DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 316 TM 027 802

AUTHOR Simola, Hannu
TITLE From Exclusion to Self-Selection: Citizenship and Examination of Behaviour in Finnish Elementary and Comprehensive Schooling from the 1860s to the 1990s.
PUB DATE 1997-08-00
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the European Sociological Association Conference (Essex, England, United Kingdom, August 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Behavior Patterns; *Citizenship Education; *Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Educational History; Educational Testing; *Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; School Restructuring; Standardized Tests; *Student Behavior; Student Evaluation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Finland

ABSTRACT

This paper investigated how the examination of student behavior, seen as techniques and their effects, has participated in the construction of citizenship in compulsory schooling in Finland. Data were gathered from "state educational discourse," including national curricula, governmental committee reports, legislative and regulatory material, and teacher handbooks. School year and term reports from 1995-96 were also studied. Four periods were identified as related to the dominant techniques of examination: (1) the old elementary school (1966-1943), dominated by punitive and exclusive techniques, with selective and standardizing techniques nearly nonexistent; (2) the new elementary school (1943-1970), which introduced new selective techniques of examination; (3) the young comprehensive school (1970-1994), which introduced standardizing techniques of examination; and (4) the real innovations of the modern comprehensive school with its variety of self-selective techniques. Virtually all the techniques of behavior examination are individualizing and normalizing, but in the elementary schools the focus has been on deviating students. In the comprehensive school, students have been regarded with more sophisticated and scrutinizing behavior examination. The most ambitious techniques proposed by academics have only been used for short periods or never used. The changing techniques are considered in light of other social changes, especially those in teaching. Central to this discussion is the concept of pastoral professionalism as presented by Michel Foucault. (Contains 74 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PE[illegible]ON TO REPRODUCE AND
[illegible]NATE THIS MATERIAL
[illegible]BEEN GRANTED BY
Hannu Simola

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 414 316

From Exclusion to Self-selection: Citizenship and examination of behaviour in Finnish elementary and comprehensive schooling from the 1860s to the 1990s

Hannu Simola
University of Helsinki

Paper presented in the European Sociological Association Conference,
"20th Century Europe: Inclusions/Exclusions"
August 27th—30th, 1997, Univeristy of Essex, Essex, U.K.

Contents

Correspondence:
Hannu Simola
Faculty of Education, P.O. Box 39
Bulevardi 18, FIN-00014 University of Helsinki
FINLAND

phone: +358-9-191 8059
E-mail: Hannu.Simola@helsinki.fi
telefax: +358-9-191 8073

TM027802

Abstract

The paper asks how did the examination of the pupils' behaviour, seen as techniques and their effects, participate in the construction of citizenship in Finnish compulsory schooling. The document material is constituted mainly of "state educational discourse", i.e. national curricula, governmental committee reports, legislative and administrative texts and semi-official handbooks on the elementary and later the comprehensive school and their teacher training from the 1860s up to now. Also a sample of school year and term report forms from 1995—96 has been used in analysis. Four periods were identified related to the dominant techniques for examination of pupils' behaviour: (1) The old elementary school (1866—1943) were dominated by punitive and exclusive techniques whereas selective and standardising techniques were virtually non existent. (2) While maintaining or even strenthening the exclusive and punitive techniques, the new elementary school (1943—70) introduced new selective techniques of examination. (3) Among the innovations of the young comprehensive school (1970—94), there were first of all standarising techniques of behaviour examination. Selective effects were completely consentrated to the new special education system. (4) The real innovation of the recent period, the new comprehensive school (1994—), are the variety of self-selective techniques. In the more general level, three more conclusions has been made: (1) Virtually all the techniques of behaviour examination are individualising and normalising. (2) During the elementary school periods, the examination was focused on the deviating pupils. It was only the comprehensive school that brought all the pupils under the scrutinising eye of more and more sophisticated and comprehensive behaviour examination. (3) The most ambitious techniques, proposed often by the academics, were used only for a short period of time, or they were never realised or their realisation deviatated essentially from the original intentions. In the final section of the paper, the changing techniques and their effects are brought into the context of other societal changes, first of all of changes in teacherhood. In this argumentation, the concept of pastoral professionalism is central.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From Exclusion to Self-selection: Citizenship and examination of behaviour in Finnish elementary and comprehensive schooling from the 1860s to the 1990s

Hannu Simola
Univeristy of Helsinki

Introduction

In his inaugural lecture at the Sorbonne in 1902, Emile Durkheim (1956, 126) described compulsory schooling as "an initiation ceremony" that makes of the initiate "an entirely new man", "a man and a citizen". He assumed that the school has the "effect of creating a new being in man". Although there is no consensus on the relationship between the "new man" realised through schooling and the intentions legitimising this constructive enterprise, the success of the compulsory school as a modern institution has been virtually without parallel (see, e.g., Meyer *et al.* 1993). According to John Boli (1989, 221), this "extended initiation rite" has developed into a fundamental societal institution promising to transform children "into modern individuals, capable of the rational calculation, self-discipline, political astuteness, and religious righteousness required to make the national policy both successful and just." Mass schooling has become the main gateway to the fully authorised citizenship globally.

It is no wonder therefore that connections between the school and other prerequisites for citizenship have always been strong. From the very beginning, schooling had links with two other initiation ceremonies — the religious rite of confirmation and military conscription that arose in response to the institutional demand for a new type of citizen in the new social order in Finland. Although the elementary[1] school was not yet even compulsory its "Founding Father", the Rev. Mr. Uno Cygnaeus, demanded that "no-one who is unable to demonstrate having attended elementary school if that was possible, should be accepted into the confirmation classes" (Cygnaeus 1910, 315—316). In 1881, military service was made considerably shorter for those possessing a graduation diploma from elementary school (Kerkkonen 1923, 135—151).

The subject of this study is history of the school examination concerning with pupils' behaviour. The concept of examination here covers a wide range of words: evaluation, assessment, grading, marking, measuring, etc. (cf. Foucault 1977). Examination links three dimensions I see as of fundamental importance here: knowledge, power and subjectivity. Different forms and procedures of examination will be seen as variety of techniques that have been proposed and realized in construction of

citizen in Finnish basic education. My historical approach is that of "history of truth" where truth as "something that can and must be thought" (Foucault, 1985, 7) is the phenomenon to be studied. The question to be asked is not "What is true?" but "How is truth created?" Thus the truths traced here are not mainly ideas, paradigms or premises presented in intentional or explicit forms but rather something from the "twilight zone" between words and things. They are often taken for granted and as so self-evident that they go without saying.[2]

My basic question is the following: how did the examination, as one ritual among others, participate in the construction of citizenship? It should be noted that the subject here is the citizenship rather than the citizen; the word rather than the thing; the texts rather than the action. But only rather. I will try to show how the concepts related to the school examination are brought into and used with a specific field of practice. My assumption is that there are no essential definitions prescribing the meaning of a word but that the word is always placed within systems of ideas and social practices which give meaning, interpretation, and social implications to that idea. Thus my interest here is in the institutional practices and epistemologies, rather than the texts themselves. (cf. Popkewitz 1991, 3)

Another reason for emphasising the citizenship rather than the citizen comes simply from the documents I am using here. They are mainly texts I have characterised as "state educational discourse": the national curricula, governmental committee reports, legislative and administrative texts and semi-official handbooks on the elementary and later the comprehensive school and their teacher training. These texts are the serious, authoritative verbal acts of experts who speak as such and who thereby form the official truth on schooling. They are, to quote Michel Foucault (1972, 49), discursive practices that "systematically form the objects of which they speak". Although these verbal acts are the products of individuals they have often (especially when circulating as law texts, administrative orders and state documents) the appearance of anonymity, of the official truth.

State educational discourse is a "*truth discourse*" in many senses. It has the guarantee of the state; the state as the "geometrical locus of all perspectives", as "the holder of the monopoly of legitimate symbolic violence", as Pierre Bourdieu (1990, 137) puts it. We may say that this truth discourse possesses at least three effects: one related to the discourse itself, a second to the power and third to the subject.[3] First, the state educational discourse defines what is "true" but, at the same time, what is "not-true". It determines what and how one has to speak to be considered an authoritative and serious expert in the field of education. This effect, producing certain ways to use language, might be called the *discursive effect*.[4] Secondly, official discourse tends to define the "right" and the "not-right", creating the basis for a certain kind of self-evident, taken-for-granted consensus about what kind of practical decisions and actions are accepted,

legitimised and justified. In a modern society, and maybe especially there, this kind of social and moral consensus is also necessary for effective and efficient societal life. This might be seen as a *power effect* of the truth discourse.[5] Finally, the official discourse also seeks to determine what is "good" and "not-good". It seems to be able to define the identity of the subjects — what they have been, what they are, and what they will be. This might be called the *subjectivity effect* of the truth discourse.[6]

The material of this study covers the whole span of mass schooling in Finland from its beginning in the 1860s up to now. It is therefore vital to focus this work exactly. First and as mentioned already above, I will focus on examination of behaviour. This means to exclude all the evaluation in school subjects. The list of attributes used as targets in assessing pupil behaviour over the years gives a hint as to where we will be going:

> "conduct", "neatness", "attentiveness", "inclinations", "character", "diligence", "persistence", "honesty", "attitude", "comprehension", "regularity", "punctuality", "initiative", "enterprise", "tidiness in work", "attitude towards safety considerations", "active participation", "ability and willingness to co-operate", "positive attitude and willingness to act according to the educational goals", "working habits", "independence", "creativity", "critical ability", "responsibility", "consideration of others" (etc.)

Second, I will deal here with examinations conducted by the ordinary teachers. Thus I will only briefly mention the examinations devised, e.g., by school physicians, nurses, psychologists or special teachers. Third, there are many procedures in schooling practices that clearly intersect with examination. Here I think especially of discipline and punishment. I will not scrutinise these. Finally, I will concentrate on what has been said about and in the written reports — i.e. the term and year reports and especially the graduation diplomas. This is of course the most fatal limitation here because they give only a faint picture of what really happens in classroom practices. Capitalising on the special character of the texts used here, however, we might hope to reach something not purely speculative beyond these texts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I
The old elementary school (1866—1943): Schooling the rural worker

The Finnish elementary school institution was established late (1866) and, compared with many European nations, became compulsory even later (1921) — actually only Belgium and Russia were at that time without a compulsory school system (Halila 1950, 15). In Denmark for example, compulsory elementary education was created as early as in 1814 and in Sweden in 1842. Finland was an agriculture-dominated country until quite recently. In 1945, about 70% of the population lived in rural areas and nearly 60% were employed in agriculture and forestry. Roughly speaking, two basic explanations might be found for this belated establishment of compulsory schooling. The establishment of the elementary school under the Russian empire (1809—1917) was actively opposed by the vast majority of the population, country people and the peasantry (Kivirauma & Jauhiainen 1996; Halila 1949b, 41—49). After independence and the bloody civil war in 1918, the upper classes also felt deeply disappointed with both the people and the efficiency of its schooling (Halila 1950, 11—14, 394—399). Thus it actually took up to the Second World War to make elementary education truly universal in Finland (Kivinen 1988).

Although the idea of Uno Cygnaeus was to make the elementary school the obligatory and common basis for all the further education, his dream never realised. The elementary school was first of all schooling for the rural population. Although the net of the elementary schools has been built up in the cities during the 19th century, in the 1930s some 20% of urban children still attended private or "preparatory" schools (Kivinen 1988). Those were abolished only in 1950s when a decree declared the four grades of elementary school as a prerequisite for entering the grammar school (Nurmi 1988, 227).

Until the Second World War, elementary school curriculum was constructed through the moral code.[7] Although the benefits of mass schooling for individuals were mentioned, schooling was principally legitimated by the needs of society, of the Nation, of the Fatherland. The aim was to educate pupils in the established religious and agrarian way of life where "work and faith were the central concepts of the curriculum and, home and fatherland [its] solid ground", as Risto Rinne (1987, 109) phrases it. Still, in 1946, a governmental committee saw the training of workers explicitly as the basic task of primary school while the middle (lower secondary) school was to bring up the future

foremen and the gymnasium (upper secondary school) the new generation of managers for the Fatherland (Curriculum 1946, 17).

From the beginning, it was clear that the elementary school must have an examination. Cygnaeus proposed in 1861 that the work of the school year must close by the spring *fetê* that is immediately preceded by the "year examination" where "the teacher may show his/her skills and (...) the children's advances in knowledge. But first of all, the results of the school year's work, useful for practical life, will become clear to the parishioners" (Cygnaeus 1910, 308) The examination had three functions for Cygnaeus. First, it was an official ritual where the knowledge and skills of the pupil were to be checked. Secondly, it was also a ritual evaluation of the teacher's competence. Finally, and this was the most important function for Cygnaeus, the examination presented an excellent opportunity to propagate the usefulness and the blessings of the elementary school among those people who were often not at all convinced by it. The emphasis of these functions changed over the years but all three have remained, in one way or another until now.[8]

The importance of the graduation diploma of the elementary school was actualised only when there was some use for it in the society. In the 1880s, military service was greatly shortened for those with the elementary school diploma, and so in 1889 the National Board of Education (NBE) announced the official form of the graduation diploma (Lönnbeck 1907, 202—203). The pupil's behaviour and progress in school subjects were to be graded by the French scale from 1 to 10. It is notable that there was a strong and prestigious opinion according which the diploma should not include any numbers at all but just a few remarks on the pupil's behaviour, diligence and progress. The diploma should thus be a certification and guarantee of citizenship, not a list of scholarly achievements. There was a consensus, however, on grading the behaviour of the pupils with two marks in the diploma: one for the "conduct" and another for their "neatness and attentiveness". (Salmela 1948, 11; Halila 1949b, 88—93)

It is a revealing fact that in spite of the achievement of national independence and establishment of the compulsory elementary school system nothing happened at official level about assessment and reports between 1889 and 1943. There were sporadic discussions of these issues among teachers and inspectors but no common consensus was reached about when for example a pupil should receive a graduation diploma, should a diploma include poor marks (1—4), how to use the grading scale, should some pupils repeat the grade, etc. According to Salmela (1948, 31—32), the teachers were up to then "sovereign as a Great Power" in their assessment. The basic reason for this inaccuracy was to be the anxiety that pupils would leave the school if the demands were too rigid. (*ibid.*, 9—21) It is fair to conclude that it was actually not so important what the graduation diploma from the elementary school was like. The most important thing was to possess it.

However, there was one mark where the symbolic guarantee of citizenship was crystallised above all: the conduct mark. Even that was not standardised by orders from the authorities. It was "quite common" to give the full 10 for conduct[9] "if the pupil did not possess a serious weakness of character or s/he had not made him/herself guilty of some grave misdemeanour." There were, however, teachers who thought that "nobody's conduct is excellent and so nobody should actually receive an excellent mark for it." (*ibid.*, 45) A semi-official handbook of pupil assessment described the meaning of the conduct mark assessment as follows:

> While grading conduct in the graduation diploma the teacher makes an announcement about how the pupil appeared, grown and developed during his/her school years. It shall be an announcement for society about what kind of position the individual prepared by the school might be placed in and about his/her value. It is the society that needs the assessment in the diploma, and not only to receive a newcomer from the school into life but also to maintain among the pupils a firm faith that respectability and capability will be prized but good-for-nothings will be punished. (Salmela 1948, 46)

If Lönnbeck might be seen as an early critic of the assesment of the scholarly achievements, it is Samppa Luoma who may be called as the early champion for the verbal assesment. In 1908 the publishing house Valistus[10] published a booklet called "Pupil's book" designed by Luoma (1908). The Pupil's book was a collection of report forms for pupil assessment by month, term and year for all the upper elementary school. In the monthly report page, the teacher should assess their pupils in dozen dimensions using the four-step scale (good - satisfactory - passable - poor). These dimensions were conduct, diligence, attentiveness, regularity in coming to the school and to the classroom, watchfulness of the instruction, carefulness of the home tasks, carefulness of the school tasks, obedience, neatness with the text- and notebooks, cleanness, and general progress. Also the delays, the absences, the punishments and the admonitions were registered here on the monthly base. Thus it was not overstatement when in the first page it was emphasised:

> Keep care of this book that you can show it to those who wish to receive information of your capability. This book is the best recommendation you may present in the future arenas of life while looking for a post. Therefore, behave yourself in the school so that this book would be for you a helper, a certificate of honour.

The new version of the Pupil's book was published probably in the 1910s[11]. Three curious innovations were introduced in this second print. First, the assesments were no more to be realized monthly but the teacher could do it less frequently. Further, in the first print, all the dimensions were rather external but the first genuine psychological dimension — *käsityskyky* (apprehension)— was introduced in the second print.

Finally, the verbal four-step scale was replaced by the equivalent number scale from 1 to 10. It is not in my knowledge how much the teachers used the first sophisticated monthly examination nor the later version. What is known, nevertheless, is that from the third version on, published probaly in 1923, these monthly report pages were excluded. Henceforth, the Pupil's book was to be just a technical collection of the term and year reports.

II
The new elementary school (1943—70): Schooling the democratic citizen

The moral curricular code changed into a *civic code* after the Second World War (Rinne 1987). Only then did the solitary and original individual emerge at the side of the Society as the legitimate basis for mass schooling. However, the individual was still subordinated to the interests of the Society. The school was seen as a "minor society" and as a working place for children. These features were to be utilised in moulding the "school-life" of the pupils so as to be totally educational. The main task of the school was to train "individuals for Society", or more precisely, "for our society." (Curr 1952, 13—14)[12]

In the 1940s, the compulsory elementary school was finally universalised in Finland. Only then were there school buildings in every corner of the country and virtually every child between age 7 and 15, in one form or another, went to school.[13] At the same time, it seemed to become necessary to standardise school examination. The common sense or teacher's conviction was not suitable for universalised schooling. Besides there was no longer any danger that pupils would leave school because it was finally institutionalised as a part, though not very long or uniform yet, of the normal life course of every citizen-to-be.

In the 1940s, the NBE finally gave orders[14] for pupil assessment and reports. Two poor marks has meant repeating the grade ever since. A graduation diploma could not include poor marks. The excellent mark for conduct will be given in the diploma "if the pupil had not made him/herself guilty of any grave offence, gross neglect or other proceeding that indicates obvious and serious weakness of character." The NBE also emphasised that the mean of the marks for each subject should stay between 7 and 8 without a specified reason for deviation. The grading must not be effected by affection or disgust for the pupil and should be based, if possible, on written tests. It was also declared that "the graduation diploma is a proof that the behaviour of the pupil is socially acceptable". To emphasise this, two new statements were included in the form of the graduation diploma. First, the teacher must complete the sentence "During his/her school career, the pupil has shown a special inclination to ....." Another sentence to continue was "The pupil has shown the following traits of character ....." (Mäntyoja 1951, 290—294; Salmela 1948, 154).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

But the circular from the NBE was not enough. Alfred Salmela, the long-standing and authoritative head of the General Education Department of the NBE, continued the standardisation work in his semi-official handbook titled "Pupil assessment in elementary school".[15] The first cycle in reform pursuits of elementary schooling was just launched in 1940s. Salmela's vision was related to it. He stated that in the "old" school it was enough to "reject the undersized and roughly-behaved" but that in modern school reform, "pupil assessment is one of its most important but also one of its most difficult problems." (Salmela 1948, 5—6)

Salmela paid a lot of attention to the assessment of behaviour because thought it a serious issue both for society and for the pupil. The function of the mark for conduct in the year or term reports is "to compel the pupil and his/her guardians to pay attention to the errors, even the smallest ones, that have occurred." But the graduation diploma was even a more serious thing. There the society demands that in assessing conduct, teacher should look "deep into pupil's heart", and the grading must be "unbribably and ruthlessly just", using "the scales of Goodness of Justice" (*ibid.*, 46). No wonder Salmela used the metaphor of a court of law here. He referred to the order of the NBE that the mark for conduct in the graduation diploma can be lowered only after deliberation by the school board. The school board was like the panel or the jury representing the common opinion and society, which is "not so formal as a conscientious and a little pedantic teacher may be." (*ibid.*, 58—59) All this was necessary because:

> The character and the behaviour of a human being belong so fundamentally to his/her personality that to show those lower than is the general level consists of a much more rigorous and injurious assessment than is an assessment of knowledge and skills. (...) Therefore great care is essential because the assessment touches upon the most sore point of a human being. (*ibid.*, 55)

What were then the crimes which lowered the mark for conduct in the graduation diploma according to Salmela? He mentioned only three clear cases: impudent contumacy against the teacher, fighting using a dangerous weapon, and pilfering and theft. We thus see that in legal terms the conduct mark in the graduation diploma was a case of serious *dolus* but not of *culpa* or *casus*. (*ibid.*, 47—49) If we believe Salmela, a lowered conduct mark really meant a kind of perdition for the pupil in Finnish society. It meant

> (...) being obliged to remain on the level of an unskilled, manual worker, not because of the mark itself but because of the defective character of the person this mark implies. A person with a lowered conduct mark in the graduation diploma is not easily accepted into a higher level than that of manual work in other employment. Further education will also close its doors to him/her. This looks like the Last Judgement indeed. (*ibid.*, 55—56)

Salmela thus went on to recommend that such a wretch could, after his/her penitence, receive a excuplatory document from the (same) teacher before the age of 18. Salmela also proposed the norm that a lowered conduct mark should not be given to more than one in every hundred pupils in their graduation diploma. A lowered mark for neatness and attentiveness was seen not as fatal, and should be given more often. The mean of the marks for neatness and attentiveness should, according to Salmela, be between 9 and 9.5, which meant on average that every third pupil would have a lowered mark for it in their graduation diploma (*ibid.*, 50—51, 59—60).[16]

Salmela also outlined the meaning and use of two sentences on the inclinations and characteristics of the pupil to be completed by the teacher in the graduation diploma. He remembered that one reason for assessment is to guide the pupil to a suitable career for him/her. The marks in the diploma, however, gave a quite one-sided picture of the pupil, wrote Salmela. They did not say much about the relation between diligence and gifts though this was of extreme importance in career counselling. Because in the society, as Salmela noted, there were many tasks needing diligence, persistence and loyalty rather than talents, the pupil with these qualities is worth having a comment about them in his/her graduation diploma. Referring to the NBE circular, he emphasised that the remarks on inclinations and character should be only positive, such as sports in the former case and diligence or thoroughness in the later. He then went on to emphasise the value of systematic observations in documentation to make the assessment valid. Finally he referred to the Swedish and U.S. discussions of assessing the "citizenship" of the pupil and declared that the aim and function of the new assessment of inclinations and characteristics corresponded to those. (Salmela 1948, 138—140)

In 1952, the report of the Curriculum Committee for the Elementary School (Curr 1952) was published. It became the national *model curriculum* as its precursor, the report the Curriculum Committee for the Rural Elementary School (Curr 1925) was in its time. Both were explicit and extensive (235 and 218 pages), and both had virtually no word about pupil assessment. The basic reason for this might be found in fact that the selective function of elementary school was still very limited. Only a few pupils aimed at studies in further education, and the diploma served only as a certificate for citizenship. Referring to Salmela's statement above, in the "old" elementary school it was enough to "reject the undersized and roughly-behaved" — and the 1952 committee were to prepare a curriculum for elementary school, not to think about general reform.

In 1952 curriculum, there was one statement referring to the emerging selective function of the elementary school. Considering the problems of vocational selection, the report noted that the elementary school should contribute to this because "the teacher knows so much about his/her pupil and his/her abilities." (Curr 1952, 22). Two other statements clearly illustrated that selection was, however, not any actualised task for elementary school. First, the curriculum emphasised that "[t]he main task of the teacher is to guide the studies of the pupil but not to control the results." (Curr 1952, 32) Second, speaking of studies in mathematics, the committee referred to the grammar school where the maths was "one of the most effective tools for pupil selection". In elementary school, mathematics "has no selective role" because it is oriented practically: "so that the pupil would cope well with life." (Curr 1946, 49)

Nevertheless, there was one point in which already the 1952 curriculum seemed an interesting precursor from the point of view of this paper: the idea of a complete archive was introduced. The curriculum proposed creating a certain system of "pupil register" for continuous and cumulative documentation of notes and observations about "the mental development and particularities of the child". The idea came from an eminent Finnish psychologist, Arvo Lehtovaara, who had published a rationale of pupil observation including 95 targets for evaluation. However, it is important to note that both the "Lehtovaara Rationale" and the pupil register were planned particularly for pupils "at risk", for those whose "mental balance and working capacity may easily be disturbed" (Curr 1952, 36). The idea of an extensive and exact archive was thus created but it was not yet time for concentrate on all pupils — the focus was still on the deviant ones.

The selective function also entered, nevertheless, into the agenda of the elementary school. In the 1950s, four grades of elementary school was made one prerequisite for entering the grammar (secondary) school (Nurmi 1988, 227). This was due to the increasing boom in the grammar school. From then on, the primary school teachers were to rank their pupils and to evaluate their possibilities for success in the grammar school. The former was based on the average grades but the later was a pure subjective assessment of the pupil's personality and talent.

Not only the pupils who went to the grammar school became subjects of selection procedures but also those who continued the elementary school. The 1958 Decree for the Elementary School stated that, for the carreer counceling, the teacher must take "continously notes, based on pupil observation", about "pupils' inclinations, abilities and hobbies" (Hinkkanen 1959, 48). In 1960, it was published a booklet for pupil's observation that included sociometric testing, evaluations of personality and behaviour, settlements of school succes and parents' attituds etc. The detailed questionaries and observation forms were standardised and, on the title page, the booklet was declared to be only for professional use. (See Jauhiainen 1993)

If these innovations came essentially from the intersection between the increasing need for selection and the rising psychology discipline, also pedagogy as a academic discipline made its contributions to the examination of pupil's behaviour. Its leading figure at that time, Professor Matti Koskenniemi, proposed repeatedly that the marks for conduct and for neatness and attentiveness are too narrow: they does not tell if the pupil has "a constructive mind or only a skill to avoid reprehensible conduct" (Koskenniemi 1944, 350). He introduced international examples of detailed evaluation of the pupils behaviour, character and personality and finally proposed a "Pupil's account" which model came from the Jena School, headed by Peter Petersen. Koskenniemi openly stated that especially the employers would benefit greatly from this kind of detailed description of the pupil's "whole being", "social and ethical attitude", "personality and its quality". (Cf. Koskenniemi 1952) To my knowledge, however, the Pupils account were never realized widely.

III
The young comprehensive school (1970—94): Schooling the egalitarian individual

The 1970s has sometimes been described as the "Golden Era of Reforms" in Finland. In the case of education, this might not be so much of an overstatement. Three important reforms were carried out. First, in the *Comprehensive School Reform* (1972—77), the dual-track school system of an eight-year compulsory school and a parallel grammar school was replaced by the single, mixed-ability comprehensive school in which the whole cohort of pupils were schooled for nine years full-time. Secondly, the *Teacher Education Reform* was put into practice during 1973—79, and it radically changed the training of primary school teachers (those who teach at the lower level, grades from 1 to 6, in the comprehensive school). Their training was removed from teacher training colleges and small-town "teacher preparation seminaries" to the brand-new university faculties of education established as part of the reform. In 1979 the training of primary school teachers was raised to the Master's degree level. All this was linked with the third reform, the *General Syllabus and Degree Reform in Higher Education* (1977—80) which abolished the Bachelor's degree. From then on, the first academic degree was to be a Master's degree, but in the midst of the 1990s, BA degrees made a comeback. (See Simola 1993a and 1993b)

To understand the distinction made between the "old" and the "new" school, it may be useful to refer to four central discursive changes emerging since the late '60s in

Finnish state educational discourse. I have characterised these as individualisation, decontextualization, goal rationalisation and disciplinisation (see Simola 1995; Simola et al. 1996; Simola et al. in print). First, *individualisation* means that the school's basic commitment is to respond to the individual learning needs and abilities of every pupil. The idea that the teacher's work was to mould the school-life of a group of pupils has changed in the late '60s to a new one in which the teacher's work is an individual-centred task. This might also be called a shift to an *individualist curricular code*. Second, the socio-historically formed institutional context of teaching and learning in school has gradually vanished from the texts since the 1970s. This process I call *decontextualisation*. Third, in the late 1960s, a shift from value-rational to goal-rational thinking about action was effected in official school texts. This process of *goal rationalisation* made the official goals of schooling the starting point for both planning and teaching. Fourth, the *disciplinisation* of speaking about teachers' work meant that, instead of different domains of knowledge, one academic discipline — educational sciences or, more precisely, didactically-oriented educational science — has taken a monopoly position in determining the true knowledge for the teacher's work.

As shown above, grading and assessing the pupil was not considered before the 1960s in curricular or committee texts. In all the decrees determining the tasks of the teacher, however, it was clearly stated that the teacher shall "check and supervise the exercises, carry out the grading and prepare the pupils' report cards" (Hinkkanen 1959, 80). It was only in 1960 that "evaluation of learning results and pupil assessment" was first mentioned as one study content of didactics[17] in teacher training (CR 1960, 77). Neither had the NBE sent new circulars or other orders about pupil assessment since the 1943 letter mentioned above. It was simply not seen as problematic.

A dramatic change occurred in comprehensive school texts. Since the 1966 report on the school reform (CR 1966), the examination has become a constant and central theme of official school discourse. The report noted the problem that the traditional grading and assessment of pupils gave both quantitatively and qualitatively limited knowledge about their progress in their studies. Both pupils themselves and parents, teachers, future educational institutes and employers were seen as in need, first, of comprehensive and individual assessment during the school years, and second, of objective and comparable grading in the leaving certificate. According to the report, verbal reports for the former and standardised tests for the latter purpose were necessary. The committee made the distinction between "pedagogic assessment" and "final assessment" clearly and explicitly stating that these "must be carefully distinguished one from the other" (CR 1966, 81). These two main examination techniques of assessment by words and grading by marks (numbers) have appeared ever since as the basis for two central

functions of schooling: objective assessment for selection of pupils and comprehensive evaluation for academic achievement.

The report of the Curriculum Committee for the Comprehensive school in 1970 became the very monument of this break. It introduced, among many other novelties, the term "evaluation" into the general educational discourse. The valid, objective and comparable pupil evaluation was seen, first of all, as serving the society outside the school as well as the parents. In 1970 this was assumed to be possible due to "the considerable development in measurement techniques of learning achievements" (Curr 1970, 161). Standardised testing especially was hoped to objectively establish the "pupil's rank in his/her own study group and the level of this study group in relation to other corresponding groups" (*ibid.*, 171—172).

Developments in educational sciences and psychology were seen both as legitimating profound intervention into the personality of the pupil and also offering the tools for it. The 1970 curriculum committee brought onto the stage the whole range of scientific vocabulary with terms referring especially to medicine. In this "diagnostic-didactic" discourse, it became usual to talk about ability and personality testing, systematic and continuing observation, summative, formative and diagnostic tests and also about the teachers able to utilise all this new technology.

According to the 1970 curriculum, everything can and must be evaluated. If in the elementary school, two dimensions of behaviour and the results in studies of different school subjects were assessed, in comprehensive school this was certainly not enough. The 1970 committee referred to the necessity of advanced evaluation methods of achieving the goals in religious, social, ethic and esthethic education but also in "development of the whole personality" (Curr 1970, 162). It was proposed to send to the parents, twice or three times per term, a written description, especially of the "development of pupil's personality and maturation and learning in his/her social skills" (*ibid.*, 170). Even "poor learning success" in "emotional development and in social skills" might lead the pupil to be "moved to special education or to further examinations and possibly to therapeutic procedures", the committee noted (*ibid.*, 160). Therefore it was created for the new comprehensive school a vast special education sector where at present about 16 percent of pupils are involved, part-time or full-time in special schools or classrooms (see Kivirauma 1989; Rinne & Kivirauma 1997).

Every pupil was also to be evaluated individually and comprehensively. If in elementary school the teacher's knowledge of the pupil was clearly concentrated on *deviating* pupils, in the comprehensive school it was looked to for methods to help the teacher to know his/her *every* pupil individually and fundamentally. Besides this systematic observation and scientific testing, another technique (already in existence in elementary school in embryo) of the complete archive was now developed in to its full flourish. The school had collected knowledge about its pupils in many forms. From the

very beginning (1866), the teacher was obliged to keep a "name book" of her pupils including name, birth, the parents, address and financial situation. Second, from 1882, the teacher had to mark in the class book the content of teaching and the names of the absent pupils. (Lönnbeck 1907, 148—149) During this century, every graduation diploma had to be archived in the school (Kerkkonen 1923, 75, 13). The fourth field of knowledge was constructed much later, from the 1950s, when the school health care was organised and universalised by the state, and information on the pupils was compiled on the individual "pupil's health cards". Finally, in 1985, the "punishment book" was created in which the disciplinary punishments were to be written. [18]

It was only the 1970 committee that made an effort to integrate all these bodies of information into one archive. It was seen justified by the ambitious goal of responding to the learning needs and abilities of every individual pupil. For the "pupil diagnosis", "the teacher needs very much information about the pupil" (Curr 1970, 160). The school should receive "as detailed announcement as possible on the physical and psychological development of the child from birth and information about his/her interests at home." The school must also know such a things as the educational principles and wishes of the parents and their educational level and work conditions; the economic situation and living conditions of the family; relationships between the siblings, etc. Thus the 1970 curriculum introduced the fully-fledged archive that was supposed to consist of massive information on "gifts, character, family background, hobbies, physical development and school performances" that were to be gathered through "testing, questionnaires, interviews, home visits, exams, etc." (Curr 1970, 186) What was of essential importance here was that this personal "pupil information card" be categorised as a "confidential document" — and as such closed to the pupil and his/her parents but open to teachers, school officials and researchers (*ibid.*, 172).

However, the 1970 committee's dream of the complete archive was never realised though the reason was not its totalitarian character but the problems in its practical construction.[19] A widely-used school handbook from the 1970s cited indeed the claim of the 1970 curriculum that "[t]he unity between the marks in the pupil information card dealing with his/her cognitive advance and personality development and the information on the pupil's health card is necessary for their effective use." (Kettunen & Koski 1972, 210) This claim was never realised (cf. Lindström & Kärkkäinen 1986, 119). The information collected on the pupil information card also became much more restricted than the 1970 committee suggested. According to the handbook mentioned above, the pupil information card should include pupil's personal data, that of his/her parents, all the pupil 's marks in various grades and a space for "further information on the pupil" (Kettunen & Koski 1972, 211—212). In the 1980s, the card became even more restricted containing no information about the vocation of the parents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The real innovation of the 1970s, however, concerned the comprehensive verbal assessment. There was, of course, nothing new in verbal evaluation which has always been the main everyday feedback that the pupils receive from their teachers. Until then, however, it was mainly informal and implicit. The origins of formal, explicit verbal assessment are to be found additional remarks on pupil's inclinations and characteristics in the elementary school diploma, as stated by the NBE directive in 1943. Now the verbal assessment, both in oral and written form, became the main proposal of the 1973 committee for reform of pupil assessment (CR 1973). The committee decleared its vision of "a gradual shift from comparative assessment to counselling verbal information" (*ibid.*, 120). Through developing goals, tests and counselling, the 1973 committee believed it possible to "abandon the predictive assessment models and to move to the use of counselling information and remarks of the courses that the pupil has passed (*ibid.*, 118). In 1976, a NBE circular recommended using "a verbal information form" in the three lowest grades.[20] The NBE also supplied model forms that became the basis of verbal assessment in the Finnish comprehensive school up to the 1990s. (Koski 1981, 12—16)

The model form consisted of 66 statements that were to be evaluated mainly on a three-step scale (e.g. frequently / sometimes / rarely). The statements dealt with six areas including "Working habits", "Adaptation", "Progress in school subjects", "Skills in mothers-tongue", "Skills in foreign language" and "Skills in mathematics".[21] The first two areas are here of special interest. Working habits were assessed through statements such as: "The pupil is able to concentrate on his/her work"; "The pupil is able to co-operate with his/her class-mates"; "The pupil is able to work consistently"). The social adaptation of the pupil was described by the statements such as: "The pupil behaves kindly and politely towards his/her class-mates and teacher"; "The pupil seems to enjoy his/her stay in the school"; "The pupil is able to follow the collectively accepted rules of the school." It is to be remembered that using these forms was only a recommendation and there is no evidence of how much they were used in reality. Nevertheless, a new technique of assessment had been introduced into Finnish state educational discourse.

The comprehensive school also brought changes in traditional numerical assessment of behaviour. A decree provided that the marks for conduct and neatness were *not* to be included in the comprehensive school graduation diploma after 1970 (Kettunen & Koski 1972, 327). This made it possible to argue for using the whole numerical scale in conduct and neatness assessment as well because it was now in school-time use only. A NBE circular in 1978 ordered teachers to use the whole scale in behavioural assessment emphasising, however, that "the excellent marks may be used often" (Koski 1981, 20). The circular stated that adequate behavioural assessment "requires an extensive view of individuality and personality development of the pupil and of those different forms by which the goals of schooling may be achieved" (*ibid.*, 21). The basic

dimensions of the conduct assessment were three: "honesty", "consideration of other persons" and "attitude towards the environment of work and living". The dimensions of the neatness assessment were "regularity and punctuality", "initiative", "tidiness in work" and "attitude towards safety considerations" (*ibid.*, 21—23).

The 1985 framework curriculum realised some basic ideas of the 1973 committee for renewal of pupil assessment (CR 1973). The 1985 curriculum concluded that it would be possible to shift from selection to counselling while orienting the pupils towards further education after the comprehensive school. This optimism was based first on a governmental decision to guarantee a full-time student equivalent for every comprehensive school graduate by the end of the 1980s. Secondly, the pupil cohorts were continuously decreasing. The curriculum text believed that these trends would give more autonomous space to the comprehensive school because its function would be less and less selective. (CR 1985, 11)

Based on these considerations, the 1985 curriculum introduced an unique assessment model where traditional relative assessment was explicitly abandoned. The learning results of one pupil must no longer to be compared to other pupils in the group but to his/her individual learning goals. It was stated that, based on the goals defined by the curriculum,

> (...) it must be clarified how far towards the general goals each pupil is able to advance in each specific issue, within the limit of his/her own abilities. Therefore the pupil's marks will show also how s/he has succeeded in this. This kind of evaluative procedure may be called *goal-based evaluation*. In giving marks the teacher does not compare the learning results of one pupil to those of others as in relative assessment. The individualisation of learning goals should spur[22] every pupil to capitalise on his/her own abilities as efficiently as possible. (Curr 1985, 29)

However, the curriculum did not abolish numerical assessment and even defined the general levels of each mark related to the national curriculum (*ibid.*, 31). To bring more flexibility to grading and to give the weak pupils an opportunity to have better than the poorest marks (*ibid.*, 30), it introduced another radical principle that meant a break with the tradition covering all compulsory schooling. The 1970 curriculum has formulated this principle as follows: "[T]he assessment carried out by the teacher would be focused on the performance and particular behaviour of the pupil but not on his/her personality as a whole" (Curr 1970, 52). Since 1985, in addition to knowledge and skills, "the achievement of general educational goals that are central for the whole development of the pupil" would also be taken into account in grading school subjects (Curr 1985, 30). Examples of such criteria included "active participation", "ability and wil-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

lingness to co-operation", "the positive attitude and willingness to act according to the educational goals" (*ibid.*, 30, 31).

These two innovations — goal-based evaluation and considering the achievement of general educational goals in assessing teaching subjects — allowed the teacher totally free hands, at least in principle, in pupil assessment. First, the teacher had both the right and the duty to define "the limits of pupil's abilities" (*ibid.*, 29) as a basis for assessment. Secondly, the teacher was justified in raising or lowering the pupil's mark in a school subject pleading the "achievement of the general goals that are important for overall development of the pupil" (*ibid.*, 30).

The third innovation of the 1985 curriculum also emphasised the omnipotence of the teacher's observing eye. The feedback on the pupil's progress and development was seen as coming from two main sources, first, from "summative testing", and second, from "observation of continuing proof". There is nothing unusual in former concept meaning just traditional exams but the later might indeed come streight from Foucault's pen:

> The teacher realises *observation of continuing proof* by controlling the participation of the pupil in the learning situation in all its forms. Both oral and written proof may be the subject of observation. The observation shall be systematised and diversified because then it will develop the teacher's knowledge of the individual pupil. The knowledge produced from observation will supplement the feedback on the pupil's progress proved by the tests. In some school subjects, the observation will be the only basis for assessment. Formative tasks are one form of observation of continuing proof though their basic aim is to give to the teacher immediate feedback on the achievement of learning objectives. (...) It is not necessary to inform the pupils of the formative tasks in advance, since then they could get some sense of summative testing. (Curr 1985, 30)

There is no evidence that the goal-based evaluation would have effected the everyday routines of assessment in the school in any way. It has been claimed that it was "inflating" the marks in the comprehensive school and making them less comparable (CR 1996, 17, 22; Apajalahti 1995, 5). If so, the NBE order to change pupil evaluation in 1991 did not weaken this trend because the detailed recommendations of the levels for the assessment in the 1985 curriculum were replaced by a short descriptions according which "evaluation must be individual and related to the age and abilities of the pupil" (*ibid.*, 6). Verbal assessment became possible in the four lowest grades of the school, and the assessment of behaviour remained similar as it has been since 1978, i.e. it was not included in the graduation diploma.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV
The new comprehensive school (1994—): Schooling the competitive individual

The change brought by the 1994 curriculum was quite dramatic. One can speak about at least three historical breaks. The first change concerned the role of teaching content. While the 130-year history of the Finnish curriculum up to 1994 was a continuum of more and more sophisticated and exact articulation of *what* was to be taught by the teacher, the 1994 curriculum meant a dramatic break in this continuity. The contents were absorbed into abstract and general notions while the goals took the central stage, stating uniformly and systematically but generally what the individual pupil should learn. It is fair to say that the 1994 framework curriculum is composed entirely of the goals and the evaluation of their achievement.

The second change was finally to bring the curriculum planning to the school level. A reason was to be read in the curriculum itself: "Research shows that teachers' participation in the writing of the curriculum is an important prerequisite for any real changes in the inner workings of the school. Curricula made by others remain something external, and there is no commitment to implement them." (Curr 1994, 11)

The third change was related to the concept of the pupil. Although the curricular code was still individualist, a qualitative change might be characterised as a shift from *egalitarian* individualism to *competitive* (or market) individualism (cf. Koski & Nummenmaa 1995). The curriculum explicitly manifested a turn toward those values that "promote the strengthening individualism" (Curr 1994, 10):

> Each student is an individual whose world of experiences forms different starting points for learning new things. The means of direct learning depend on this individual history of experiences. In the making of the curriculum, this means facilitation of individual study plans on the basis of talents, interests, and learning difficulties. (*ibid.*, 11)

It is no wonder then that the main justification for all the development, systematisation and intensification of evaluation was presented as being entirely in service to the pupil him/herself.

> The evaluation should promote the development of sound self-esteem in the student as well as a formation of realistic awareness of his [*sic*] own knowledge and skills and of the importance of continuous studies. His self-esteem is reinforced and his awareness of himself, his own aims and possibilities are emphasised when his freedom of choice and the flexibility in the school system are increa-

> sed. The feedback in the form of evaluation in school that the student gets directs his interests and efforts. (...) The task of evaluation is to encourage the student — in the positive way — to set his own aims, to plan his work and to make independent choices. (...) Student evaluation and other evaluation are based on the aims of the curriculum. What is important is that the evaluation centres on the individual and takes into consideration his developmental stage and abilities. (*ibid.*, 29—30)

Emphasis on the verbal evaluation and the process of learning fitted well with the individual-centred ethos of the 1994 curriculum. According to the text, "[v]erbal evaluation gives to the individual student a meaningful wealth of evaluation information which supports him in his studies. (...) More and more attention in this feedback should be paid to the process of learning" (*ibid.*, 28) The importance of evaluation was manifested in speaking about the importance of reviewing, improving and developing the "school's evaluation system" as an essential part of both curriculum and school practices (*ibid.*, 30). A novelty in assessment of conduct and neatness was that they would be reported by one mark. This mark for behaviour would still not be included in the graduation diploma but here the 1994 curriculum added an important sentence: "unless the parents so requests." (Curr 1994, 32) "Self-evaluation", "group evaluation" and "evaluation discussion" were introduced as new techniques of examination. (*ibid.*, 29)

If the emphasis was clearly on the verbal rather than numerical assessment and on the process rather than on the learning result evaluation, these both dimensions were however there. The 1994 curriculum stated clearly that the evaluation also has selective functions:

> The evaluation information serves an important purpose outside the school. The student's guardians, other institutes of learning, and working life need information on the student as decisions which are important for his future are made. (...) The use of evaluation in making individual choices, among other things, requires reliable and fair evaluation of learning. In life, the student is faced with situations where his knowledge and skills are compared with those of others and he is placed in order on the basis of the evaluation the school gives him. (*ibid.*, 29)

It might be seen as a signal of the importance of evaluation and reports that their chapters were the only ones of the 1994 framework curriculum which were completely rewritten already in the very next year by the NBE (National Board of Education 1995). Verbal assessment became possible also in all grades in comprehensive school, although since the 4th grade only as complementay besides the numeric assessment. One can see in the 1995 text an increasing emphasis on individual centredness and an attempt to diversify the basis of assessment. Justification of evaluation comes now nearly completely from the individual pupil, and numerical grading may be complemented by a verbal assessment in all reports. (cf. Apajalahti 1996, 7)[23]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The report of the working group on pupil evaluation appointed by the Ministry of Education is the most recent piece of state educational discourse on school examination (CR 1996). From the point of view of this paper, the report made one essential proposal bringing the assessment of behaviour once again to the fore. It first accused the traditional behavious mark of being "quite narrow and, on the other hand, tending to stigmatise the pupil" (CR 1996, 41). The behaviour mark should be replaced by the "description of pupil's working". The report proposed that the graduation diploma of the comprehensive school would be a whole consisting of two obligatory parts and accompanied by voluntary appendices.[24] The first part would be the traditional report with numerical grading[25] and the second part a description of pupil's working habits. The report lists targets of this verbal assessment:

> (...) besides conduct and neatness, the working description includes diligence, persistence, initiative, independence, creativity, criticalness, responsibility, cooperativeness and consideration of others. Thus the evaluation of pupil's working will respond better to the challenges imposed by modern society and working life than assessing merely the conduct and neatness." (*ibid.*)

It is quite ironic then that the report notes just before the above paragraph: "Regarding the verbal assessment, it is essential that the target of the evaluation be pupil's proofs and performance but not his/her personality" (*ibid.*).

Report formulas in 1995—96:
Some observations on verbal assessment of behaviour

The 1994 curriculum made it possible for the schools to create a curriculum of their own based, however, on the national frame curriculum (Curr 1994). In many cities and municipalities, the local board of education gave the schools quite free hands in the forms of reports, as in the cases of Helsinki and Vantaa, for example. The schools were allowed to use their own forms both for the intermediate reports (given at least once in the course of the school year) and for the yearly reports (given at the end of the school year). They should, however, have formal confirmation of their form from the city school board. In the following, I will present some observations on the material consisting of report forms from 55 primary schools — 38 from Helsinki and 17 from Vantaa — representing 54% and 43% of primary schools of those cities in the school year 1995—96.[26] The report forms are for primary school (grades 1—6), mainly, however, froms 1—4.[27] The material analysed here concern only assessment of behaviour; thus the verbal assesment of pupil's knowlege and skills in school subjects is excluded.

Before the detailed consideration, it is important to note that these forms are "verbal" in a very limited sense of the word. Actually the assesments are multi-choice

questionnaires where teacher's or pupil's agreement with a statement is expressed on a three- to five-step scale. Only a few forms include open questions or even sentences to be completed. Therefore, we may well claim that the "Pupils' Book" designed by Luoma from 1908 (see above, pp. 9—10) are early predecessors of this kind of "verbal" assessment. The following extract (Extract 1) gives two examples of types of the statements in assessment realized by teacher:

Extract 1: Examples of typical statements in assessment realized by teacher

You work conscientiously and enthusiastically

rarely often mostly

To adapt him- or herself to different working groups

Pupil masters the skill	Pupil masters the skill satifactorly	Pupil needs more practice

I one quarter of the schools (N=14), there were in the forms also the area where the pupil assess him/herself. Among these schools using pupils self-evaluation, 9 used a parallel teacher assessment. The teacher marks his/her own assessment or comments *after* the pupil has done his/her self-evaluation. We may then imagine the situation where the pupil grades him/herself as ticking "mostly" on "responsibility for his/her own school and home work" but the teacher ticks only "often". Or the pupil states that s/he "accepts disappointments" "well" but the teacher marks "poor" acceptance instead.
Two typical formulations for the pupul's self-assesment were the following kind (Extract 2):

Extract 2: Examples of typical statements in self-assessment realized by pupil area where the pupil assess him/herself

I take care of my tasks and things

rarely often mostly

Following good manners

I master the skill	I master the skill satifactorly	I need more practice

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While from the most schools, there were both term and year report forms and from different grades, the same statements were used repetatively. In the following table 1, the distribution of different statements is presented[28]:

Table 1: The distributions of the different statements, by number and per cent

	Assesment by teacher (N)	Percent of all statements (%)	Self-assesment by pupil (N)	Percent of all statements (%)
1- Attitude	13	5 %	3	2 %
2- Behaviour	5	2 %	15	8 %
3- Conscientiousness	8	3 %	7	4 %
4- Attentivity	2	1 %	10	5 %
5- Punctuality	-	-	2	1 %
6- Adaptability	48	20 %	36	19 %
7- Co-operativity	37	15 %	13	7 %
8- Dilingency	6	3 %	7	4 %
9- Responsibility	44	18 %	42	22 %
"Traditionals" in sum	**163**	**68 %**	**135**	**70 %**
10- Socality	3	1 %	15	8 %
11- Independency	58	24 %	13	7 %
12- Activity	6	3 %	5	3 %
13- Creativity	2	1 %	1	1 %
14- Criticism	1	0 %	-	-
15- Courage	1	0 %	-	-
16- Personality	-	-	7	4 %
17- Others	7	4 %	16	8 %
"Progressives" in sum	**78**	**32 %**	**57**	**30%**
Totals	**241**	**100 %**	**192**	**100 %**

The table 1 tells that there were 241 different statements used in teachers' assessment and 192 in the pupils' self-assesment. The statements are devided in two categories. The "traditional" statements refer to the behaviour (or chracteristics) of a well-behaved, punctual, painstaking, dilingent, adaptable and obedient pupil; ti put it simply: of a nice pupil. These kind of traits have often been connected in the progressivist child-centred literature to the traditional school goodnes, to so called "hidden curriculum". To the contrary, the "progressive" traits refer to qualities often emphasised in modern child-cemtred pedagogy.

We may make some interesting notes from the table above. The great majority (about 70 percent) of the stements — both in teacher's assement and pupil's self-assement — are traditionals. Furthermore, we must add here the also those of the "progressive" statemets that in fact refer to specific "school-independency" or "school-activity", at least. By these I mean the formulations like ""the pupil is able to silent, independent work" or "the pupil shows his or her activity by putting up his or her hand" which refer to traditional rather than to progressive notions. [29]. Thus it is fair to say that roughly 70 to 90 percent of statements refer to the traditional behaviour of good pupil. It is curious that many traits emphasised in the reform dicourse since the 1960s (e.g., honesty, thruthfulness and justice) are completely excluded from the verbal assessment of these schools or exist only very rarely (e.g., creativity, criticism and courage) there. The concentration to the traditional school kindness comes even clearer if we see how the traditional and progressive statements are distributed between the schools (table 2):

Table 2: Distribution of the "progressive" statements among the schools

Number of the "progressive" statments (N)	Nuumber of the schools (N)	Percent from all schools (%)
0 statements	12	22%
1 statement	27	49%
2 statements	9	16%
3 statements	3	5%
4 statements	0	0%
5 statements	3	5%
6 statements	1	2%
Totals	**55**	**100 %**

We see that the fifth of the schools (N=12/22%) does not use any traditional statement in their forms. Furhermore one half of the schools use only one progressive statement which is not much if we take seriously what above was said about "school-activity" or "school-independency". In other words, only one third of the schools used quite surely some "progressive" statements among the "traditionals".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V

Techniques of examination and their effects

As stated at the beginning of this paper, my focus here is on power in studying the construction of the citizenship through examination in compulsory schooling. We have above gone through a history of examination in the Finnish elementary and comprehensive school. What we have found are, first of all, different procedures or techniques that are supposed to be used in examination practices, or in evaluation, assessment, grading, marking, testing, etc. They might be seen as intermediating elements in relationships between the teachers and their pupils. In the following, I will first summarise the disappearance and appearance of different techniques in school examination. Then I try to deliberate on effects — just possible and potential because the documentary material does not allow more.

All the examination is essentially a question of power — although in state educational school discourse this is the issue that has lately veered almost into a *taboo*. It is seemingly clear that this is the case *par excellence* where the teacher uses his/her power over the pupil. However, I will utilise here two different notions or dimensions of power: one is a concept of power as sovereignty and the other is a view of power as productive (see Popkewitz & Simola, 1996). I will claim that it is exactly in these techniques where we can see the two-dimensional effects of power. The procedures of examination appear often as clearly repressive ones but, at the same time, they are productive as well. The idea of power as a problem of sovereignty is one that has dominated literature about schooling (see, e.g., Popkewitz & Brennan, in press). The concept of sovereign power directs attention to "something" owned by teachers, students, or structurally defined groups such as those of class, race and gender. That ownership can be re-distributed among groups in social arenas so as to redistribute power, hence the use of the term of "sovereignty".

The concept of power as productive involves attention to a different but complementary side of power to that of sovereignty which focuses on the ways in which it produces practices, knowledge and subjectivities. If we think about childhood, curriculum or teaching, for example, they embody systems of ideas that circulate within teaching. These ideas are not "merely" descriptive and expressive of contexts and people's intentions. The ideas normalise practices through the way in which ideas differentiate, distinguish, and divide. If we take common practices such as saying that a child is a "good learner" or that a teacher is "successful", for example, these phrases are not "merely" descriptive of people's accomplishments. They also inscribe a continuum of norms

that distinguishes and divides. To speak about the "successful" teacher or child brings to bear unspoken norms of comparison, since the "successful" also implies norms for the "not-successful". (Popkewitz & Simola, forthcoming)

We may thus see school examination of pupul's behaviour as *techniques* that produce different *effects* both to the subjects of examination (pupils) and to those realizing them (teachers). This kind of techniques are, e.g., giving numerical marks for conduct, neatness and attentiveness without any official guides or orders (1866—1943), describing pupil's inclinations and character in the Graduation Diploma (1943—70), mensual assessment of different dimensions of behaviour in the Pupul's Book (1908—23), Lehtovaara Rationale for observation of deviant pupils (1952—70), and pupil's semi-verbal self-assessment with parallel teacher's assessment in term and year reports (1994—), evaluative discussion between teachers and parents (1994—).

Effects of these techniques are, at least partly, independent from intentions of those realising them. Lowering the mark for conduct in the Graduation Diploma ment exclusion and punishment, no matter if the intention of teacher were just to educate the pupil. Effects of using Lehtovaara Rationale in observation of pupils during the 1960s were selective and normative eventhough the teacher only wanted to help the pupil with learning difficulties. The individual study plans produce selctive and self-selective effects inspite of their inentions to response to inclinations and interests of pupils.

We may clarify the concepts of techniques and theri effects by analysing shortly three different types of basic techniques in examination of pupil's behaviour in Finnish schoolin: There are, first, pedagogic examinations realised during the school years in very different forms; econdly, examinations for term and year reports, and finally, the examinations materialized in Graduation Diploma. Virtually all the examinations have *individualising* and *normalising* effects. They mould the soul and the body of the child as many studies have shown. The 1994 curriculum put this fact clearly as follows:

> To a large extent, the student concretises the aims of his studies and forms his self-image through evaluation. Evaluation is part of all phases of interaction in school. Some of it is conscious feedback to the student on his studies and progress; some is unconscious communication from the teacher and fellow students. (Curr 1994, 28)

This is not to say that these effects would necessary be positive, emancipatory or empowering but neither are they always negative, repressive or punitive. All in all, new subjectivities are constructed, and they construct themselves in practices constituted (partly) by the techniques of these pedagogic examinations.

Besides individualisation and normalisation, the main effect of the examination materialised in the assessments written in the graduating diploma — no matter whether they are numerical or verbal, chosen by the pupils or by somebody else — is *selective*.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It classifies, categorises, defines, verbalises, numerates, makes comparable, objectifies but also individualises — in a word, it tells the truth about the pupil as an individual. These practices are clearly top-down procedures, using power in a classic, possessive and sovereign way, and so the effects also could be *punishing* and *excluding*. However, this is not to say that the subjects of power, the pupils, would be totally subjugated here. Although very limited, they have always had ways to influence to the results of examination: flattery, bribery, menaces and blackmail, at least. And there are visions of self-evaluation that may increase this variety.

Between the pedagogic examination and diploma, there are the term and year reports. They cannot be selective in the way the diplomas are but their main effects may be normalising and individualising. As the textbook that dominated teacher training for decades put it: "At the age of 9 to 14 (...) [t]he pupils increasingly begin to use the yardstick of marks for their own performance" (Lehtovaara & Koskenniemi 1966, 265). This leads us to the new kind of selective techniques where the effect does not work top-down but rather it is the pupil who selects him or herself up or down, in or out. I call this effect *self-selective*. We may also distinguish here the effects of the numerical (or hierarchized verbal) assessment from the open verbal assessment. While the main effect of the former is *standardising* the effect of the later may rather be normalising. The former creates a hierarchy or a scale for evaluation whether the later concentrates in constituting the normal. We may say also that if there were not any explicite and official norm or standard, effects in an strongly hierarchised institution like the school might be very repressive because there were no limits for teachers using assessment as a tool for discipline and punishment.

Now, let me sum up the appearances and disappearences of different examination techniques in the Finnish compulsory schooling. Before a more detailed presentation, it might be helpful to organise this summary first by means of the following table (Table 3). Also the main effects of the each technique are presented in the table.

Table 3: Techniques of behaviour examination and their effects

The old elementary school (1866—1943)	The new elementary school (1943—70)	The young comprehensive school (1970—94)	The new comprehensive school (1994—)
year examination (1880-early 1900) **InNr**	defined C in GD (1943-70) **InNrExPu**	"didactical-diagnostic" testing & observation (1970)*	standardised full-scale in C and N in TR, included in GD if requested (1994-) **InNrSeSt**
undefined C in GD (1889-1943) **InNrExPu**	defined N+A in GD (1943-70) **InNr**	home reports on pupil's development (1970)*	standardised verbal assessment in TYR (1970-) **InNrSt**
undefined N+A in GD (1889-1943) **InNr**	defined C in TYR (1943-70) **InNrPu**	comprehensive and closed archive (1970)*	special education system (1970-) **InNrExSe**
undefined C in TYR (1933-) **InNrPu**	defined N+A in TYR (1943-70) **InNr**	special education system (1970-) **InNrExSe**	individual study plans (1994-) **InSs**
undefined N+A in TYR (1933-) **InNr**	inclinations & characteristics in GD (1943-70) **InSe**	counselling evaluation (1973)*	self-evaluation in TYR (1994-) **InNrStSs**
"Student book" (1908-23?) **InNrSe**	"Lehtovaara Rationale" for observation of the deviating pupils (1948-70) **InNrSe**	standardised full-scale in C and N in TYR (1978-94) **InNrSt**	self-evaluation with parallel teacher's evaluation in TYR (1994-) **InNrStSs**
	"Pupil's Account" (1948)*	standardised verbal assessment in TYR (1978-) **InNrSt**	group evaluation (1994-) **InNr**
	"Pupil's Register" (1952)*	goal-based evaluation (1984-94) **InNrSt**	evaluative discussions (1994-) **InNrSe**
	success prediction of the grammar school candiates (1955-70) **InSe**	observation of conitinuing proof (1984-) **InNr**	portfolio (1996-) **InSeSs**
	systematic observation for carreer counselling (1960-70) **InNrSe**		description of pupil's working in GD (1996)*

The abbrevaitions used in the table
* = proposal that never realized
C = mark for conduct
N = mark for neatness
A = mark for atentiveness
GD = graduation diploma for the elementary or comprehensive school
TYR = term and year reports
GS = Grammar School

Effects:
Pu = Punishing
Ex = Excluding
Se = Selecting
Ss = Self-selecting
St = Standadising
In = Individualising
Nr = Normalising

The first period (1866—1943) during which the elementary school became compulsory seems to be dominated by repressive and exclusive examination techniques. The teachers might base their conduct marks on common sense or their own convictions and morals. Many examples of arbitrary teachers action was given by Salmela. The lowered mark in the diploma seemed to exclude the pupil effectively from succesful ci-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tizenship, and in reports it produced behaviour categorised as almost criminal. It is to note, however, that the examination focused only on the deviating pupils. The curiosity of the old elementary school was the detailed "Pupil's Book" with its mensual and detailed examination of pupils' behaviour but it was used only dozen of years, and there is no knowledge how much teachers utilized it in reality.

After the Second World War, a need appeared to define the criterions for the conduct and neatness and attentive marks which limited the arbitrary freedom of teachers in grading behaviour. In the new elementary school (1943—70), the main effects of the behaviour examination was still exclusive and punitive. The sentences on inclinations and characteristics in the Graduation Diploma gave, however, a slight opportunity for positive selection, too. But as real innovations of the new elementary school were the selective techniques focused on different groups of pupils: the Lehtovaara Rationale on devating pupils, the success prediction on Grammar School candidates and the observation model on pupils continuing their studies in the upper grades of the elementary school[30]. Though the focus of examination thus started to move from the deviating to all pupils, the most ambitious techniques — the Pupil's Account and Pupil's Register, proposed by the leading figures of pedagogy and psychology — were never realized.

In the first period of the comprehensive school (the 1970—94), the marks for behaviour (now devided to "conduct" and "neatness") were moved out of the diploma, and thus their selective effect disappeared. The conduct and neatness were to be evaluated now in the full scale which meant appearance of the standardising effect. This means that its productive effect may also be seen as positive. Also the possibility of verbal assessment in the first 2 or 3 grades produced a slight standardising effect as well as so called goal-based evaluation because it brought the in assessment of behaviour into the assessment of school subjects. While giving the teacher a free hand to combine behaviour assessment with the subject assessment, it also created a new potentially repressive effect. The selective effects of behaviour examination were concentrated completely in the new system of special education. Here we may faind also the continuity of the exclusion because to be moved into the special education — no matter if it was part-time or full-time — had surely exclusive effects. In sum, the main innovations of the young comprehensive school were the standardising techniques focusing now on all the pupils. Exclusive and selective techniques were limited to the growing special education. It is noteworthy again that the most ambitious innovations, proposed naw by the educational scientists, were not realised.

The 1994 curriculum seemed to open the fourth period, the period of the new comprehensive school. The selective techniques are brought back to the mark of conduct and neatness by giving the chance to include those in the diploma — if the parents request. Also in evaluative discussions and portfolio may have selective effects though

the system special education is still the most important technique to select and exclude pupils. Telling about the increasing needs for selection, a recent report of a working group (CR 1996) proposed to enclose a "description of pupil's working" with the numerical graduation diploma mentioned. If carried out, this would strongly increase the selective effects of the behaviour examination.

The most striking novelty of the new comprehensive school is, however, the introduction of "self-evaluation", both at the levels of reports and pedagogic examination. Furthermore, it is to be remembered that the 1996 report also proposed to incorporate with the diploma different kind of documents including self-, group-, peer- and authority examination, for example. The most popular innovation in this sector is the so-called "portfolio" that has fashionably been described by one of its advocates as a "pupil's stock portfolio" (CR 1996, 98). In this vision, the self-evaluation would function at all levels of examination: The self-evaluation in all its forms may have strong self-selective effects. Our sample of report forms from Helsinki and Vantaa made it clear that self-assessment is also creating normalising and even standardising effects. What was the most curious here was the predominant technique in which the teacher assesses the pupil in parallel after his/her self-assessment. It is claimed that self-evaluation is used in an increasing number of schools and in nearly all the schools committed to experiments on the pupil evaluation (CR 1996, 32). [31]

Before making the summary, let me present the distribution of effects of behaviour examination techniques in the form of a table as follows (Table 4):

Table 4: The distribution of effects of behaviour examination techniques

Effects	1861—1943	1943—70	1970—94	1994—
Punitive	2	2	-	-
Exclucive	1	1	1	1
Selective	1	4	1	4
Self-selective	-	-	-	4
Standardising	-	-	3	2
Individualising	6	8	5	9
Normalising	6	6	5	7

Basing on the tables above (Table 3 and 4), we can make the following conclusions on the four periods. Firstly, the old elementary school were dominated by punitive and exclusive techniques whereas selective and standardising techniques were virtually non existent — the only exception was the Pupil's Book but it is unknown how widely it was used. Secondly, while maintaining or even strenthening the exclusive and punitive

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

techniques, it was the new elementary school that introduced selective techniques of behaviour. It is essential, however, that there were no one technique focusing on the all the pupils but varioius special techniques for examination of different groups of pupils, according to the increasing need for selection. Thirdly, among the innovations of the young comprehensive school, there were first of all standarising techniques of behaviour examination. But what was even more important, the selective effects were completely consentrated to the new special education system. This exclusive and selective technique was run by the new professionalist, the school-psychologist, in cooperation with the teacher. Finally, the recent period, the new comprehensive school, has brought back the selective techniques although the role of special education system is still the most essential. The real innovations were, however, the variety of self-selective techniques.

In the more general level, we may make three more conclusions. Firstly, virtually all the techniques of behaviour examination, throrough the years of the mass schooling, are individualising and normalising. To put it shortly, their main effect is to mould an individual citizen who has internalised the hegemonic divisions of the society between the true and not-true, the good and not-good, the right and not-right. Secondly, the examination was focused, during the elementary school periods, on the deviating pupils, or during the new elemenatry school, the special groups of the pupils but not all the pupils. It was the comprehensive school that brought all the pupil under the scrutinising eye of more and more sophisticated and comprehensive examination of behaviour. Finally, the most ambitious techniques, proposed often by the academics, were used only for a short period of time, or they were never realised or their realisation deviatated essentially from the original intentions. This makes especially the conclusions from the recent period very vunerable. As we have seen during our excursion to the term and year report forms from Helsinki and Vantaa, the innovation seemed to have strengthen and detailed the traditional behaviour examination rather than to have widen the scope of the assessment towards a more progressive and liberal directions.

VI
Pastoral power and construction of citizenship

In this final section of my paper, I try to bring the changing techniques and their effects into the context of other societal changes, first of all of changes in teacherhood. I have elsewhere characterised this as a shift to *pastoral professionalism* (Simola 1995; Simola

et al., in press). The basic elements in this change were individualisation, decontextualisation, goal rationalisation and disciplinisation as mentioned earlier. From the specific point of view of examination, the core of this was a shift *from* the limited and partial, external and formal elementary school examination that guaranteed citizenship *to* the individual and profound, exact and multifaceted comprehensive school examination system that works for "objective" selection but, increasingly for the inscription of self-selection onto the pupil.

It is fair to conclude that in the history of mass schooling in Finland, the teacher has always tried to see into and effect the depths of the pupil's heart. In assessing pupil's conduct this was done openly by the elementary school but the examination aimed mainly at the deviating pupils. Salmela seemed to understand well how sensitive business it was. In comprehensive school, the targets were the personalities of all the pupils. I have cited above two notes explicitly forbidding assessment of the personality of the pupil permitting only his/her "proof and performance" (Curr 1970, 52; CR 1996, 41). Ironic enough, immediately after these notes the both documents hurry on to recommend scrutinising the most personal features of individual pupils.

There might be, however, a curious distinction between "pre-progressive" and "progressive" pedagogic thinking of the task and possibilities of compulsory schooling. Citing Johan Friedrich Herbart (1776—1841), Donald Broady (1986) has noted that the old school demanded "from the pupils only that which it is possible to demand, i.e. the external side of education and learning." Internalised and individual learning was basically the task of the home and the family tutor. (See also Simola 1993b) It was the eminent Finnish educational scientist, professor Matti Koskenniemi, who stated in the 1940s that while the old Herbart-Zillerian school — vital in Finland up to the 1950s — the personality was coerced *through* teaching, in progressive pedagogy the school must educate *directly* (Lahdes 1961, 157). Therefore the basic difference might be found in thinking how omnipotent the schooling is.

It was not only in pedagogics that the elementary school was much more limited than the modern comprehensive school. It is to be remembered that up to the late 1960s, the length of compulsory schooling was not standardised and in most cases was not followed by any further education. For the great majority of the pupils, the school was just a temporary period before moving to the "real" life. Only the comprehensive school reform created a system of basic education lasting several years, institutionalised to such an extent as to be considered a natural part of the normal individual development of every citizen.[32] Thus while the elementary school could only offer to its pupils a certificate of citizenship and (limited) Perdition if someone received a lowered conduct mark in his/her graduation diploma, the comprehensive school was able to offer both Salvation and Perdition. In an "information society" bound to the doctrine of "life-long

education" — or perhaps better say life-sentenced schooling — this Judgement appeared to be perpetual.

In the following, I try to organise the changes in techniques and their effects by framing them in four dimensions. First, while the teacher in the old school was supposed to treat as individuals only those with problems of adaptation to the disciplined life in the classroom, the modern teacher promises to treat everybody as individuals and, by offering individual study plans and personal curricula, to respond to the learning needs and abilities of every pupil. In the old school, the teacher was like a shepherd, knowing especially those in danger of causing panic in the flock or at risk of getting lost. The modern school teacher tends to see him/herself more as a professional like a physician or a lawyer — though this would suppose acceptance of a certain kind of "home tutor illusion".[33] The subject of his/her work is now an individual rather than a group. This dimension might be described as *individualisation*.

The second dimension might be called *penetration*. The truth about the individual pupil, which the teacher of the old school was supposed to know and tell, was partial and limited to general conduct on a pass/fail scale and in school subjects on a numerical scale. The targets in assessing conduct were quite clear and exterior: contumacy, fighting and theft, for example. The modern teacher needs to be convinced of his/her ability and justification for penetrating into the most secret nooks of the personality of the pupil and to promise to tell the whole truth about the pupil. The targets of assessment are much more internal and obscure: creativity, criticalness, independence and attitude for example.

Thirdly, while in the old school there was a clear and open, coercive and sanctioned obligation to follow the commands of compulsory schooling, the modern school rather invites and induces, declaring and underscoring a right to learning. Power in the modern schooling seems, indeed, to work rather inductively and invitingly than through coercion and command, positively and productively rather than negatively and preventatively. In the 1950s, schooling was seen as a necessity for civilization, but also as "unnatural in its actual comprehensiveness starting as early as the age of seven" (Curr 1952, 27). It was acknowledged explicitely that schooling, even at its best, "imposes on the children a lot of strange things that will be resisted by the nature of the child " (*ibid.*) This confrontation between the "natural" child and "unnatural" schooling disappeared during the 1970s while the problem of unnaturalness changed into one of pedagogical expediency. This might be seen in the metaphors used in behaviour assessment: in elementary school it is the law, in comprehensive school, science. This *naturalisation* reaches its ironic culmination in pupils self-examination though it is still at least confirmed by the parallel assessment of the teacher.

Finally, while the old texts seem to be conscious to the limitations of the school — its obligatory and mass character, its formal and pedantic teachers, its unnatural and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

one-sided practices — the modern school became "decontextualised": school learning was universalised as a model of "general learning", and the texts no longer spoke of institutional peculiarities of schooling. Using the terms of David Tyack and Larry Cuban (1995), the "grammar of schooling" became tacit. A this moment, a distanced reader would get the impresion that to study in a Finnish school is taking part in individual or small group teaching. This *decontextualisation* or reification has also made the problem of power almost non-existent in discussion about evaluation.[34] While the truth that the elementary school told about a pupil tended to be seen as partial and limited, the comprehensive school cannot resist the temptation to tell the whole truth. A good example is the most recent report referred to here (CR 1996). It forbids evaluating the personality of the pupil; it includes an appendix where the ability of teacher to comprehensive and valid assessment is clearly questioned; it makes a clear distinction between pedagogical evaluation during the school career and the assessment in the diploma. But finally, it makes a proposal to enclose an extensive description of the "pupil's working" with the graduation diploma. For the comprehensive school examination, the will to knowledge is an irresistible seduction.

One may see here a certain further "pastoralisation" of power, in the sense Foucault (1983, 213—216) used the word. He characterised pastoral power as being a historically unique, "tricky combination in the same political structures of individualisation techniques and of totalisation procedures" (1983, 213—216). Pastoral power was born with Christianity, and its modernised form could be seen as a basic technique of the Western nation states.[35] Foucault saw pastoralisation as a vital technique in the process of governmentalisation which is the essence of the modern state. There are three characteristics of this new pastoral power which distinguish it from its ecclesiastical precursor. First, the promised salvation concerns this world rather than the next. Secondly, the officials of the pastoral power have changed. Finally, "the multiplication of the aims and agents of pastoral power focuses the development of knowledge of man around two roles: one, globalizing and quantitative, concerning the population; the other, analytical, concerning the individual." (*ibid.*, 215)

> This form of power is salvation oriented (as opposed to political power). It is oblative (as opposed to a principle of sovereignty); it is individualizing (as opposed to a legal power); it is coextensive and continuous with life; it is linked with a production of truth — the truth of the individual himself. (*ibid.*, 214)

The new forms of pastoral power in teaching may create first of all the new pupil who is willing and able to engage in self-evaluation and self-selection. This means that pupils undergo constant assessment and grading, invest in and incline themselves towards the faith of schooling. Both the new expert teacher and the new "portfolio pupil" are constructed, both willing to take part in the continuous and comprehensive, systematic and sophisticated examination, no matter whether carried out by their peers, their superior or themselves. If the mission of the teacher in the old school was to be a gatekeeper to fully authorised citizenship, the mission of the modern comprehensive school teacher might be seen, to cite Rinne (1988, 443), as "to inscribe into the pupils the sense of 'self-selection' and 'suitability', to guide the pupils to the free choices and routes that are fitting and suitable for them."

But is that not, indeed, highly functional in the late-modern society ruled by doctrines of free but obligatory individual choice, of persistent competition of exchangables and replaceables, of constantly weighing the adequacy and sufficiency of others and oneself (see, e.g., Rose 1994; Beck, Giddens & Lash 1994)? The school seems to be promising, once again, to response to the "requirements" of the "Society". For some, this means a Foucauldian nightmare, for some others exactly what has been needed for long time already. For majority of the teachers, I venture to guess, these are once again promises of the reform rhetoric that will never be realized in everyday level of schooling. There are, however, all reasons to claim that none of these critical worries, optimistic hopes or cynical prophecies will be realized. Leaning on the historical study above, we may say that systematically the most ambitious innovations has not been realised in the reality of schooling. The abilities and possibilities of teachers to evaluate their individual pupils seem to be very limited. In a Finnish study (Mäensivu, 1995), eight primary school teacher were scrutinised as evaluators and discribers of their pupils. Although the teachers were working in the lower grades of the primary school and well motivated to their task, the conclusion was disconsolate:

> (...) teachers have to evaluate and describe their pupils without knowing them too well. The pupils are described by means of their external behaviour. In the multifaceted and busy school-life, shattered by accidental brakes and outside disturbances, it is not possible for teachers to know deeper learning processes and motivation of their individual pupils. In these circumstances, the pupils are described practically, sometimes even at random. To put it in a slighly pointed way, one could say that the description of the pupil will be constucted depending on the impressions the teacher happens to receive of the pupil, on which kind of group the pupils happens to be fallen into, on who happens to be his or her teacher, on how his or her parents happen to co-operate with the school and on what kind of support the teacher happens to recieve from colleagues and experts. (Mäensivu 1995, 120—121)

A significant part of the teachers, the most of school politicians, administrators and educational scientists cannot, however, resist temptation to tell the truth of the pupils and so introduction of new, promising and ambitious techniques for behaviour examnination will continue. In this study, I have outlined some potential effects of these techniques. What we need to know what will be the real effects in schooling reality, however, are empirical studies that are yet to be done. The 1996 report claims, for example, that the "[e]xperience has proved that pupils, in generally, do not have by na-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ture sufficient abi lity for self-evaluation but they learn them rather quickly" (CR 1996, 32). We do not know, however, what is really to be examined when a 7 year old kid is deliberating whether s/he lets "the others and him/herself work in peace" or when a 10 year old wonders whether s/he "accepts disappointments" — especially when his/her teacher immediately comments on this choice. What we know, based on the historical experience of one century of school reforms (e.g. Tyack & Cuban 1995), is that we should ask how the schools change the reform rather than the opposite. The reforms change the school, indeed, but rarely in the intended direction.

References

APAJALAHTI, M. (1996). *Peruskoulun oppilasarviointi.* Helsinki: Opetushallitus. Muistio (moniste) 7.2.1996.

BECK, U., GIDDENS, A. & LASH, S. (1994). *Reflexive modernization : politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order.* Cambridge: Polity.

BOLI, J. (1989). *New citizens for a new society : The institutional origins of mass schooling in Sweden.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1977a). *Outline of Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1990). *In other words. Esseys towards a reflexive sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

BROADY, D. (1986). *Piilo-optussuunnitelma.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

COMMITTEE REPORT (1966) KM 1966:A 12 *Koulunuudistustoimikunnan mietintö.* Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

COMMITTEE REPORT (1969) KM 1960:7 *Seminaarilainsäädännön uudistamiskomitean mietintö.* Kansakoulunopettajaseminaarien opetussuunnitelmat. Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

COMMITTEE REPORT (1973) KM 1973:38 *Oppilasarvostelun uudistamistoimikunnan mietintö.* Moniste.

COMMITTEE REPORT (1996). *Peruskoulun oppilasarviointityöryhmän muistio.* Helsinki: Opetusminsteriö. Opetusminsteriön työryhmän muistioita 4: 1996.

CURRICULUM (1925) KM 1925 *Maalaiskansakoulun opetussuunnitelmakomitean mietintö.* Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

CURRICULUM (1946) KM 1946:2 *Kansakoulukomitean mietintö.* Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

CURRICULUM (1952) KM 1952:3 *Kansakoulun opetussuunnitelmakomitean mietintö II. Varsinaisen kansakoulun opetussuunnitelma.* Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

CURRICULUM (1970) KM 1970:A 4 *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelmatoimikunnan mietintö I. Opetussuunnitelman perusteet.* Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus.

CURRICULUM (1985) *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet.* Kouluhallitus. Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus.

CURRICULUM (1994) *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet.* Opetushallitus. Helsinki: Painatuskeskus.

CYGNAEUS, U. (1910). *Kirjoitukset Suomen kansakoulun perustamisesta ja järjestämisestä.* (The writings on establishment and organization of the elementary school in Finland). Helsinki: Kansanvalistusseura.

DURKHEIM, É. (1956). *Education and sociology.* New York: Free Press.

FOUCAULT, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language.* New York: Pantheon Books.

FOUCAULT, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* London: Peguine Books.

FOUCAULT, M. (1983). The Subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (pp. 208—226). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

FOUCAULT, M. (1985). *The Use of Pleasure. The History of Sexuality: Volume 2.* London: Penguine Books.

HABERMAS, J. (1975). *Legitimation crisis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

HALILA, A. (1949a). *Suomen kansakoululaitoksen historia. I osa: Kansanopetus ennen kansakoulua ja kansakoululaitoksen synty.* Porvoo - Helsinki: WSOY.

HALILA, A. (1949b). *Suomen kansakoululaitoksen historia. II osa: Kansakouluasetuksesta piirijakoon.* Porvoo - Helsinki: WSOY.

HALILA, A. (1949c). *Suomen kansakoululaitoksen historia. III osa: Piirijakoasetuksesta oppivelvollisuuteen.* Porvoo - Helsinki: WSOY.

HALILA, A. (1950). *Suomen kansakoululaitoksen historia. IV osa: Oppivelvollisuuskoulu vuosina 1921—1939.* Porvoo - Helsinki: WSOY.

HEIKKINEN, S., SILVONEN, J. & SIMOLA, H. (1996). Technologies of Truth: Peeling Foucault's Triangular Onion. Unuplished manuscript. University of Helsinki:

HINKKANEN, A. (Ed.). (1959). *Uusi kansakoululainsäädäntö.* Helsinki: Valistus.

JAUHIAINEN, A. (1993). *Koulu, oppilaiden huolto ja hyvinvointivaltio. Suomen oppivelvollisuuskoulun oppilashuollon ja sen asiantuntijajärjestelmien muotoutuminen 1800-luvuin lopulta 1990-luvulle.* (School, student welfare and the welfare state. The formation of the student welfare system in the Finnish compulsory education system and its network of experts from the late 1800's to 1990's). Turku: Turun yliopisto. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis C 98.

KANSANEN, P. (1995). The *Deutsche Didaktik. Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 27(4), 347—352.

KERKKONEN, K. (Ed.). (1923). *Kansakoulukäsikirja lisäyksineen. Järjestelmällinen kokoelma asetuksia, määräyksiä, kiertokirjeitä y.m. Suomen kansanopetuksen alalta ynnä aakkosellinen hakemisto.* Porvoo: Werner Söderström osakeyhtiö.

KETTUNEN, A. & KOSKI, E. (Ed.). (1972). *Peruskoulun käsikirja.* Helsinki: WSOY.

KIVINEN, O. & RINNE, R. (1988). Valikointi, koulutus ja työ. *Kasvatus — The Finnish Journal of Education* 19(6), 502—517.

KIVINEN, O. (1988). *Koulutuksen järjestelmäkehitys. Peruskoulutus ja valtiollinen kouludoktriini Suomessa 1800- ja 1900-luvuilla.* Turku: Turun yliopisto. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis. Scripta Lingua Fennica Edita. C 67.

KIVIRAUMA, J. (1989). *Erityisopetus ja suomalainen oppivelvollisuuskoulu vuosina 1921-1985.* (Special education and the state school system 1921-1985). Turku: Turun yliopisto. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja. Sarja C. Scripta lingua Fennica edita, 74.

KIVIRAUMA, J. & JAUHIAINEN, A. (1996). Ensimmäisten kansakoulujen perustaminen sivistyneistön suurena projektina. *Kasvatus — The Finnish Journal of Education* 27(2), 153—163.

KOSKENNIEMI, M. (1944). *Kansakoulun opetusoppi.* (Didactics for the elementary school). Helsinki: Otava.

KOSKENNIEMI, M. (1952). Miten voisin lisätä todistuksen tehoa. (How could we increase the effect of the report). In K. Saarialho & M. Koskenniemi (Ed.), *Kansakoulun työtapoja II. Yläkoulun menetelmistä* (pp. 116—128). Porvoo: Werner Söderström osakeyhtiö.

KOSKI, E. (1981). *Peruskoulun ala-asteen oppilasarvostelu. Opas opettajille, koulujen johtajille ja kouluneuvostojen jäsenille.* Vantaa: Kunnallispaino.

KOSKI, L. & NUMMENMAA, A. R. (1995). Kilpailu kouludiskurssissa. *Kasvatus — The Finnish Journal of Education,* 26(4), 340—349.

LAHDES, E. (1961). *Uuden kansakoulun vaikutus Suomen kansakouluun.* Keuruu: Otava.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LAPPALAINEN, A. (1985). *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelma syntyprosessi ja peruskouluopetuksen johtamisjärjestelmän muotoutuminen*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston opettajankoulutuslaitos. Tutkimuksia 28.
LAURILA, J. (1932). *Kansakouluasiain käsikirja*. Helsinki: Otava.
LEHTOVAARA, A. & KOSKENNIEMI, M. (1966). *Kasvatuspsykologia*. Helsinki: Otava.
LINDSTRÖM, A. & KÄRKKÄINEN, L. (1986). *Uusi koululainsäädäntö III. Opetussuunnitelman laadinta, oppilasarviointi, työrauha, koulukohtainen hallinto ja koulunkäynnin avustaminen*. Helsinki: Opettajien kustannus oy.
LUNDGREN, U. P. (1991). *Between education and schooling: Outlines of a diachronic curriculum theory*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University.
LUOMA, S. (1908) *Valistuksen oppilaskirja*. (The Pupil's Book). Helsinki: Valistus.
LUOMA, S. (no publishing year) *Opintokirja*. (The Study Book). Helsinki: Valistus.
LÖNNBECK, G. F. (Ed.). (1907). *Kanskoulun Käsikirja*. Helsinki: K. W. Edlundin kustannusosakeyhtiö.
MEYER, J. W., NAGEL, J. & SNYDER JR., C. W. (1993). The expansion of mass education in Botswana: Local and world society perspective. *Comprative Education Review*, 37(4), 454—475.
MÄENSIVU, K. (1995). Opettaja oppilaidensa kuvaajana — praktis-konstruktiivinen näkökulma. (The teacher as as a discriber of his of her pupils — A practical-constructivistic approach). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. Unpublished licentiate thesis in pscyhology.
MÄNTYOJA, A. (Ed.). (1951). *Kansakoulun lainsäädäntö*. Helsinki: Otava.
NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION (1995). *Peruskoulun oppilasarvioinnin perusteet ja todistusten kaavat*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus. Määräys 58/011/95.
NURMI, V. (1988). *Uno Cygnaeus. Suomalainen koulumies ja kasvattaja*. Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus.
OJAKANGAS, M. (1992). "Kuri käsittää koulun koko elämän ...". Viime vuosisadanvaihteen suomalainen kansakoulupedagogikka ja ruumiin poliittiset teknologiat. *Sosiologia*, 29(4), 277—293.
POPKEWITZ, T. S. & BRENNAN, M. (In press). Restructuring social and political theory: Foucault, the linguistic turn and education. In T. S. Popkewitz & B. Marie (Ed.), *Governing education: Foucault's challenge to the knowledge, curriculum and political projects of schooling*. New York: Teachers College Press.
POPKEWITZ, T. S. & SIMOLA, H. (1996). Professionalization, academic discourses and changing patterns of power. In H. Simola & T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Professionalization and education* (pp. 6—27). Helsinki: Univeristy of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education, Research Report 169.
POPKEWITZ, T. S. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform. Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
RINNE, R. (1987). Has somebody hidden the curriculum? The curriculum as a point of intersection between the utopia of civic society and the state control. In P. Malinen & P. Kansanen (Ed.), *Research frames of the Finnish curriculum* (pp. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education. Research Report 53.
RINNE, R. (1988). Kansan kasvattajasta opetuksen ammattilaiseksi: suomalaisen kansanopettajan tie. *The Finnish Journal of Education Kasvatus*, 19(6), 430—444.
RINNE, R. & KIVIRAUMA, J. (1997). Education and marginalisation: The changing position of poor education as a factor in indigence in Finland. Paper presented at the International Sociological Association conference. University of Joensuu, June 16—18, 1997.
ROSE, N. (1994). Expertise and the government of conduct. *Studies in Law, Politics and Society*, 14(3), 359—397.
SALMELA, A. (1948). *Kansakoulun oppilasarvostelu*. Helsinki: Otava.
SARASON, S. B. (1991). *The predicatble failure of educational reform. can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

SIMOLA, H. (1993a). Educational Science, the State and Teachers. Forming the corporate regulation of teacher education in Finland. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher education reform in eight countries.* (pp. 161—210). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
SIMOLA, H. (1993b). Professionalism and Rationalism of Hopes: outlining a theoretical approach for a study on educational discourse. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 3(2), 173—192.
SIMOLA, H. (1995). *Paljon vartijat. Suomalainen kansanopettaja valtiollisessa kouludiskurssissa 1860-luvulta 1990-luvulle*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. Opettajankoulutuslaitos. Tutkimuksia 137.
SIMOLA, H. (1997). *Ulossulkemisesta itsevalikointiin — Opettajuus, kansalaisuus ja käyttäytymisen arvostelu kansa- ja peruskouludokumenteisssa vuosina 1866—1996.* (From exclusion to self-selection: Teacherhood, citizenship and examination of behaviour in Finnish primary and comprehensive school documents from 1866 to 1996). Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin opetusvirasto. Helsingin kaupungin kouluviraston julkaisusarja A3:1997.
SIMOLA, H., HEIKKINEN, S. & SILVONEN, J. (in press). Catalog of possibilities: Foucaultian history of truth and education research. In T. S. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education* (pp. 64—90). New York: Teachers College Press.
SIMOLA, H., KIVINEN, O. & RINNE, R. (1996). *Decontextualizing Pedagogy:The rise of didactic closure in FinnishTeacher Education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996.
SOMERKIVI, U. (1982). *Peruskoulu. Synty, kehittyminen ja tulevaisuus*. Vantaa: Kunnallispaino.
TYACK, D. & CUBAN, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia. A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
WEBER, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press & The Falcon's Wing Press.

Notes

[1] By the *elementary* school, I mean the compulsory schooling before the *comprehensive* school reform in 1971. From 1921 on, it lasted 8 years, from age 7 to 15. The comprehensive school in Finland is 9 years long starting at age 7. It is divided into the 6 year lower stage (i.e. primary school; class teachers mainly) and the 3 year upper stage (i.e lower secondary school, subject teachers mainly).

[2] See our methodological discussion in Simola 1995, Simola *et al.*, forthcoming and Heikkinen *et al.* 1996

[3] See more detailed discussions in Simola 1995, 24—34, Simola *et al.* forthcoming and Heikkinen *et al.* 1996.

[4] To cite Bourdieu (1977, 167—169) it creates the *doxa* and draws the border line between the "universe of discourse or argument" and the "universe of the undiscussed [or] undisputed"; between a field of doxa and a field of opinion.

[5] For example, the discussion of the legitimacy crisis of modern society might be seen as concerning this problematics (see, e.g. Weber 1947, 324—423; Habermas 1975).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6 According to Bourdieu, the official discourse accomplishes three important functions: "Firstly, it performs a diagnostic, that is, an act of cognition which enforces recognition and which, quite often, tends to affirm what a person or a thing is and what it is universally, for every possible person, and thus objectively. (...) In the second place, the administrative discourse, via directives, orders, prescriptions etc., says what people have to do, given what they are. Thirdly, it says what people really have done, as in authorised accounts such as police reports. I each case, it imposes a point of view, that of the institution, especially via questionnaires, official forms etc. This point of view is set up as a legitimate point of view, that is, as a point of view which everyone has to recognise at least within the limits of a given society." (Bourdieu 1990, 136)

7 Here I follow Lundgren in defining curriculum as, first, "a selection of contents and goals for social reproduction, that is a selection of what knowledge and skills are to be transmitted by education"; second, as "an organisation of knowledge and skills", and third, as "an indication of methods concerning how the selected contents are to be taught; to be sequenced and controlled, for example" (Lundgren 1991, 5). A "curriculum code" is for Lundgren a "homogenous set" of "principles according to which the selection, the organization and the methods for transmission are formed" (*ibid.*; see also Rinne 1987).

8 Halila (1949c, 185) says that examination period at the turn of the century in Helsinki was a three week ordeal in May when the inspector might enter the school whenever and give the teacher a paper filled with tasks for testing the skills of both teacher and pupils. Today the emphasis is on the spring *fête* and delivering the school year reports.

9 In the graduation diploma, there was no place for numerical, only verbal marks in conduct and neatness. Thus the scale was actually four-step ("good", "fair", "passable" and "poor"). Since 1931, the number has had to be written there too, and so the scale is refined to a ten-step scale. (See Lönnbeck 1907, 203; Laurila 1932, 431)

10 Valistus means Enlightment, and it was owned by the SOL, Union of Finnish Elementary School Teachers.

11 Luoma (no pupblishing year). There is no publishing date in this revised version but it must be in the 1910s or 1920s, judging from certain formulations in the reports and from the third version that was dated in 1923.

12 The collectivist tradition was strong in Finland and remained so up to the 1950s. Linked with moral and civic curriculum code, the keywords even of Finnish progressive "new school" movement since the 1930s were rather *Die Arbeit Schule* , workbooks and social education than child-centred individualism (Lahdes 1961; Simola 1995, 118). It is curious that in all party programs up to the 1960s, the legitimation of the school reform was based on the interest of society rather than on that of the individuals (Lappalainen 1985, 154).

13 Up to the comprehensive school in 1970, it was possible to get through the compulsory education in 4,000 hours while normally (in a "complete elementary school") it took more than 8,000 hours. This "reduced elementary school" covered about 10 % in 1950 and about 3% of all pupils in 1960. They were mostly living in remote corners of the country (cf. Kivinen 1988, 189, 266).

14Circulars 18.6.1943, 19.2.1944 and 6.4.1944.

15 This text is especially interesting here for various reasons. First and as already mentioned, Salmela, as the head of the General Education Department of the NBE, was the most central person concerning to the elementary school in the Finnish school administration for many years (1937—64). The first edition was published in 1944 and the second in 1948. Its character was clearly semi-official that can be read, for example, in the style and spirit of his recommenadtions that were much more like orders than just opinions. Secondly, the book about the pupil assessment was written in a key moment for understanding the whole period of elementary school: it was strongly linked to the period before the Second World War but, at the same time, it stretched already out for the reforms to come. Finally, we may trust that — takining critically into account a certain programmatic character of the book — Salmela, as an old-time school administrator, knew the everyday situation in the schools very well which was no longer the case with school administrators, "the young Masters" that dominated the discourse since the 1970s. In generally, the role of the "grass-root level" decreased radically in school policy during the comprehensve shool reform (see Somerkivi 1982; Lappalainen 1985; Simola 1995).

16 Salmela also stated the norms according which 5% of pupils might repeat the grade and 5% might be moved up conditionally. (Salmela 1948, 136—137)

17 The term *didactics* is a very problematic one in English. It is used here in the meaning that it has in the education literature of Germany and the Nordic countries. Kansanen (1995) states that "in UK as well as in US frameworks for education, the subarea of didactics seems to be lacking. (...) [M]uch of its content belongs to educational psychology." In Germany and [the] Nordic countries, didactic problems define an independent subdiscipline of education. The scope of didactics covers that of Anglo-American curriculum theory and educational psychology including also much philosophical and theoretical thinking. (*ibid.*) In Anglo-American literature, there are just a few texts concerning the relation between didactic and curriculum theory but see, e.g. articles on the German *Didaktik* tradition in Journal of Curriculum Studies vol. 27, issues 1 and 4 (1995).

18 These interesting issues of health and punishment go beyond the limits of this papers though they has been extremely important in constructing citizenship in the school (see, e.g., Ojakangas 1992; Jauhiainen 1993).

19 However, the handbook cited the 1970 committee report extensively and emphasised care and systematisation in using the pupil's information cards (Kettunen & Koski 1972, 210—213). It is worth remembering that the 1970 report of the curriculum committee became the binding norm as the official curriculum in 1972 by decision of the NBE.

20 The decree 1970 (PkA §98) gave the opportunity *not* assessing the pupils after the fall and spring terms of the first year and after the fall term of the second and third years. In 1976, the NBE recommended using a "written information" in these cases (Koski 1981, 8—9).

21 Some examples of other areas statements: (3) "Progress in school subjects" (religion, environmental studies, natural history, geography, sport, music, visual arts, handicraft), (4) "Skills in mothers-tongue" (e.g., "listening", "questioning", "discussion"), (5) "Skills in foreign language" (e.g., "pronunciation", "text understanding", "speech understanding") and (6) "Skills in mathematics" (e.g., skills in counting, skills in subtraction, skills in multiplication)

22 It is a curious detail that in Finnish the verb "spur" which originally has meant to drive the spurs, often violently and painfully, into the horse's flanks has always been used here. For some reason the verb "encourage" or "stimulate" have rarely been used here though they also exist in Finnish.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

23 The statement in Martti Apajalahti's the memo, a secretary of the working group on pupil evaluation (CR 1996) nominated by the Ministry of Education, is parallel: "(...) the numerical assessment fills only a small part of the needs of pupil evaluation, and it seems to be having a less and less important role in evaluation." (Apajalahti 1996, 7)

24 As examples of the possible appendices the report lists the following: complementary verbal evaluation; explanation of the pupil's participation to school board; explanation and evaluation of the pupil's special skills; self-evaluation of the pupil and possible portfolios — the most enthusiastically introduced innovation and symbolically called a "stock portfolio" (CR 1996, 33) — ; other reports received from school work; a description of the school curriculum and its possible emphasis. (*ibid.*, 41—42)

25 The report here makes interesting proposals to strengthen the comparability of the grading through "test bank" from which the teachers could voluntarily order standardised tests for checking the level of his/her pupils for the numerical reports.

26 The observations are based on preliminary work done by Eeva-Leena Järnefelt, a doctorand scrutinising pupil assessment in the recent primary school reform. Obviously, our material includes the forms from all those schools that have used report forms of their own. Thus the material may be a quite representative sample of the *active* schools in this sense. Espoo, one of the three big cities in the capital district, is not included here because all the primary schools there still used the same municipal report form in 1995—96.

27 This is because according to the frame curriculum, the assessment may be realised verbally in grades 1—4. To replace the numerical marks by verbal ones in grades 5—6, a school needs a official promise for experiment which is rather easy to acquire these days.

28 For detailed principals and examples of classification, see Simola 1997.

29 For detailed principals and examples of classification, see Simola 1997.

30 These grades 7 and 8 were origianlly called *jatkolouokat* (extesion classes) and later *kansalaiskoulu* (Civic School). Since the early 1960, increasing number os the pupils with the Graduation Diploma from these classes contiunued their studies in vocational training.

31 This fits also in a way to the notion that the knowledge field on the pupils (the pupil information card and the class book) has became restricted: there is a shift from the "hard" data to the "soft" data, from "official" knowledge to "personal" knowledge.

32 Up to the 1990s, compulsory schooling in Finland had lengthened in reality to twelve years. Nearly 9 out of 10 pupils receive the matriculation certificate from the upper secondary school or the certificate from the two- to three-year vocational education. Dropping out of the school system before this puts youth at severe risk of being marginalized — not so much because of the lack of skills or knowledge but because they lack the certificate which defines one's place in the labour force, as well as in society. (See Kivinen & Rinne 1988).

33 The work of the teacher is still work with masses where the possibility of dialogue interaction is very limited. Consider just two hypothetical situations. How would a physician survive in a situation where, say, 25 patients with their individual problems had to be attended to in the same room? Or how would a lawyer cope if s/he had to

plead for a group consisting of rapists, pick-pockets, drunken drivers and tax dodgers all at the same time? (Simola 1993b, 179—180)

34 This is hardly any Finnish peculiarity: e.g. Saymor B. Sarason (1991), the Grand Old Man of the U.S. school reforms, claims that reforms have failed because of not analysing the school as a complicated social system and neglecting to scrutinise its power relations.

35 According to Foucault, Christianity was the only religion that organised itself as a church in which certain individuals can serve others as pastors; first, working for the salvation of parishioners, secondly, sacrificing themselves for these parishioners if necessary, thirdly, treating them as individuals, and finally, possessing a special knowledge of their souls.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM027802

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: From Exclusion to Self-selection	
Author(s): Hannu Simola	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 8/30/1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

[X] Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Sample sticker to be affixed to document [ ]

Check here

Permitting microfiche (4" x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here

Permitting reproduction in microfiche of other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic or optical), but not in paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature:	Position: Docente, Dr.
Printed Name: Hannu Simola	Organization: University of Helsinki Faculty of Education
Address: P.O. Box 39 00014 University of Helsinki FINLAND	Telephone Number: +358-9-191 8059
	Date: 10/13/97

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation. They will forward ...erials to the appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse. ERIC/AERA Acquisitions, ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment ...ation, 210 O'Boyle Hall, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC 20064, (800) 464-3742