

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Raiker, Andrea; Mäensivu, Marja; Nikkola, Tiina

Title: The role of the teacher in educating for democracy

Year: 2017

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Raiker, A., Mäensivu, M., & Nikkola, T. (2017). The role of the teacher in educating for democracy. In A. Raiker, & M. Rautiainen (Eds.), *Educating for Democracy in England and Finland : Principles and Culture* (pp. 27-41). Routledge. Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education.

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Chapter 3

The role of the teacher in educating for democracy

Andrea Raiker, Marja Mäensivu & Tiina Nikkola

Introduction

In England and Finland, the role of the teacher is regarded as pivotal for development of conceptions of democracy. The UK *Teacher Standards* (DfE, 2012:10) explicitly states that teachers will demonstrate high standards of ethics ‘...by not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy...’, implying that teachers know and understand the nature of democracy and will teach it directly in citizenship lessons or indirectly via the ‘hidden curriculum’. Also in Finland, the value base concerning democracy, equality and active agency in civil society is embedded in the basic curriculum of the *National Core Curriculum* (Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014:12-13) and in the *Basic Education Act* (MoJ, 1998:1:22). Although it is not directly articulated, development of conceptions of these values is seen as the responsibility of teachers because they are the ones who can demonstrate these values every day in their classrooms.

This chapter will examine the role of the teacher in educating for democracy by comparing education policy documents and practice in England and Finland with the conception of the ‘progressive teacher’ proposed by Paulo Freire, the internationally renowned Brazilian philosopher and educator, whose experiences led him to a very political understanding of education as a force for democracy. He also contextualised education in historical, cultural and social as well as in political terms. As the purpose of this book is, in part, to research the relationship between democratic values and political ideologies in England and in Finland, we argue that comparisons with Freire’s thinking will provide meaningful and informative insights.

Although the pivotal role of the teacher in educating for democracy is advocated by Freire, his writings, particularly the fourth letter in his *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach* (2008), make it clear that he considers that only teachers with certain attributes are capable of educating for democracy. For example, on discussing elitist versus democratic approaches to teaching, he comments that he:

...cannot see how one could reconcile adherence to an ideal of democracy and of overcoming prejudice with a proud or arrogant posture in which one feels full of oneself. How can I listen to the other, how can I hold a dialogue, if I can only listen to myself... (Freire, 2008:208)

In this extract, Freire is describing the conservative or traditional teacher described in detail in *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2000). Shaul in his introduction to this translation

reflects on the parallels between teaching in modern technologized societies and in teaching illiterates in Latin America. He concludes that in both scenarios, teaching can result in ‘... rapidly making objects of most of us and subtly programming us into conformity to the logic of its system’ (Freire, 2000:33). Such a teacher could be termed a ‘competent technician’ who is awarded with the designation of competence by the dominant elite, and acts on behalf of that elite as a narrator of a curriculum prescribed by that elite. ‘Narration’, writes Freire, considering the effect on pupils of the teacher as narrator:

...leads [them] to memorise mechanically the narrated content... it turns them into ‘containers’, into ‘receptacles to be filled’ by the teacher. The more completely she fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are. (Freire, 2000:71)

Freire contrasts this ‘banking’, authoritarian and undemocratic concept of teaching with that of ‘progressive’ teaching. The progressive teacher will not only be competent in the sense of ‘scientific competence’, but also in the spheres of affection and creativity. For Freire, the learning process itself is a creative force; it is other-seeking and dialogic. To be progressive, teachers must be aware of and empathise with the ways individual students learn based on their very personal experiences resulting in their unique ‘reading of the world’. Students should:

...have full responsibility as an actor with knowledge and not as a recipient of the teacher’s discourse. In a final analysis this is the major political act of teaching. Among other elements, this is the one which makes the progressive educator different from the reactionary educator (Freire & Macedo, 1993:47-48).

Encouraging students to speak, to give them voice, is fundamental to the democratic process. In order to give voice, Freire advocates questioning and engaging with the dialogic, with purposeful discussion, as necessary strategies to elicit students’ prior knowledge and understanding. Although the teacher assuming the role of facilitator is regarded by many educators as being a democratisation of power in the seminar and classroom, Freire is dismissive of the notion. By diminishing emphasis on:

...the teacher’s power by claiming to be a facilitator, one is being less than truthful to the extent that the teacher turned facilitator maintains the power institutionally created in the position. That is, while facilitators may veil their power, at any moment they can exercise power as they wish... (Freire & Macedo, 1999:47).

This chapter will now consider the extent to which the role of the teacher in England and Finland supports education for democracy through critical examination of policy and practice in teacher education (teacher education) focused particularly on Freire’s categories of scientific competence, affection, facilitation, questioning, engaging with the dialogic, and generally on the creative and democratic process of learning.

The role of the teacher in England

According to Allen and Toplis (2013) in their contribution to a textbook on learning to teach in the secondary school, ‘...your primary role as expected by a prospective employer is to *teach the curriculum* [original emphasis], with the aspiration being every pupil in the class achieves the learning outcomes for each of your lessons...’ This is no different from countries as politically diverse as the United States of America (USA) and China. By ‘curriculum’ is meant the formal curriculum that is laid down by government as the *National Curriculum* (2014), comprising of overarching principles and specific subject content to be covered. The *National Curriculum*, when introduced in 1988, was substantial in size and highly prescriptive. Each subject had an appendix containing description of attainment levels, indicative of the required achievement of each child at the end of a specific teaching year. Reviews and subsequent redrafted and published documents, in 1999 and 2014, have reduced the *National Curriculum* in size and prescription. Attainment levels have been abolished. There is more scope for teachers to choose content and pedagogical approaches. This is similar to the USA, but not to China where the central role of a teacher is to work with a prescribed curriculum in depth with no or little opportunity to deviate from that curriculum (Yang, 2007).

In England the quality of specific subject content, or subject content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), giving entry into Initial Teacher Education courses for secondary education has been identified by government as a cause for concern because children’s achievement in international tests is declining. International comparisons in education are becoming increasingly important. Governments throughout the world are using them to identify nations that are high achieving. For the neo-liberalist British government, the interest lies in acquiring information ‘...on how we’re doing compared with our international competitors’ (DfE, 2010:3). The most recent OECD PISA survey of 65 countries (OECD, 2014) shows that the performance of children in the UK is continuing to fall in comparison with other countries. Since the 2000 survey, the UK has slipped from seventh to twenty-third in reading, although this shows improvement over the 2009 PISA position of twenty-fifth. In mathematics, the UK has fallen from eight to twenty-sixth and from fourth to twenty-first in science. The mean score of the UK was 496, with a ranking of 24th; of the USA 481 at 36th; and China Shanghai at 613 (1st), China Hong Kong at 563 (3rd), China Taipei 560 (4th): and China Macau 53 (6th). The British government has extensively studied the education systems of top-performing countries such as China Shanghai, Canada, Singapore, Finland, South Korea and has concluded that a major cause is inadequate teacher subject knowledge. Therefore only graduates having lower second degrees and above are now funded for teacher education (DfE 2010). Despite Freire’s assertion that ‘narration’ turns students ‘...into ‘containers’, into ‘receptacles to be filled’ by the teacher’, graduates aiming at becoming secondary teachers must have good subject and curriculum knowledge. The Chinese approach to tight control of teaching and teachers certainly ensures that. In England, teacher education secondary courses expand subject knowledge but courses are generally only a year induration with a minimum of 24 weeks in school. This means that the expansion of subject knowledge must be pragmatic and didactic. Likewise, in school the role of the teacher is to

deliver the curriculum in a form that can be learnt. Constraints of time mean that essential knowledge has to be delivered didactically, or by narrative. However, like the USA, the UK's policy frameworks determining teacher education go beyond the narrative.

The role of the teacher in England is determined by the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012) which define the minimum level of specified competences to be achieved for the award of Qualified Teacher Status, a benchmark that can subsequently be used for future continuing development (CPD). The eight teaching standards and three statements defining personal and professional conduct are given in Table 3.1 below.

<Table 3.1 here>

Each standard and the first statement are broken down as a series of bullet points to be used as the bases for assessment and CPD (DfE, 2012). It can be seen that the demonstration of good subject and curriculum knowledge, what Freire would describe as 'scientific knowledge' has no exalted position in the eight teaching standards. Even the *Initial Teacher Education Handbook* which is used by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills' (Ofsted) inspectors to assess the quality of initial teacher education providers goes beyond subject knowledge and its transmission, stating that inspections are '...to evaluate the quality of teaching and training, and their contribution to the learning of children/pupils/learners' (2015:15). Strong subject knowledge is regarded as embedded within, but not synonymous with, learning; emphasis is placed on the environments and interactive processes that should be established by the teacher to maximise the learning of subject knowledge according to socio-constructivist principles. This supports a learner-centred approach to education, resonating with the position taken in the USA but not in China, where education is viewed as teacher-directed and content orientated. The English/USA approach echoes Freire's view of learning being a creative and dialogic process. Despite the underpinning need for accountability driving teaching and learning in the UK (see Chapter 8), the approach to teaching and teacher training in England goes beyond the 'banking', and therefore undemocratic concept of teaching, into the realms of 'affective teaching'.

The importance placed on environments and processes in the *Teachers' Standards* to promote learning reflect Freire's identification of 'affection' as being a necessary attribute of the progressive teacher, and hence of teacher educators. By affection, Freire means a particular form of love:

...I mean...the very process of teaching; to discover how beautiful it is to be involved in the process of teaching to the extent of the process of teaching is directed towards the process of education, which is rather different from training. (Freire & Macedo, 1995:20).

Freire considers 'training' to be a word with immoral overtones and semantic limitations. In England, teacher education is commonly termed 'teacher training and student teachers are

called 'trainees'. 'Training' suggests external direction with elements of coercion so that a sequential pattern of events occurs to achieve a prescribed outcome. There are certainly aspects of the English system that support the use of the term 'training' rather than education: the rigorous Ofsted inspections of initial teacher education providers against the *Teachers' Standards* and a variety of other statutory frameworks; the right of Ofsted inspectors to place providers in special measures or even have their licenses to award QTS rescinded.

However, the argument presented here is that the *Teachers' Standards*, because they require the adaption of '...teaching to meet the strengths and needs of all pupils' and the establishment of behavioural norms '...to ensure a good and safe learning environment', do encourage Freire's conception of the word 'love' by incorporating elements of 'concern', used here in the Heideggerian sense. The *Teachers' Standards* encourage an approach to teaching where the learners are challenged, assimilate and take ownership for what they have observed and understood during a learning event; in other words they are both concerned about and have a concern for their learning. Thus love, concern and empathy emanate from the processes and environments, which can be understood as 'events', and are established by the teacher to embrace the learner so that learning is maximised. In creating and managing teaching events, the teacher is acting as a facilitator. This is not relinquishing power, as Freire maintains, but sharing power from a position of pedagogic confidence and competence. Teacher educators and teachers show their concern, not only in the seminar and classrooms, but also in the pastoral care which is an essential aspect of their role and in the long hours they work to adapt their lesson plans and teaching to the strengths, areas for improvement and needs of their learners. An initial teacher education provider is never placed in special measures through being awarded the lowest grading, in the range 'outstanding', 'good', 'requires improvement' and 'inadequate', because of lack of love. There are strong and deep historical and cultural roots to affective learning in England. As Pepin (1999) points out, the learner-centred and individualistic education seen throughout primary, secondary and tertiary phases in England is philosophically based in humanism, a philosophy that gained ground during the English Renaissance and Enlightenment periods of the 16th and 17th centuries and was taken across the Atlantic by the settlers who were instrumental in founding the USA. According to Pepin (1999:126), humanism '...assumes that to acquire knowledge is not a logical, sequential and standardised process, as rationalists would claim, but learning is regarded as 'intuitive'. Standardised, methodical, systematic learning is not reconcilable with this view of education'. This latter approach to learning is indicative of the Chinese method which is heavily dependent on rote-learning, repetition and the memorising of information. In contrast, in the USA and England, teachers are seen as managers of learning but sharing that responsibility with their pupils so that they will profit from individualisation of experiences; group work, cooperation and collaboration in learning are considered essential.

It appears that the aim of consecutive UK governments since and including that of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s is to constrain and redirect a cultural stream that has existed for over 500 years. It could be argued that this could be a cause of the continuous publication of government initiatives and strategies over recent years, for example, the *National Literacy Strategy* (1998), *National Numeracy Strategy* (1999), *Excellence and Enjoyment* (2003),

Every Child Matters (2004), *Vision Report of the Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group* (2006), *The White Paper; the Importance of Teaching* (2010). However international comparisons on student achievement respected by government, such as PISA, suggest that these initiatives are not having the desired effect as yet, perhaps because the extremes of individualistic, humanist thought and practice of the 1960s have not yet been completely tempered. As will be outlined in Chapter 4, in this decade of liberation and facilitation, teachers could teach what they wanted to teach in a manner and to a timescale that suited them, albeit constrained in secondary education by the national Certificate of Secondary Education national examinations for children aged 15. Although the decade could be viewed as a time when the role of teacher embraced democratic freedom in terms of choice and personal responsibility, the period has been termed the era of ‘uninformed professionalism’ (Earl et al, 2003). In Chapter 4, it is argued that individualistic expression of freedom in the role of the teacher led to the de-professionalisation of teaching with government control replacing teacher autonomy. One could imagine Freire shaking his head sadly at this lost opportunity for teachers to act politically by demonstrating they could act responsibly through working ethically and thus professionally through their own authority. For Freire:

‘...there is no freedom without authority, there is no authority without freedom. It is through the contradictory relationships between authority and freedom we can experience the value and the need for limits’ (Freire & Macedo, 1995:210).

Despite growing government authority and control over teacher and school education, curtailing teachers’ and teacher educators’ freedom, there has been increasing emphasis on supporting questioning and engaging with the dialogic at all levels of education. Questioning to encourage learners to give voice to their thinking was identified as a key finding of the research carried out by the *Gillingham Partnership Formative Assessment Project 2000-2001* (2003) and the work undertaken by the Assessment Reform Group (2003). This research, commissioned by the government, was in response to the realisation that by the time a learner failed a summative assessment, regarded as assessment *of* learning, it was too late to take action. The purpose of assessment *for* learning (AfL) is to raise achievement by identifying issues as early as possible and addressing them through appropriate interventions. It was recognised that learners, rather than produce shadows of themselves, a metaphor used by Freire, constructed their own views of the world based on reasons that have meaning for them. This constructionist view of learning means recognition has been given to pupils in schools and teacher trainee having an understanding of what they do and do not know. So they too must be brought into the assessment process. As a facet of educating for democracy, the educator and the learner both give feedback on the assessment with the educator taking the lead as the ‘expert’ on what is needed to meet the learning objective. It is the learner’s responsibility to achieve the learning objective. Both assessment *for* and *of* learning are now contained in the *Teachers’ Standards* under the heading of *Make accurate and productive use of assessment*. As demonstrated in a quotation given in the introduction to this chapter, the process of assessment for learning is in accord with Freire’s views on the role of teaching as a political act in the promotion of democratic practices

The role of the teacher in Finland

Teachers' autonomy is a characteristic of Finland's educational system. Compared to the English system, teachers have strong autonomy to plan, teach and evaluate as they see appropriate. Finnish teachers' work is not officially monitored. For example in the early 1990s school inspectors stopped visiting teachers' classrooms; since then there has not been any official surveillance by the Ministry of Education. Also there are no official teachers' standards either for teachers or student teachers. One of the reasons for the lack of assessment of the quality of teacher's competences might be that in Finland the teaching profession is a high status occupation attracting top grade applicants for teacher education. This contrasts with other Nordic countries like Norway and Sweden, where the role of the teacher is not as highly regarded as in Finland, and therefore teachers' work is more controlled.

Another reason for the extensive autonomy enjoyed by Finnish teachers is the high standard of scientific education and practical competences instilled by their university education. In order to qualify as teachers, students are required to have Masters' degrees, in education for class teachers and in a specific subject for subject teachers. High level qualifications and scientific competence are considered to be important factors in Finland's success in PISA (Kupiainen et al, 2009).

Teacher education is directed at establishing autonomy. All universities have the freedom to organize their teacher education as they see fit, because there is limited government control and few official standards. For example to be qualified as subject teachers, students have to have 60 credits (ECTS) in pedagogical studies in addition to their specific subject studies but each University can decide the content. There are very few national standards determining teacher qualification, and those that exist mainly dictate the extent of the qualification, not its content. To become teachers, students have to pass university teacher education courses, but their competence is not assessed otherwise. After qualification, teachers' abilities to teach are not evaluated or controlled in any way; it is expected that newly graduated teachers will be ready to act autonomously. Because teaching is such a prized occupation 'affection', love of the process of teaching, is neither a criterion for admittance to, nor is it emphasized, in teacher education.

Of course teachers' autonomy does not mean that teachers do not have any kind of guidance for their teaching. They have to follow the *National Core Curriculum* (Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014) which sets out the common principles guiding the value base of schools and also specific subject content for each grade. But this *National Core Curriculum* is not precise, leaving teachers freedom to make choices and execute their profession as they see appropriate. For instance the value base of the Curriculum is about learning, not about teaching and there is only one small part where the Curriculum explicitly states something about teachers: teachers are responsible for pupils' activity, learning and wellbeing and their task is to guide, to support as well as to observe and to recognise possible difficulties but also appreciate and treat all the pupils fairly (Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014:34). The teacher's role then is not precisely specified in

the Curriculum. However, if we perceive a teacher as someone who enables learning, there can be found for example the 'affection' stated in the Curriculum *via* conceptions of learning. The Curriculum states that encouraging guidance will reinforce the pupil's confidence to her/his potential (Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014:17).

Along with the *National Core Curriculum* there are also locally designed curricula by which local education authorities can arrange teaching in the best way suited to local circumstances (see Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014:9-13). The local curriculum design not only engages teachers in developmental work but also gives them power to reflect on the basis of their teaching, giving them wide pedagogic responsibility. Above all, teachers' autonomy is based on trust: compliance with national local curricula is not assessed because teachers are regarded as being highly professional and responsible.

Although there are not very strong official control systems over the teaching profession and teachers have an extensive autonomy, there are still some unofficial and maybe hidden elements that strongly direct and control teachers' work. For example, student study books are typically used in classrooms. Although a teacher has autonomy and thus the opportunity to teach the *National Core Curriculum* content in any way s/he wants, almost all teachers use these books. Because teachers' guideline books accompany the student study books, teachers follow the suggested 'pedagogy' in the guides, presented as tips on how to run each lesson, instead of exercising their autonomy. Such books can be useful to teachers; however, it is remarkable that there is no official scrutiny by the educational authorities to ensure that these market products follow the national and local curricula. As well as the convention of using study and guide books, school practices seem to be uniform everywhere. For example it is common practice that the school day is divided in 45 minutes lessons based on school subjects. Considering the emphasis placed on the autonomy of the teacher's role, it is surprising that teachers rely on these unofficial and unspoken control systems.

How do these 'autonomic' teachers promote democracy education in their everyday work? An interesting aspect of the Finnish system is that little is known of classroom practice, unlike in England where information is disseminated through documents like Ofsted reports. However, according to research, democracy education should be stronger in Finnish schools. Also, researchers have observed that knowledge about democracy and democratic practices do not transfer effectively into practical skills. (Suoninen et al, 2010.) Of course Finnish schools provide knowledge about democracy in accordance with the *National Core Curriculum*. There are also opportunities for democratic practices, because many schools have pupil associations to promote joint action and participation in matters relating to pupils such as organising school events (MoJ, 1998:22). However, despite these activities, pupils do not feel that they have opportunities to influence their own study conditions, and they do not consider politics as something that belongs to them (Suoninen et al, 2010). Young people's interest in politics and political issues is significantly below the European ICCS average (Kerr et al, 2009:108). They seem not to be interested in taking an active role in society, and do not think that they are educated for democratic citizenship during their school years (Demokratiakasvatusselvitys 2011). The problem may be that although these practices,

like school associations, are important they are just minor additions between normal school work. They not have an influence and do not accumulate as practical skills. However, in the Freirean sense democratic practices mean precisely normal, everyday school work, not something extra.

Teachers should demonstrate democratic values and practices in their work as an essential element of promoting every pupil's 'reading of the world'. In Finland, the *National Core Curriculum's* (2014:17) conception of learning emphasizes the pupil as an active agent whose interests and experiences guide learning processes. This is laudable in theory, but in everyday teaching it is easier to emphasize subject content than these higher order objectives. As mentioned before, teachers use study books to ensure that all the curriculum subject content is covered. This can lead to situations where the pupils' own active use of knowledge is minimal and hides pupils' own 'reading of the world'. Using study books can lead to, as Freire puts it, 'teacher as narrator': pupils memorise mechanically the study book content which presents teachers' narration. Although the internet is used a source of information in addition to study books, critical evaluation of online knowledge is difficult for many pupils (Kiili et al, 2016; Kiili et al, 2008). This indicates pupils' poor ability to question, an ability which can be seen as essential for democratically influential citizens.

For educating for democracy, promotion of pupils' 'reading of the world' is not sufficient; teachers should also be giving pupils 'voice' in everyday school life. For Finnish teachers this is one of the stumbling blocks. Firstly, engaging pupils with dialogue is not typical in Finnish classrooms. Despite that the *National Core Curriculum* having moved in a more socially-oriented and student-centered direction, some subjects, e.g. science, is taught in an authoritative and monologic manner (Lehesvuori, 2013). Instead of dialogue, pupils listen to teachers talk, read study books and fill up exercise books. Secondly, pupils' involvement in decision making is minimal and typically limited to organising school events. Decision making is always in the hands of the teacher who can dictate the opportunities for pupils to use their voice in the classroom. These both, lack of dialogue and pupils' opportunities to make decisions, originate from the teacher's role which has developed towards autocracy; although the Finnish teacher's role has nowadays developed more towards facilitator, authority is merely less obvious. The lack of possibilities for using voice and making decisions in everyday school work has led to a situation where pupils do not learn about actions of democracy in Finnish school communities. The development of the teacher's role must be discussed to understand why.

The cultural and historical bases to the development of Finnish teacher professionalism since the 1850s are to be found in the belief that teaching is a national and divine calling. A further factor was introduced in the 1960s with teachers engaged in developing the welfare state through comprehensive schooling. However, from the 1980s onwards, neoliberal educational policy has brought new tensions to the teacher's role which are more difficult to perceive. The role has always involved being a loyal servant for the state, whatever the state's social and political aims and commitments. Even though the role of the teacher in social rebuilding has always been significant, it is interesting that this aspect has not been emphasised in

Finnish educational discussion (Vuorikoski & Räisänen, 2010). Instead, the role of the teacher in Finland is based on social neutrality. Teachers do not act as democratically influential persons – which is essential in developing democracy education. The understanding of the role of the teacher among student teachers and schools is one of neutrality and political non-involvement (Syrjäläinen et al, 2005).

The culture of primary school teacher education, its content and form has remained mostly unaltered from that established in the teacher seminaries of the mid-19th century. This culture can be understood as being based more on the political will to establish Finnish identity than on education science. When the scientific bases of teacher education were criticised, it became necessary to raise its status by strengthening its academic standards (Rantala et al, 2013:64-65). Teacher education was transferred to universities in the late 1970s. During its whole academic existence, teacher education has developed strongly in the didactic-psychological direction, and the social aspect of education has had very little impact on the recruitment criteria of professors and lecturers for teacher education and on the content of the teaching curriculum. This has been criticised since the 1990s, and it has been said that it produces a narrow and unhistorical understanding about the role of teachers (Kivinen & Rinne, 1994; Simola et al, 1997). Lack of social aspect in teacher education might be a significant reason behind the political neutrality of the role of the teacher in Finland. The social connections of education and their influence on the role of teachers have been left almost invisible in Finnish teacher education and the school system. This has had an effect on how the possibilities for democratic action for teachers and pupils are being understood in schools. The working methods of teachers have responded to the idea of inquiry-based learning and the understanding of teachers as facilitators of learning. Nevertheless, the role of the teacher as a democratically influential person – which would be essential from a point of view of democracy education – is almost indifferent in both approaches.

Conclusions

It could be inferred from the emphasis in Finland on teachers' autonomy that teachers are seen as cultural workers more than competent technicians acting on behalf of the dominant elite. In comparison to English practitioners, teachers in Finland have wide independence to act as they please. For example, the imprecision of the *National Core Curriculum* gives teachers space for autonomous action. Autonomic Finnish teachers have opportunity to use their creativity when organising everyday school work. In England there are more official systems which control their work, e.g. Ofsted and the *Teachers' Standards*. Therefore teachers in England could be regarded as being competent technicians who are the executors of government ideology.

But the discussion in this chapter suggests greater complexity. The argument presented above suggests that *Teachers' Standards* are underpinned by English cultural norms; because of this document's importance in evaluating trainees, newly qualified teachers and experienced practitioners alike, the role of the teacher is essentially that of cultural worker. In Finland teachers do not necessarily use their autonomic position in its full extent and are guided by

unofficial systems like study books. Their autonomic position also gives teachers opportunities to give their pupils voice and support their reading of the world. However, although 'engaging with the dialogic' is considered to be an important part of the learning process, dialogue is not widely used in Finnish classrooms; if it is, it is an addition to normal school work than a daily part of it. The teacher's autonomic position enables them to omit dialogue from curricula. From this point of view, Finnish teachers can be seen as being more like competent technicians. In contrast, in England pupil voice is encouraged through group work grounded in socio-constructivist theory. Group work is seen as being an essential component of class lessons and seminars (see Chapter 4). In addition learners are involved in assessment feedback, a pedagogic practice based on research, and statutory frameworks such as the *Teachers' Standards* have the expectation that learners throughout the phases will be encouraged and supported to give voice. From the English perspective, it can be seen that the role of the teacher educator includes acting as a fulcrum to teaching and learning, modelling processes and environments that trainees will find in schools and embedding them in theory to create praxis.

Nevertheless, in Finland teachers' scientific competence is trusted whereas in England the actions of successive governments demonstrate that it is not. PISA results since 2003 appear to confirm the UK government's view that teachers and teacher educators cannot be trusted with achieving high standards for their pupils. One result of this is that teacher education is slowly being taken out of universities and placed in training schools; these are schools that have been judged 'outstanding' by Ofsted. This means that the theoretic component of teacher education is decreasing. On the other hand, there are a growing number of schools, e.g. Free Schools and Academies, that are funded by government but are not controlled by local authorities. Such schools are able to employ teachers who have had no teacher education, theory or practice, the justification being that such individuals are subject specialist experts. Although nearly all schools are subject to Ofsted inspections, these occur less often and are not as lengthy. The UK government's view on, and rigorous evaluation of, what constitutes teachers' scientific competence is unclear.

The role of the teacher is composed in relation to wider social constructions. Finnish schools have succeeded in PISA evaluations and therefore seem to confirm that country's conception of the role of the teacher. Still, international comparisons of learning do not reflect the totality of the pupil learning experience. Every education system reflects the culture and history of the country concerned. As well as having highly competent teachers, Finland's success can be explained by the education system (uniform basic education for the whole age group), and the autonomy given to schools. Also Finnish society is positivistic with regard to education, with only the core curricula designed for nationwide application. In Finnish schools, much attention is accorded to individual support for learning and well-being. Schools are developed in multi-professional cooperation, and Finland has an efficient library system of very high quality (Kupiainen et al, 2009). The role of the teacher has been strongly supported by the structures of Finnish society, but despite this individual and psychological aspects in teaching and in teacher education are being emphasised more than social and structural aspects. If the social significance of teachers is not being understood, then educating for democracy is

inevitably shallow. In England, the culture of society since the Enlightenment movement of the 16th and 17th centuries has created an education system that is liberal and humanistic and hence democratic at its core. Since the 1970s, liberalism has been replaced in politics by neo-liberalism and the prescription of education in the years following has reflected the changing ideology. As has been argued above, the declining achievement of English students demonstrates that the English government's approach to teaching and the teacher's role at both school and university level requires further thought and action. For example, further research on the authoritarian and teacher-centred methods employed by various Pacific Rim regions might be instructive. This, together with deliberation on the contradictions revealed in this chapter on the relationship between authority and freedom, identified by Freire as fundamental for democracy, could increase understanding of the value of the teacher's role in educating for democracy as well as improving international test scores.

References:

Allen, M. and Toplis, T. (2013) 'Student Teachers' Roles and Responsibilities' in Capel, S., Leask M. and Turner, T. (Eds.) *Learning to Teach in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Assessment Reform Group (1999) *Assessment for Learning: Beyond the Black Box*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, School of Education.

Demokratiakasvatusselvitys [Report of Democracy Education] (2011) Raportit ja selvitykset 2011:27. Helsinki: Opetushallitus. Available at: http://www.oph.fi/download/139654_Demokratiakasvatusselvitys.pdf [accessed 18 January 2016].

Department for Education (2010) *The Importance of Teaching; the Schools White Paper 2010*. Norwich: The Stationary Office.

Department for Education (2012) *Teachers' Standards*. Available at: www.education.gov.uk [accessed 18 January 2016].

Department for Education (2013) *The national curriculum in England: Framework document*. Available at: www.education.gov.uk [accessed 18 January 2016].

Department for Education and Employment (1998) *The National Literacy Strategy Framework for teaching mathematics from Reception to Year 6*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *The National Numeracy Strategy Framework for teaching mathematics from Reception to Year 6*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Department for Education for Schools (2003) *Excellence and Enjoyment: A Strategy for Primary Schools*. London: Department for Education for Schools Publications.

Department for Education for Schools (2004) *Every Child Matters*. London: Department for Education for Schools Publications.

Department for Education for Schools (2006) *2020 Vision Report of the Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group*. Nottingham: Department for Education for Schools Publications.

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *The National Curriculum Key Stages 1 and 2*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Earl, L., Watson, N., Levin, B., Leithwood, K., Fullan, M. & Torrance, N. (2003) *Final Report of the External Evaluation of England's National Numeracy and Literacy Strategies. Final Report. Watching and Learning 3*. DfES: Nottingham.

Ministry of Justice (1998) *Basic Education Act: 21.8.1998/628*. Available at: <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1998/en19980628> [accessed 18 January 2016].

Freire, P. (2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition* (trans. Myra Berman Ramos). New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (2008) (ed. Sonia Nieto) *Dear Paulo: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1993) 'A dialogue with Paulo Freire' in McLaren, P. & Leonard, P. (Eds.) *Paulo Freire A Critical Encounter*. London: Routledge, pp. 47-48.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1995) 'A dialogue: culture, language, and race' in *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), pp. 377-402.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D.P. (1999) 'Pedagogy, Culture, Language and Race: a Dialogue' in Leach, J. and Moon, B. (Eds.) *Learning and Pedagogy*. Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 46-58.

Lehesvuori, S. (2013) Towards dialogic teaching in science: challenging classroom realities through teacher education. *Jyväskylä studies in education, psychology and social research* 465. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Available at: <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/41268> [accessed 18 January 2016].

Kerr, D., Sturman, L., Schulz, W. & Burge, B. (2010) *ICCS 2009 European Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary students in 24 European*

countries. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Kiili, C., Leu, D. J., Marttunen, M., Hautala, J. & Leppänen, P. H. T. (2016) *Sixth graders' critical evaluation skills of online sources*. Manuscript in preparation.

Kiili, C., Laurinen, L. & Marttunen, M. (2008) 'Students evaluating Internet sources: From versatile evaluators to uncritical readers' in *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 39 (1), pp. 75-95.

Kivinen, O. & Rinne, R. (1994) 'The thirst for learning, or protecting one's niche?' in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15 (4), pp. 515-528.

Kupiainen, S., Hautamäki, J. & Karjalainen, T. (2009) The Finnish Education System and PISA. *Ministry of Education Publications 2009:46*. Helsinki: Opetusministeriö. Available at: <http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/liitteet/opm46.pdf?lang=en> [accessed 15 January 2016].

Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (2015) *Initial Teacher Education Inspection Handbook*. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted [accessed 17 February 2016].

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014) *PISA 2012 Results in Focus: What 15-year-olds know and what they can do and what they know*. Available at: www.oecd.org [accessed 18 January 2016].

Pepin, B. (1999) 'The influence of national cultural traditions on pedagogy: classroom practices in England, France and Germany' in Leach, J. & Moon, B. (Eds.) *Learning and Pedagogy*. Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 124-135.

Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet [National Core Curriculum] (2014) Määräykset ja ohjeet 96. Helsinki: Opetushallitus. Available at: http://www.oph.fi/saadokset_ja_ohjeet/opetussuunnitelmien_ja_tutkintojen_perusteet/perusopetus [accessed 18 January 2016].

Rantala, J., Salminen, J., Säntti, J., Kemppinen, L., Nikkola, T., Rautiainen, M. & Virta, A. (2013) 'Luokanopettajakoulutuksen akatemisoitumiskehitys 1970-luvulta 2010-luvulle' [The academic development of teacher education from 1970's to 2010's] in Rantala, J. & Rautiainen, M. (Eds.) *Salonkikelpoiseksi maisterikoulutukseksi. Luokanopettaja- ja opinto-ohjaajakoulutusten akatemisoitumiskehitys 1970-luvulta 2010-luvulle*. *Suomen kasvatustieteellisen seuran tutkimuksia 64* Jyväskylä: Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura, pp. 61-81.

Shulman, L.S. (1986) 'Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching' in *Educational Researcher*, 15, pp. 4-14.

Simola, H., Kivinen, O. & Rinne, R. (1997) 'Didactic closure: Professionalization and pedagogic knowledge in Finnish teacher education' in *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13 (8) pp. 877-891.

Suoninen, A., Kupari, P. & Törmäkangas, K. (2010) *Nuorten yhteiskunnalliset tiedot, osallistuminen ja asenteet. Kansainvälisen ICCS 2009 -tutkimuksen päätulokset. [Social knowledge of the youth, their participation and attitudes. The main results of international ICCS 2009 research.]* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Koulutuksen tutkimuslaitos.

Syrjäläinen, E., Värri, V-M., Piattoeva, N. & Eronen, A. (2006) 'Se on sellaista kasvattavaa, yleissivistävää toimintaa - opettajaksi opiskelevien käsityksiä kansalaisvaikuttamisen merkityksestä' [How student teachers understand the meaning of active citizenship] in Rantala, J. & Salminen, J. (Eds.) *Kansalaisvaikuttamisen edistäminen koulussa ja opettajankoulutuksessa. Historiallis-yhteiskuntatiedollisen kasvatuksen tutkimus- ja kehittämiskeskuksen tutkimuksia 5.* Helsinki, Finland: Historiallis-yhteiskuntatiedollisen kasvatuksen tutkimus- ja kehittämiskeskus, pp. 39-68.

Vuorikoski, M. & Räisänen, M. (2010) 'Opettajan identiteetti ja identiteettipoliittikat hallintakulttuurien murroksissa' [The identity of teachers and identity politics in turning points of governmental rationalities] in *Kasvatus & Aika*, 4(4) pp. 63-81. Available at: http://www.kasvatus-ja-aika.fi/site/?page_id=350 [accessed 7 February 2016].

Yang, F. (2007) 'Education in China' in *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 34(2), pp. 135-144.

Table 3.1 The role of the teacher (adapted from the Teachers' Standards 2012)

PART 1	Teaching: a teacher must-
	Set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils;
	Promote good progress and outcomes of pupils;
	Demonstrate good subject and curriculum knowledge;
	Plan and teach well-structured lessons;
	Adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils;
	Make accurate and productive use of assessment;
	Manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment;
	Fulfil wider professional responsibilities
PART 2	Personal and professional conduct-
	Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school...
	Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
	Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.