*Matti Rautiainen, Pekka Räihä*

## Education for Democracy: A Paper Promise? The Democratic Deficit in Finnish Educational Culture

This article presents one way of changing the participatory culture of training teachers – the Critical Integrative Teacher Education (CITE)[1] programme now being implemented at Jyväskylä University. For the last ten years the Finnish school system has been the centre of considerable international attention because of its success in PISA. The Finnish school, however, has two faces. In the shadow of those good learning outcomes there lurks a democratic deficit in school and a lack of school wellbeing amongst children. This article examines the nature of the Finnish school and teacher education from the perspective of democracy. If participatory culture in Finnish schools is restricted, then the same also applies to teacher education. The long tradition of education as well as the radical school democracy experiment in the early 1970s resulted in the neutralization of teacher education and the removal of politics and politicality. This led to a teacher education with the emphasis on didactics and psychology but with a social viewpoint conspicuous by its absence. Even though the system offers opportunities to implement even radically different training methods, there is little that is done differently.

**Keywords**
Democracy, critical integrative teacher education, participatory culture

## 1 Introduction

At the end of June 2010 Finland once again took top place in an international school evaluation study. This time it was the ICCS study, which looked at the civic knowledge, skills, values and attitudes of young people. The results showed that the civic knowledge of young Finns in the 8th class of comprehensive school ranked amongst the highest in the world. When attention was shifted from knowledge to attitudes and particularly to participatory culture, Finland came out near the bottom: only a small minority of young people are interested in politics, or even indeed in civic activity, i.e. participating in the activities of the community (Suoninen et al. 2010). The same conclusion was reached in a Finnish-German research project that compared civic participation of young Finns and Germans (Feldmann-Wojtachnia et al. 2010).[2]

The results are simultaneously surprising and unsurprising. Schools

---

1 See https://www.jyu.fi/edu/laitokset/okl/integraatio.
2 See http://www.nuorisotutkimusseura.fi/sites/default/files/verkkojulkaisut/Youth%20participation%20in%20Finland%20and%20in%20Germany.PDF

continue to be anything else but democratic communities. The two faces of school – good learning outcomes, but also a passive participatory culture and lack of school wellbeing – are an exaggerated picture of the Finnish school, but one that nonetheless holds true for many schools. Admittedly, active efforts have been made to remedy this situation, albeit with meagre results, by means of various activity-increasing measures and through the curriculum. The significance of school as the fulfiller and definer of the democratic way of life remains central.

> "Basic education[3] is part of fundamental educational security. It has both an educational and instructional mission. Its task on the one hand is to offer individuals the chance to acquire a general education and complete their educational obligations; and, on the other, to furnish society with a tool for developing educational capital and enhancing equality and a sense of community. Basic education must provide an opportunity for diversified growth, learning, and the development of a healthy sense of self-esteem, so that the pupils can obtain the knowledge and skills they need in life, become capable of further study, and, as involved citizens, develop a democratic society. Basic education must also support each pupil's linguistic and cultural identity and the development of his or her mother tongue. A further objective is to awaken a desire for lifelong learning. In order to ensure social continuity and build the future, basic education assumes the tasks of transferring cultural tradition from one generation to the next, augmenting knowledge and skills, and increasing awareness of the values and ways of acting that form the foundation of society. It is also the mission of basic education to create new culture, revitalize ways of thinking and acting, and develop the pupil's ability to evaluate critically." (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2004, 12).[4]

Even though the development of a participatory culture is a clearly expressed objective in the Core Curriculum, which gives the guidelines for schools, it has remained marginal because of the spheres of influence occupied by the school subjects and the lobbying they carry out.

What is surprising is that so little has happened in ten years. Finland previously participated in an equivalent study (Civics) at the end of the 1990s and the results were largely the same as those obtained in the recent ICCS study.[5] They revealed, or rather made public, the culture of non-participation existing in schools. A non-participatory culture is by no means the only problem that has troubled the Finnish school (Suutarinen et al. 2001). Tiredness and lack of wellbeing are also an everyday part of school. Research indicates that especially the senior secondary school (lukio) is felt to be more taxing than vocational school. Even though the research results (e.g. Salmela-Aro 2008; Salmela-Aro et al. 2008, 682-683) show that as many as 20% of senior secondary girls demonstrably suffer from some degree of exhaustion, there are no changes planned for teaching at senior secondary level. If workers under an employer experienced exhaustion to the same extent as senior secondary pupils, the law would require the

---

3 See http://www.oph.fi/english/education/basic_education/school
4 See National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2004:
http://www.oph.fi/english/sources_of_information/core_curricula_and_qualification_requirements/basic_education
5 See ICCS 2009 European Report:
http://www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Electronic_versions/ICCS_2009_European_Report.pdf and Toots 2010:
http://www.jsse.org/2010/2010-3/pdf/Toots-JSSE-3-2010.pdf

employer to take measures to correct the situation. But why does school not change even if there is need for change?

## 2 Why Does the Passivizing Tradition Continue?

The system of basic education in Finland needed reforming in the 1960s. The hundred-year-old primary school system had reached the end of the road and a thorough reform was initiated. With this reform both basic education and teacher education changed in Finland. Compulsory basic education for all was extended to nine years, after which pupils would choose either upper secondary school or vocational education. The transition to the new basic school was carried out in stages beginning in 1972. The 1971 decree on teacher education transferred teacher education to the universities and from the end of the 1970s qualification as a class teacher has required a higher university degree, a Master of Education.

Finland attended comprehensive school in the 1970s and early 1980s, and it was a school totally stripped of pupil activeness. The democratization experiments carried out at the start of the 1970s were brought to a rapid halt. The highly politicized school councils were quietly ditched towards the end of the 1970s and schools became small islands where people were careful not to talk about politics, in other words, not to take a stand on contentious issues. With the introduction of the comprehensive school, assessment of learning moved more vigorously towards evaluation of how well individual pupils achieved the objectives set for each subject. Thus, by the start of the 1980s, schools had become socially neutral places (Kärenlampi 1999). In school pupils studied the contents of the subjects, albeit with no attention at all to an understanding of these contents, and they were educated in a blissful and rapidly developing welfare state. In the country of lottery winners – winning on the lottery is what Finns call being born in Finland – there was no need to educate pupils to see things differently and develop their activeness. It was a virtue to dutifully achieve learning outcomes and not, for example, to talk about learning objectives and whether they were sensible. The physical structure of schools, such as their space allocation, was a direct reflection of this mental state. Apart from the corridors and entrance halls pupils had no space of their own for meeting or spending time (e.g. Tolonen 2001).

The school experiences of people our age are very similar irrespective of where in Finland they are from. There are of course also exceptions, but they really are exceptions. It is true that these experiences tell of a time when the directive and regulatory powers of central government were stronger than nowadays, but have times changed as school autonomy has increased? Today school could, if so desired, have a very different operational culture, as we make clear in this article.

If, however, we take a look at the diverse range of outcomes that the vigorous activation of schools and students has produced in Finland over the last ten years, then there is one operation that rises above the others in terms of its success – school pupil unions. When something had to be done,

pupil union work was established as the basic virtue of the participating pupil. In the Partcipating Student project a huge number of Finnish teachers were trained to run and supervise pupil unions. They in turn took what they had learned back to their own regions and into their own schools. The result was that within a few years there was a pupil union system that was very similar in all schools (Nousiainen, Piekkari 2007). However, the pupil union system only involved a fraction of school pupils, mostly those who were otherwise active.

The pupil unions are in the spirit of representative democracy and they belong in school, as long as they are given decision-making power in matters affecting the school, not merely responsibility for arranging May Day and Valentine's Day celebrations. What is interesting in the way pupil unions arrived in school is the message it conveys about the development culture in our schools: despite school autonomy the schools are very similar. There is then only a small amount of bottom-up change. On the other hand, top-down change at its best can proceed extremely effectively: regional teacher recruitment, effective training providing an operational model, and immediate implementation of activities in school.

Compared to Sweden, for example, development has been very different. Whereas in Finland school democraticization only experienced a peak at the beginning of the 1970s and recently again in the 2000s, in Sweden the relationship between democracy and school has a longer and profounder history appropriate to a culture of discussion, although even in Sweden the idea of participatory citizenship did not really make a breakthrough into schools until the 1970s (Englund 1986, 318-325). The 1960s and 70s in the west were generally a time of powerful social justice and participation in schools and they became seedbeds of democratic education, either through radical change (as in Finland) or more restrainedly as part of the old structure (Goodson 2005, 121, 127).

It is clear that the politicized and radical school council experiment of the 1970s left its scars on Finnish schools, especially on teachers who had strongly resisted the experiment from the outset. The experimental reform was especially hard for middle-class secondary school teachers committed to the political right (Kärenlampi 1999, 29). While challenging teachers' political ideology, it also invaded the protected and autonomous inner circle of the teaching profession and made "forbidden fruit" – social and political reality – a part of school. The school democracy movement raised the question of on whose terms and on what ideological basis the activity and goals of school are organized. In other words it brought into view the political nature of school which, with the fading of the school democracy movement, once again donned the garb of neutrality: school reverted to a place where the values-based and political nature of teaching and school culture was obliterated.

Vacuums, however, are in the habit of being filled. With the removal of a value base and politicality, the gap was filled with more intensive study of school subjects. Even though from the teacher's perspective everything seemed to be fine and in order, pupils saw the change differently. Too much of school development has been to meet the teachers' welfare needs,

not those of the pupils, according to professor Lea Pulkkinen's analysis.[6] Pulkkinen urges us to stop basking in our PISA success and take seriously the fact that Finnish children do not like school. At the moment school is too knowledge-based. The discussion initiated by Pulkkinen, however, never really took off and it was redirected from school and teachers to a consideration of the shortage of resources for youth psychiatry. It seems that nobody is taking the unpleasant messages emanating from schools seriously (Räihä 2010a).

## 3 Empirical Findings – Teacher Education as an Upholder of Tradition

Justice is a particular social virtue that contains within itself all other virtues (see e.g. Aristotle 1981, 211). It is part of an open democracy that people have the right to ask about the principles of justice and demand that they are fulfilled. For this reason, communities have rules and practices which endeavour to ensure the protection of the law. In Finnish schools, however, there are no organs providing legal protection, whereas in Sweden, for example, legal protection is regarded as having a positive effect, increasing trust and clarifying the limits for exercising power (Ahonen 2003, 28).

In western democracies efforts to ensure the implementation of the idea of justice have involved, among other things, the division of power, its best-known exemplar being Montesquieu's tripartite system. The organs of legal protection in Swedish schools represent the principle whereby an independent organ evaluates the actions of those exercising power and their just implementation. In Finland issues of legal protection are marginal. Rautiainen (2008) carried out an extensive study of the conceptions of communality amongst students, all prospective subject teachers, and yet not a single student approached the activity of a community from the perspective of legal protection. Perhaps questions of legal protection are not considered necessary because in the students' opinion school itself includes the idea of justice – school is premised on the pursuit of justice. The role of the teacher is to ensure the realization of this idea.

Data in Rautiainen's (2008) research was collected in the form of essays under the heading: what community should there be in school culture? What does it require of the members of the community? The resulting 221 essays were analyzed using the traditions of phenomenography and hermeneutics.

Students' understanding of this idea, however, reflects conservative thinking, maintaining the operational culture and structures of school rather than reforming and changing it. Students' notions about school are rather traditional and they form links in a lengthy chain where political activity is exceedingly moderate (for example, nobody writes about the possibility of civil disobedience in school) and where the role of the teacher as determiner of students' activity and as supervisor is significant. Even

---

6 See http://www.uusisuomi.fi/kotimaa/36756-tassako-evaat-koulusurmien-estamiseksi. According to Lea Pulkkinen, professor of psychology, crises like school killings (Kauhajoki and Jokela in Finland) cannot be prevented by increasing funding for youth psychiatry. Instead she requires a change in the curriculum.

though many students are willing to have equality in school, only a small number are interested in why school exists. Nevertheless, almost all of them are willing to make school a place with more discussion and sense of community.

Students also express the most doubt about achieving the genuineness and openness related to discussion and encountering a person. Furthermore, their conceptions are characterized by the more commonsense idea that together we can achieve a better result. The second most prominent feature of the students' conceptions is the goal built into collaborative activities, namely the socialization of students into society, as is made clear in the following student extract (Rautiainen 2008, 87-88):

> "One of the basic examples is probably the troublemaking learner who through his (or her) own behaviour fundamentally disturbs or even obstructs attainment of the goal of the other members of the micro-community (i.e., class), namely a successful learning process. He can by certain criteria be called a social criminal. This, however, cannot mean the same as the caricatured status of "outlaw;" on the contrary, other members of the community should make efforts to "adjust" this individual disturbing the enjoyment of others so that he can re-enter the community. The goal may be a little idealistic, but in my opinion achievable, as long as the various members of the community cooperate closely amongst themselves. In this way, as the final outcome of this long-term effort, and (as so often in this particular scenario) with the input of the school welfare officer and/or school psychologist, not forgetting that of the family counsellor, the individual can be made to cease his socially "criminal" activity."

> "In order for this society to function well, rules have been drawn up for it and they must be followed. Disobeying a rule may result in punishment, just as when the law is broken. When every member of society follows the rules, society apparently functions well. Real functionality is only achieved when people act together."

Acting together is understood more as a method whereby goals revert to pedagogical objectives or school's general socializing goals. There is also a noticeable difference in that whereas we think of discussion as belonging to the teacher–teacher axis, acting together is located more on the teacher–pupil axis. Students' conceptions, however, do also emphasize the importance of discussion between teachers and pupils, as becomes apparent in the following student extract (Rautiainen 2008, 88):

> "Besides, how can an educator demand of his students the ability to cooperate or to get along with other people if he himself as an adult human being is incapable of functioning as an active member of his own community or in cooperation with other teachers or with the home?"

Placed on Schein's (1985) three levels of organizational culture, an increase in discussion, which students emphasized, is placed on the level of activity, which concerns the organization's visible structures and activities. A minority of students talk about the level of values and basic assumptions, attainment of which is a prerequisite for truly understanding a culture.

Communality is thus the solution that will improve the functionality and smooth running of school. Since students receive the task assigned to school as almost cut-and-dried, all that remains for the teachers and pupils in school is to carry out that task. Because very few see the task as something that has to be interpreted by the school community, there is very little room in school for seeing differently or for politicality. It also causes tension between the two groups: those who want to discuss the fundamentals of the community, and those who want to concentrate on doing. From the perspective of school development it is extremely important to work together in considering the basis of the work, the core of teacherhood. This is possible by researching and discussing one's own work down to its deepest foundations. Analyzing the foundations in turn opens up the possibility of seeing school in a new cultural context.

According to students communality is strongly linked to the core idea of democracy: everybody having an opportunity to participate and influence those matters that affect themselves and their environment. Students view the gap between this idea and reality as the biggest of all. In addition there is a strong contradiction inherent in this: the teacher is responsible for and likewise decides on matters affecting school, while the pupil's participation is directed and defined by teachers. Students, nevertheless, regard improvement of pupils' opportunities for participation as one major focus of school development, as becomes apparent in the following student extract (Rautiainen 2008, 96).

> "In a school community pupils should be given the opportunity of directly influencing school activity. A simple example would, for example, be defining the objectives for courses. Pupils should have the possibility of influencing all kind of activity. Admittedly, participation does presuppose sufficient knowledge about how school works, but this could be gradually taught even during lessons. Pupils should have equal chances of influencing the school community and everybody should have the opportunity and right to affect matters. The issues and the decisions should have a realmeaning and appropriate goals. The community must approve the goals democratically, but be open to new suggestions and ideas. Pupils could be given different roles and tasks in the community. Through joint action and planning pupils commit themselves to developing the community."

In practice the task of creating a culture of participation in a novel way will ultimately run into the problem of lack of time. When teachers' experience of school tends towards the idea that there is not enough time even for going through the basics, how can time be found for practising living democratically? In addition to lack of time, change is made more difficult by the deeply rooted traditions of school, such as the pupil's unquestioned position as learner and the teacher's as supervisor. Many attempts to change teaching are brought back down to earth surprisingly quickly, and students are not the smallest group resisting change. Changes require students to study in a more responsible way, something which their subordinate role in school has not accustomed them to and which is not even desired. In fact, the aim is rather to evade responsibility using various means (Mäensivu 2007).

14

Students do not actually set any limits to the development of democracy at school. Yet the idea of a completely democratic school seems strange and they want to preserve the hierarchic order of school. They are willing to give power above all in those matters that they consider to affect pupils. Their conceptions then are very contradictory. When teacher education creates the image of an ideal school, and the students themselves do the same, the end result is a school where everything good will be realized: individualism will flourish as part of a strong community where there is a lot of discussion but also a lot of studying. The students' decisions on what is most important in school mean compromises where school shows signs of being a school for cooperation, but in the background there remains the present school foundation with its emphasis on individualism. Accordingly the teacher's strong position as a definer of individualism and democracy also remains (Rautiainen 2008, 147).

## 4 CITE – Making Participation a Way of Life in Education

The Critical Integrative Teacher Education (CITE) programme, intended for prospective class teachers, began at Jyväskylä University in 2003 and is one of the training programmes that is built on a culture of doing it differently. It is based on a goal whereby understanding the reality of a school's and teacher's work is more important to the teacher than controlling it. In the programme students are taught to understand and confront phenomena that relate especially to learning, teaching and being an individual and member of a community.

Figure 1[7]



7 All photos used in this article are taken by Anssi Koskinen.

Instead of the passive pupil we should really start talking about the passive school system. In so far as pupils have been shown to be growing up as subordinates rather than active citizens, the situation of teachers looks no better. They are products of a decontextualized teacher education programme. In that programme didactics and psychology are more important and of greater priority than training a prospective teacher to understand school as a sociohistorical institution (Räisänen 2008; Simola 1997). As it is now, teacher education produces conforming and loyal teachers rather than critical teachers. And since the conservative, perpetuating attitude of students intending to be teachers is also strong already during their training and before entering working life (Rautiainen 2008), attention should be directed at the entire system, not its parts.

The selection tests for teacher education programmes[8] have also in themselves supported the perpetuating role of school and teacher education. According to Räihä (2101b), student selection has replicated rather than renewed the teaching body. The search has been for teachers that are precisely suitable for this day and age, and not for those who are capable of changing with the flow of time. The aim of the selection tests is to recruit the right kind of people (i.e. those adapting smoothly to school), but in addition they are used in the supremacy struggle between subject areas, meaning the attempt to secure a place for one's own subject in the selection process (Räihä 2010b).

Although the position of democracy, its promotion and nurture is central to the school system, discussion about school participatory culture in Finland is based around the concept of individualism and not democracy. Democracy requires a strong sense of community whose foundations are deeper than the democratic organs of an institution, when we see it as the principle directing the way humans lead their lives. The relationship between communality and democracy is complex and intricate since the concepts involve a great number of different meanings and interpretations of their true nature.

From a historical perspective the Finnish school has been marked by strong individualism with the educational emphasis on individual success and, in addition, a sense of responsibility for other people (Ikonen 2006, 94-98). The sought after individualism has in any case been symbolic in nature, so that the sense of community manifests itself as a feeling of solidarity, shared beliefs, feelings and experiences (Antikainen et al. 2003, 14). When school had a significant part in the task of constructing national identity, communality and nationality were constructed in relation to national virtues. In the modern globalizing world communality at school extends at its widest to the whole of humanity, at least on the level of speech and objectives.

Strong communality can be strong democracy when the values and actions of the community are based on tolerance and respect for diversity. In such cases the feeling of community is built on a foundation which offers the opportunity to disagree and see things differently. Otherwise a democratic way of life in a strong community is not possible; rather, the community

---

8 Class teacher education has been one of the most popular study programmes in Finland. In 2009 there was approximately eight applicants for each available study place. When the numbers of applicants significantly exceeds the number of places, selection test assume a key role. (Räihä 2010b.)

will mark itself off as a group whose members have common beliefs and experiences and inside which different views are not permitted. Understanding and shaping of the new should begin from noting that there does not exist a neutral school where subjects are just studied or citizens formed according to a particular formula. Through his or her choice of profession a teacher makes a powerful commitment to take part in the implementation and development of a democratic society. This idea has, however, largely disappeared from the basic visible character of the teaching profession, or at least it has been understood very narrowly, even wrongly.

The teacher's role in shaping the everyday democracy of school is important. Even though power in school is legally more and more in the hands of the headteacher, teachers play a significant part in school activities and shaping its culture. Through their actions they can create a culture where the hallmarks of participatory democracy prevail, but they can also create a superficial democracy where some of democracy's practices are visible but where the flame of democracy does not burn. In fact, at worst, the school may also form a community which no longer represents democracy, but rather oligarchy or even autocracy.

If we want school to pursue the democratic way of life as a form of human living, education and training have to be reorganized. Democracy cannot be pasted onto a curricular course plan, but at the same time it should not be organized merely under the guise of traditional activities promoting representative democracy. Taking part should be an everyday event, at which point what happens in classrooms or generally during education, becomes central. The basic activities, i.e. learning and being together, should be such that democracy can be implemented. Time has to be set aside for discussion where the possibility of an alternative view, the contentious nature of issues and consensuality can arise. Time, for its part, can be created by integrating communality into regular studying.

In democracy it is a question of listening to the other person and respecting his or her opinion. This should be realized in school organization at three levels: in encounters between pupils, between teachers, and between pupils and teachers. For these encounters to take place, however, structures have to be created. For pupils this can be done in the classrooms as part of the normal school day, but what about a common shared time for teachers, or one for the whole school – teachers and pupils?

When do teachers have time in school to discuss the basic questions about school, for example, why school exists or where their own school community is heading? In most communities the answer is probably never or a small group meeting voluntarily in their free time. In schools teachers have amazingly little time reserved for joint activities. Staff meetings once a month revolve around basic routines and for the rest of the time the teachers, at least one or two, are teaching. The structures are such that they make finding a common time impossible. If a particular group wants to start doing things differently, it is a long uphill struggle to challenge the structures, but nevertheless not an impossible task (Rautiainen et al. 2010).

The role of teacher education takes centre stage in creating the basis of a new culture. If we can say that the operational cultures of school differ from

each other only slightly, then the same applies to teacher education: the ways of doing things differently at the community level are few and far between. Since present-day teachers find an active school somewhat strange, the responsibility for change now falls increasingly to teacher education. Even here, though, change is not easy because, with some rare exceptions, teacher education itself also prefers to uphold existing school culture rather than develop alternatives where participation and activity would be constant and on a daily basis.

It is true to say, however, that teacher education has made efforts to change over the years. But the changes have not necessarily been deep structural changes, at least not aimed at activating teachers and hence students. Rather they have reinforced the prevailing mindset. When teacher education offers a specialization, for example, in art or languages, this cannot really be called a culture of doing things differently but more a weighting of contents in the programme. This weighting can lead to a deeper change, but at worst specialization may be a method of controlling the chaotic and fragmented nature of the programme with the ultimate aim of preserving, not changing, the culture (cf. Räihä 2010b).

In CITE we face phenomena authentically and not through imagined school situations. In practice, this means that we aim at arranging a sufficiently free and open intellectual atmosphere for the group to build a common understanding of itself and its work. The research includes experiential studies on learning and group processes. The experiences and diversity in the group are the starting point of the programme. For the course to succeed it is essential that instructors and students are able together to construct an investigative community where it is possible and safe to be interested in researching (Nikkola et al. 2008).

Figure 2

In the CITE programme a new culture of participation is being built which is based on an understanding of group and community activity. One of its dimensions is the political nature of education and, more broadly, of human actions, in other words the fact that issues are not neutral but always contain the possibility of seeing differently. It is possible to grasp them only by discussing with others. The activities of CITE are therefore structured to make discussion possible. For the entire academic year Mondays and Tuesdays are set aside for students studying in CITE. For the rest of the week they take the same courses as other students. For its own part, the teaching given by the CITE course instructors endeavours to help create and understand the new operational culture.

Even though it is difficult to create a new culture of participation, change has happened at the level of both attitude and action. One student describes this change as follows:

> "Yes, I think that you could affect them (the studies) and the contents of the courses as well, if you just want to do things differently then sure you can do them differently, if you can give your reasons why."
> "Yes, at least I've noticed that you yourself can have a big effect on your life and what goes on around you... Yes, like, you can, I mean all those teachers are just human beings and you can talk to them and try and change their mind."

According to teacher who has gone through the Critical Integrative Teacher Education (CITE) things could be done differently from how they are done now.

> "When you've been doing that work and had a look at the system, then perhaps you think more about what school could be. What it isn't yet, but what it hopefully could be sometime. Then you try to look at it, thinking about what could be done with this system. Some things really do annoy me, well, not just some but quite a lot. The idea of how you could set about changing it somehow, when you're just a rank-and-file teacher doing her basic work and trying to manage from one day to the next. And even though you mightn't have the chance or courage to set about changing it, I reckon it's important for me to notice, that I notice that there's something wrong here and something should be done about it. Because then at least you won't be spending your next 40 years wearing blinkers and be like the one who mutters to herself."
> (Räihä et al. 2011, 68).

At the action level CITE students as a group have carried out interventions to do with the student culture in the Department of Teacher Education. On its own initiative the 2005 intake group began to pursue history of education courses, which in the students' opinion were insufficiently on offer as part of regular studies. The same group also proposed a more sensible way of completing a natural history course. The course instructor accepted the group's well-argued proposal as a more sensible alternative (Moilanen, Rautiainen 2009). The examples demonstrate above all the shouldering of responsibility for professional development as well as taking an active role in one's own community.

Beside seeking to change the culture of teacher education and school, the

CITE programme also challenges university culture in a broader sense. Where the current trend, including at universities, is to try and make everything happen in networks or digital space, the CITE programme brings students more tightly together. And the time spent together in this closely-knit group not only concerns students but also instructors. More often than not there are several instructors present during CITE courses. In this way CITE authentically creates a model of teacher cooperation and learning together for future teachers.

Figure 3



Creating the new also affects the culture of evaluation (Moilanen, Nikkola, Räihä 2008). For example, no special course feedback is collected from students but courses are changed and refocused on the basis of research studies on the CITE. We have also researches teachers graduated from CITE programme (Räihä et al. 2011). Like other things, course teaching in the CITE group is to a large extent authentic – no external material is introduced into the courses. The result is that the theses and other research completed by students as well as instructors spring from that experience of being in a closely-knit group. In this way students become an active part of the community's activities also in the most crucial area – the development of teaching. Probably school should be like that, too.

## References

Ahonen, Sirkka. 2005. Opettaja kansalaisen mallina ja mentorina. [The Teacher as a Civic Model and Mentor]. In: Rantala, Jukka; Ahonen, Sirkka, eds. Kansalaisvaikuttaminen opettajankoulutuksen haasteena. [Civic Involvement as a Challenge for Teacher Education]. Historiallis-yhteiskuntatiedollisen kasvatuksen tutkimus- ja kehittämiskeskuksen tutkimuksia [Historical-Sociological Education Research and Development Centre Studies], No. 3, 19-32.

Antikainen, Ari; Rinne, Risto; Koski, Leena. 2003. Kasvatussosiologia. [Educational Sociology]. Helsinki.

Arendt, Hannah. 1958. The Human Condition. Chicago.

Aristotle. 1981. The Politics. (Transl. T. A. Sinclair). London.

Dewey, John. 1966. Democracy and Education. New York.

Englund, Tomas. 1986. Curriculum as a Political Problem. Changing Educational Conceptions with Special Reference to Citizenship Education. Upsala Studies in Education 25.

Feldmann-Wojtachnia, Eva; Gretschel, Anu; Helmisaari, Vappu; Kiilakoski, Tomi; Matthies, Aila-Leena; Meinhold-Henschel, Sigrid; Roth, Roland; Tasanko, Pia. 2010. Youth Participation in Finland and in Germany – Status Analysis and Data Based Recommendation. (www.nuorisotutkimusseura.fi/sivu.php?artikkeli_id=1040) assessed October 21, 2010.

Goodson, Ivor. 2005. Learning, Curriculum and Life Politics. The Selected Works of Ivor F. Goodson. London.

Ikonen, Risto. 2006. Yrittäjyyskasvatus. Kansalaisen taloudellista autonomiaa etsimässä. [Enterprise Education. Looking for the Citizen's Economic Autonomy]. SoPhi 102. Jyväskylä.

Kärenlampi, Paavo. 1999. Taistelu kouludemokratiasta. Kouludemokratian aalto Suomessa. [The Fight for School Democracy. The Wave of School Democracy in Finland]. Bibliotheca Historica 37. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura [Finnish Historical Society].

Moilanen, Pentti; Nikkola, Tiina; Räihä, Pekka. 2008. Opiskelijapalautteen käyttökelpoisuus yliopisto-opetuksen kehittämisessä. [The Usability of Student Feedback in Developing University Teaching]. In: Aikuiskasvatus [Adult Education], Vol. 1, 15-24.

Mäensivu, Marja. 2007. Opiskelija vastuuttomana alamaisena: opiskelun hierarkinen kehys oppimisen estäjänä. [The Student as Subordinate without Responsibility: The Hierarchic Study Frame as a Preventor of Learning]. Master's thesis. Teacher Education Department. University of Jyväskylä.

National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2004. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education.

Nikkola, Tiina; Räihä, Pekka; Moilanen, Pentti; Rautiainen, Matti; Saukkonen, Sakari. 2008. Towards a Deeper Understanding of Learning in Teacher Education. In: Nygaard, Claus; Holtham, Clive, eds. Understanding Learning-Centred Higher Education. Copenhagen, 251-263.

Nousiainen, Leena; Piekkari, Ulla. 2007. Osallistuva oppilas – yhteisöllinen koulu. Toimivan oppilaskunnan opas. [The Participating Pupil – The Community School]. Publications of the Finnish Ministry of Education, Vol. 32.

Rautiainen, Matti. 2008. Keiden koulu? Aineenopettajaksi opiskelevien käsityksiä Koulukulttuurin yhteisöllisyydestä. [Who Does School Belong to? Subject Teacher Students' Conceptions of Community in School Culture]. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 350.

Rautiainen, Matti; Nikkola, Tiina; Räihä, Pekka; Saukkonen, Sakari; Moilanen, Pentti. 2010. From Disorder to New Order: The Complexity of Creating New Educational Culture. In: Nygaard, Claus; Courtney, Nigel; Holtham, Clive, eds. Teaching Creativity – Creativity in Teaching. Faringdon, 189-202.

Räihä, Pekka. 2010a. Vakava-hankkeesta ei tullutkaan uuden ylioppilaan pelastajaa. [The Vakava Project Did Not Turn Out to Be the Saviour of a Newly Graduated Secondary School-Leaver.] In: Kasvatus [The Finnish Journal of Education], Vol. 41, No. 3, 213-225.

Räihä, Pekka. 2010b. Koskaan et muuttua saa! Luokanopettajakoulutuksen opiskelijavalinnan uudistamisen vaikeudesta. [Never May You Change! On the Difficulty of Reforming Student Selection for Class Teacher Education Programmes]. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 1559. Tampere University Press.

Räihä, Pekka; Mäensivu, Marja: Rautiainen, Matti; Nikkola, Tiina. 2011. The Sequence of Educational Innovation from University to Working Life. In: Nygaard, Claus; Courtney, Nigel; Holtham, Clive, eds. Beyond Transmission: Innovations in University Teaching. Oxfordshire, 63-76.

Räisänen, Mirka. 2008. Transformatiivisuuden säikeitä opettajapuheessa. Diskurssianalyysi opettajan yhteiskuntasuhteen rakentumisesta Opettaja-lehdessä. [Strands of Transformativeness. Discourse Analysis in Constructing a Teacher's Social Relationship in the *Opettaja* Magazine]. In: Kasvatus [The Finnish Journal of Education], Vol. 39, No. 1, 6-19.

Salmela-Aro, Katariina. 2008. Motivaatio ja hyvinvointi elämän siirtymissä. [Motivation and Well-Being at Life Transitions]. In: Psykologia [Psychology], Vol. 5, 374-379.

Salmela-Aro, Katariina; Kiuru, Noona; Nurmi, Jan-Erik. 2008. The Role of Educational Track in Adolescents' School Burnout: A Longitudinal Study. In: British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 78, No. 4, 663-689.

Schein, Edgar, H. 1985. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco.

Simola, Hannu. 1997. Pedagoginen dekontekstualismi ja opettajankoulutuksen opetussuunnitelmat. [Pedagogical Decontextualism and Teacher Education Curricula]. In: Kasvatus [The Finnish Journal of Education], Vol. 28, No. 1, 24-37.

Suoninen, Annika; Kupari, Pekka; Törmäkangas, Kari. 2010. Nuorten yhteiskunnalliset tiedot, osallistuminen ja asenteet. Kansainvälisen ICCS-tutkimuksen esituloksia. [Social Knowledge, Participation and Attitudes of Young People. Preliminary Results of the Internatiuonal ICCS Study].

University of Jyväskylä: Finnish Institute for Educational Research.

Suutarinen, Sakari; Brunell, Viking; Poutiainen, Annikki; Puhakka, Eija; Saari, Hannu; Törmäkangas, Kari. 2001. Suomen peruskoulun päättövaiheessa olevien nuorten yhteiskunnalliset tiedot, taidot, käsitykset, asenteet ja toiminta 28 maan kansainvälisessä vertailussa. Tulosten yhteenveto. [Social Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes and Activity of Young People Completing Finnish Basic Education in an Internatiuonal Comparison of 28 Countries. Summary of Results]. (http://ktl.jyu.fi/arkisto/civics/civics.htm.) accessed August 18, 2012.

Tolonen, Tarja. 2001. Nuorten kulttuurit koulussa: ääni, tila ja sukupuolten arkiset järjestykset. [Youth Cultures in School: Voice, Space and Everyday Orders of the Sexes]. Helsinki.

Toots, Anu. 2010. New International Study on Youth Civic Knowledge, Attitudes and Behaviours is Available for the Research Community. In: Journal of Social Science Education, Vol. 9, No. 3, 103–104. (http://www.jsse.org/2010/2010-3/pdf/Toots-JSSE-3-2010.pdf) accessed February 28, 2012.