruited from the middle classes. At the end of the 1960s, the breakdown of teachers for secondary schools, by social background, was as follows: the middle and lower middle-class comprised 53 per cent, the agrarian population, 20 per cent, the upper and middle upper class, 16, per cent, and the working class, 11 per cent. (Kiuasmaa 1982, 660)

The third period (1971–

T*he reform of teacher training in the 1970s started already in the 1960s, with the discussion about the structure of the school system. From 1866 there had been a parallel school system: public education had elementary schools and their own teacher training colleges, while secondary schools had their teacher practical training in Norma Lyceums. The discussion on education was widely followed. There were high hopes for the comprehensive school, but doubts as well: the reform concerned both pedagogical and organisational issues. Parliament participated in the discussion in a more active way than even before. Although public discussion continued to be very active. Parliament attempted to bring to process promptly to a conclusion. In 1967, the Government introduced a bill in Par-*

liament on the principles of the education reform. Realisation of educational equality was a central idea. It would grant everyone to the same opportunities to continue their studies, from com-prehensive school trough to university. This Law required new schools, which required reform in teacher training, which contributed to the development of higher education. In 1971, a new Law on Teacher Training was passed: it transferred teacher training to the universities. Elementary school training institutes were closed and staff was employed by the new teacher training units founded in the universities. The objective of the reform was to standardise teacher training and to apply the principle of continuous education. The teacher of the future would be an education expert, teaching various groups, giving guidance in studies, and acting as a planner and, stimulator (Laki 1971; Kuikka 1997,117,127-128)

The 1971 law transferred teacher training to the universities, with the educational requirement being a Masterls decree. The change in the strueture is described in the following diagram:

Practical training Normal Lyceum	Practical training Normal Lyceum
Subject(s) studies Examination the university	Subjects studies & pedagogical studies Examination the university
.....
The structure 1864-	The structure 1971-

What were the new principles?

Students who wanted to participate in pedagogical studies to become a teacher had to apply to a teacher training college after their second or third years of subject studies. The number of applicants varied in different years, but there was not room for everyone to be admitted. The main aim of the reform was that students had to choose a teaching career earlier

than before. Previously students made this choice after an examination at the university. The old story has it that they applied for practical teacher training when they were not accepted at any other work place. One important aim was to get motivated students who would become motivated teachers. The second, important principle was related to cooperation between subject studies and pedagogical studies, in other words, to try to unite theory and practice. Earlier, they were very far from each other and often were placed in different study years. With the realisation of this principle, many professorships for subject didactics were established in teacher training colleges. There were professorships, for example, in the didactics of mathematics and the didactics of foreign languages. This type of organisation led to much discussion within the universities. Many of the university institutions wanted to get these professorships for themselves. Their argument was to combine theory and practice in their own research, for example, in the mathematical sciences, in history and in geography. But these subject didactics professorships were placed in teacher training colleges with the justification that teacher candidates, through their own practical teaching, would learn to connect, for example mathematics and the didactics of mathematics.

The third principle was to connect the studies of subjects in the universities with practical teaching training in Normal Lyceums and other secondary schools. This meant that teacher candidates learned to know their subject better and better all the time while at the same time, they were able to follow how teachers taught scientific results in the school classroom with pupils. In other words, an attempt was made to reduce the gap between research done at the universities and the teaching in the secondary schools.

Another principle of the new teacher training was an attempt to reduce the gap between different teacher categories and to promote cooperation. The extension of qualification of

teachers was discussed. Teachers could extend their qualifications by passing certain courses, which would allow them to teach on other school level such as in . secondary schools. Many teachers 1 unions accepted this principle in theory, but in practice they criticised it very much, fearing the possibility of unemployment.

New principles were formulated by the committee in 1975, and, were reinforced by the decree of 1978. This meant that the universities and teacher training departments had an essential role to play in the development of teacher training. This also meant, first of all, an increase in research activities in the didactics of subjects, and, more than earlier, cooperation between the universities and the Normal lyceums. At the same time, practical teacher training was to be realised in levels other than in comprehensive schools and in schools other than Normal Lyceums. (Komitea 1975; Asetus 1978)

The role of Normal Lyceums in the new teacher training led to intense discussion. Some teachers criticised this kind of system, wanting to discontinue ordinary schools for practical unions defended their tasks by pilot schools and research schools. Normal Lyceums their activities but with new guidelines.

Summary

In this paper I have described the development of teacher education for secondary school teachers. in Finland from 1780–1980 divided into three periods. We can analyse the following results.

Secondary school teachers must complete a university programme usually taking a Masterls decree. Therefore they have received scientific education in subject area. In the last century, further education was discussed and began to be realised in the 1970s. The second essential subject was pedagogy.

Professor H. G. Porthan began lecturing in pedagogy in the 1780s, and later, in 1852, the first professorship in pedagogy was established at the University of Helsinki. Pedagogy became university discipline which was a qualification requirement for teachers. Didactics was one part of pedagogy, and had a practical and normative task in teacher training. In the 1970s, didactic research became a very important factor, when both general didactics and subject didactics took on new tasks in the reform of the school system and with the increase of professorships in teacher training colleges.

The third part focused on practice teaching Teacher candidates in the Turku seminary visited ordinary schools (1806–1827). Later, Normal Lyceums were the essential schools, being very independent and creating their own traditions. Change came in the 1970s, when responsibility for Normal Lyceums were transferred to the universities. This meant a gradual, closer cooperation between different departments at the universities. The role of the Normal Lyceums changed, as they became pilotschools and, schools for research. Practical teaching training began to be organised in other schools, more than earlier.

The fourth point referred to the selection of teachers. Earlier, the choice of a teaching was actually after made completing a university decree. Since the 1970s, students take an entrance examination after their second or third year of studies. The aim is to get motivated students and motivated teachers.

References

Asetus 1856. Hans Kejslerliga Majestäts Nådiga Förordning angående blifwande Gymnasii och Skollärares bildning wid Alexanders-Universitet 7.4.1856.

Asetus 1869. Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen asetus koulunopettajiksi aikovain valmistuksesta Aleksanterin yliopistossa ja

niistä opinkokeista, jotka koulunopettajan virkaan hakijan pitää suorittaman 24.11.1869.

Asetus 1873a. Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen asetus normaali-lyceumista Suomessa 29.5.1873.

Asetus 1873b. Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen asetus koulunopettajiksi aikowain valmistuksesta Suomen Aleksanterin-yliopistossa ja niistä opinnäytteistä, jotka koulunopettajan virkaan hakijan pitää suorittaa 10.7.1873.

Asetus 1978. Asetus kasvatustieteellisistä tutkinnoista ja opinnoista 29.6.1978.

Hanko J. T. 1947, 1955. Suomen oppikoululaitoksen historia I–II. Porvoo.

Kiuasmaa K. 1982. Oppikoulu 1880–1980. Oulu.

Komitea 1975. Vuoden r. 1975 opettajankoulutustoimikunnan mietintö. Helsinki.

Koulujärjestys 1843. Hans Kejslerliga Majestäts Nådiga Gymnasii och Skolordning för Storfurstendömet Finland 6.11.1843.

*Kuikka M. T. 1984. Didaktiikan asema suomalaisen opettajankoulutuksen alkuvaiheissa 1800-luvulla. Teoksessa *Koulu ja Menneisyys*. Suomen Kouluhistoriallisen Seuran vuosikirja 1984. 7–39.*

Kuikka M. T. 1997. A History of Finnish Education. Keuruu.

Laki 1968. Laki koulujärjestelmän perusteista 467/1968.

Laki 1971. Opettajankoulutuslaki 844/1971.

Päivänsalo P. 1971. Kasvatuksen tutkimuksen historia Suomessa vuoteen 1970. Helsinki.

Sainio M. 1953. Kasvatuksen ongelma 1800-luvun suomalaisessa teologiassa. Jyväskylän kasvatustieteellisen korkeakoulun julkaisuja. Jyväskylä.