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INTRODUCTION

Institutionalisation of Educational Sciences and the Dynamics of Their Development

RITA HOFSTETTER & BERNARD SCHNEUWLY
University of Geneva, Switzerland

ABSTRACT The articles in the first issue of the European Educational Research Journal aim to analyse the moving forces of the emergence and evolution of educational sciences as a disciplinary field, i.e. as a social institution that is specialised in the production, discussion and diffusion of knowledge about education. The articles explore the hypothesis that the process of emergence and evolution is strongly interwoven with reforms that take place in the whole educational system, from primary school to university, and more generally with the evolution of social demands coming from the fields of education. They pay particular attention to the relationship between the evolution of educational sciences and professional qualification requirements.

Introductory Remarks: some reasons to study the history of educational sciences today

The articles [1] in this first issue of the European Educational Research Journal aim to analyse the moving forces of the emergence and evolution of educational sciences as a disciplinary field [2], i.e. as a social institution that is specialised in the production, discussion and diffusion of knowledge about education. The articles explore the hypothesis that the process of emergence and evolution is strongly interwoven with reforms that take place in the whole educational system, from primary school to university, and more generally with the evolution of social demands coming from the fields of education. They pay particular attention to the relationship between the evolution of educational sciences and professional qualification requirements.
For some years, a new institutionalisation phase of educational sciences has been observed in Europe and in other parts of the world (Krüger & Rauschenbach, 1994; Lindblad & Mulder, 1999; Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2002). At the same time, the systems of education as a whole are in a process of profound transformation due to growing and changing demands for professional qualifications, particularly in educational professions, and to an international standardisation of programmes, diplomas, and so on. Though specific, the current transformation of educational sciences is part of a much longer and much larger process and its current forms are the result of a secular evolution. Thus, it is interesting to utilise a historical perspective in order to understand more thoroughly the dynamics of the process. This allows us to shed light on the moving forces, the processes, the periods and the possible directions of the evolution of educational sciences and to elaborate critical reflexivity concerning scientific practice, i.e. to explicate as far as possible the standpoint a researcher in social science necessarily adopts (Bourdieu, 1995, 2001). As Bourdieu states, ‘One form of unconscious ... with which we have to struggle when we work scientifically, is what history has deposited in our brains, as sediments, concepts, problems, automatisms of language and thought. So, only a reflexive use of history can give us freedom with regard to history, give us some chance not to convey concepts that are led by their historicity’ (1999, p. 18; our translation).

Each article in this issue analyses a particular aspect of the process in a specific cultural context and thus identifies some of the general regularities of the evolution of the field as much as its more specific integration into local, regional and/or national contexts. This introduction presents, first, the general conceptual and methodological framework that was the point of departure of the contributions. Second, it explores and discusses the way in which each article engages this problematic in presenting the empirical material it relies on, discusses findings generated from the material and integrates it in within a more general perspective of the research on the disciplinary field. Finally, it focuses on two overarching questions that emerge from the different contributions and that could also concern contemporary actors in the disciplinary field.

**A History of (Educational) Sciences Oriented towards their Process of Institutionalisation**

Focusing on different Western countries, the articles analyse what will be called, throughout this introduction, educational sciences, i.e. a disciplinary field that is also named pedagogy, education, educational research, pedology, educational science, following different periods and traditions, and that has many other names in other languages. The diversity of the names used and their evolution during the period under study is without doubt significant for the moving and somehow evanescent nature of the disciplinary field. In a first approximation, we propose the following understanding: systematic reflection
on education through its progressive professionalisation and specialisation, particularly by educational research.

Privileging a historical perspective not only enriches our vision of the disciplinary field but also responds to theoretical dimensions linked to the object being studied. Being the result of a human activity inscribed in a given social field, a disciplinary field, the field of educational sciences, like any other, does not cease to evolve by constant internal and external differentiation (Weingart, 2001, pp. 87 ff.) It does not exist by essence, or by virtue of a theoretical ideal. That is why its historians claim to analyse it from a descriptive perspective (instead of normative) (Gillispie, 1988; Blanckaert, 1999). This perspective aims to determine the evolution of its institutional and cognitive forms based on the analysis of its real scientific practices, the material and social conditions that founded them, the discourses and controversies they produce, their intellectual loans and progress.

The period under study – the end of the nineteenth and the whole of the twentieth century – is all the more interesting as it contains not only the emergence but also the ongoing institutionalisation of the disciplinary field. Reflection on educational phenomena exists, of course, at any period of history (Hameline, 1998). But for more than a century this reflection has been integrated into new institutional structures by progressively taking certain traits of the social form of academic disciplines (at the same time as, incidentally, and following similar paths to other social sciences) (De Landsheere, 1986; Depaepe, 1992; for the history of social sciences in general, see Wagner et al, 1991). What are the traits of this social form? In some key words, they are institutions that are simultaneously specialised in research and education; contents or objects of research that are delimited and commonly accepted; networks of communication that are well organised; programmes and education practices that guarantee the socialisation of young researchers; rules and social conventions that define the recognition and hierarchy of the actors (Favre, 1985; Becher, 1989; Stichweh, 1993). All these instruments of production and transmission of knowledge allow the specialisation and professionalisation of research in a given domain, the renewal, the collectivisation and the universalisation of the produced knowledge and the evolution of the scientific discipline. And what the articles of this current issue are interested in is precisely the dynamics of this process of institutionalisation (Gottraux et al, 2000), which can also be called the 'process of disciplinarisation' (Blanckaert, 1993; Mucchielli, 1998), including its moving forces, its forms and its periods.

The historians and sociologists of the (social) sciences show that this process of disciplinarisation, far from evolving in a closed scientific recess, is deeply interwoven with the social world (Ben-David & Collins, 1966; Matalon & Lécuyer, 1988; Blanckaert, 1999). This is particularly true for social sciences that emerged at the end of the nineteenth century in a context where particularly difficult social problems appeared and strong demands to constitute knowledge about social facts came from some sections of society,
and more particularly from institutions (such as school, politics, administration, law, insurance systems) linked to the state (Le Dinh, 1997; Gottraux et al, 2002). This origin, as shown by Wagner & Wittrock (1991), is grounded in what Wagner (1990) calls a coalition of discourses: the actors of the political field find support (and inspiration) for their political innovations in the discourses of the actors of the disciplinary field; this, inversely, consolidates the still weak position of the latter. This strong relationship between social sciences and their social and political context still continues to influence the evolution of the disciplines. Educational sciences follow the same dynamics and interact strongly with the professional and social fields of reference and their demands – i.e. education – all the more so as pedagogical reflection existed long before the institutionalisation of the disciplinary field (Tenorth, 1994; Popkewitz, 1997, 1998; Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2002).

The questions asked by the articles in this issue concern precisely the incidences of this interweaving during the different periods of the evolution of educational sciences and in the specific contexts in which they are integrated. What are the traces (Ginzburg, 1989), in a given environment at a given period, that can be interpreted as indicators of the first forms of existence of a disciplinary field, taken for granted its uncertain and moving contours and its interweaving with the social world that itself produces professionals and specific knowledge? Why is this field progressively institutionalised: how far does the transformation of school systems and the social demands linked to it determine this process? In what way does the professionalisation of education and its corollary, the growth of professional qualification requirements, influence the process of institutionalisation of educational sciences: in preceding it, accompanying it, establishing it, conditioning it, slowing it down? Is there an evolution of the institutional forms of the field during the process of disciplinarisation, and are these forms linked to specific periods? Are these institutional forms similar or different compared to other disciplines? What are the relationships between educational sciences and the other disciplines, more particularly social sciences, which are partially included in educational sciences? Does the process follow similar or different configurations according to geographic or cultural areas and does the importance of local and international factors evolve over time?

Contrasted and Complementary Approaches to the History of Educational Sciences: presentation of the articles

The traces that can serve as indicators of the emergence and evolution of educational sciences are first of all institutional, the more so as institutions condition the existence itself of the disciplinary field. That is why, in the framework that constituted the basis for the articles in this issue, the authors were asked to focus their attention on institutional traces: academic chairs; textbooks; institutions and posts whose mandate contained educational research; publications in specialised journals; public discourses on education.
These traces are necessarily linked to cognitive dimensions in so far as the institutional forms have precisely the function to produce, renew and diffuse knowledge about educational phenomena.

The diversity of empirical data that has been collected by the authors is due to the sources at their disposal, to the advancement of knowledge in a given studied context, and perhaps, also, simply to personal preferences. But one can suppose that it is also the result of methodological choices due to a particular object and its temporal and geographical situation. The authors are eager to understand an evolution and avoid determining their questioning by conceptual models that come later in history; in other words, to avoid ‘presentism’ (Gillispie, 1988; Blondiaux & Richard, 1999). They privilege, thus, different data and modes of analysis when they study the emergence phase of the disciplinary field or when they analyse its recent development. The diversity of data mirrors, also, in our view, the plurality of theoretical frameworks built to understand the history of (social) sciences, which presupposes certain conceptions of science and of its evolution.

The diversity enriches the debate in proposing contrasting viewpoints and information on the evolution of educational sciences in different countries and periods.[3] We will therefore present each contribution by integrating it in a more general reflection on the evolution of the disciplinary field. In doing this, we hope to refine and reformulate the questions listed above, but this does not mean, of course, that we pretend to make a synthesis or to reach general conclusions: the time is not yet ripe for that.

**Academic Chairs**

The institutionalisation of academic chairs is a particularly interesting index for the emergence of a disciplinary field. Because since the beginning of the university in a modern Humboldtian sense (Charle, 1994), the chair constitutes the unity of two functions, i.e. research and education, production of new knowledge and socialisation into modes of conceiving and thinking elaborated in a field (Stichweh, 1993), it is a pillar of the disciplinary building. To create a chair means thus to recognise a new scientific space that is often obtained by struggle or is imposed by authorities for social, economic and political reasons.

All the articles in this issue evoke chairs in one way or another, but two of them, dealing with France and Switzerland (Gautherin and Späni et al [4]) are focused on the detailed observation of the creation of the first academic chairs linked to education. This task is very complex: the empirical material makes visible a complicated and vanishing reality and its meticulous analysis excludes any linear and schematic view of the process. The concept itself, of ‘academic chair’, its designation, and the frontiers of the disciplinary field, vary; so even the choice of the chairs to analyse is difficult. At the turn of the twentieth century, the chairs in education were frequently held by professors whose profile and attributes were eclectic, and their contribution to educational research and to academic and professional programmes is not
clearly defined (Schwenk, 1977/78; Brezinka, 1995; Härnqvist, 1997; Cruikshank, 1998; Gautherin, 2002; Späni, 2002). Only in a second phase, lasting the whole of the twentieth century, with an acceleration in the last decades of the century, in these two countries, as in many others, did academic chairs that clearly belong to the disciplinary field grow strongly in number, become definitively settled, and be held by representatives of the field who have a mandate for research and are socialised in the discipline (Escolano et al, 1980; Simon, 1994; Baumert & Röder, 1994; Campos, 1995; Charlot, 1995; Kloprogge et al, 1995; Rinne, 1995, 2000; Rosengren & Ohngren, 1997; Gretler, 2000; Bertolini & Tarozzi, 2002).

Pursuing other studies specialised in the history of academic chairs (Charle, 1994), the two contributions show the strong interweaving between the first institutionalisation of chairs and the reforms of the school system. These reforms need a more thorough pedagogical theorisation in order for the state to have at its disposal general and transmissible rules, and they imply higher standards in teacher education. This phenomenon seems to be quite general in Europe and in the USA in the last quarter of the nineteenth century (see also the article by Lindberg on Sweden and the references given in the previous paragraph). In France, for instance, the Third Republic, in order to build the new republican citizenship, at the same time created public, non-religious, free and compulsory education, redefined its 'normal schools' for teacher education, founded its higher normal schools designed for teacher educators and established its first courses and chairs in educational science (in the singular). Admittedly, Gautherin notes that the creation of chairs was the result of a pure political–administrative decision and that it was not a response to a socio-professional demand, neither by teachers nor by academics. This does not mean that once instituted it will not provoke a demand. Inversely, it is mainly the socio-professional demand that, in other regions, can provoke the offer; this is clearly the case at certain moments in Switzerland (Späni, Hofstetter & Schneuwly), in Scotland (Nisbet), but also in certain German regions, where teachers and their trade unions themselves, eager to guarantee an optimal education and greater social recognition, have contributed largely to the institutionalisation of programmes and academic chairs.

Everywhere, however, it is possible to detect the interweaving of the process with the reform movement of school systems. This interweaving has different forms and influences. For Switzerland, for instance, Späni, Hofstetter and Schneuwly show that all Swiss universities created their first chairs partially or totally devoted to pedagogy at the turn of the twentieth century, explicitly linked to the construction of the 'Etat enseignant' (the state as teacher, in its role guaranteeing teaching) and teacher education. But this process takes different shapes according to the given context. The authors put forward the following hypothesis. The stronger the link to teacher education, particularly secondary teacher education, at the moment of the creation of chairs in education, the more the philosophical and moral aim of the discipline is anchored, actively supported, incidentally, by the profession of secondary
teaching itself. Inversely, a certain institutional distance to professional education and a dominant orientation towards primary teaching, together with engagement in school reforms and community with other educational professions’ sense of ‘engagement in school reforms and neighbourhood with other educational professions’ (nurses, vocational selection, psychological consultation of children, etc.), favour empirical and experimental paradigms. Such paradigms can even be institutionalised in the long term as chairs or as research institutions. In other words, there is a strong interweaving between, on one hand, the first forms of the discipline in the academic space, i.e. the chairs, their mandate, their designation, their holders, their institutional place, and, on the other hand, the social context and problems, particularly those related to teacher education and more generally to the evolution of the educational system.

Textbooks

The development of a disciplinary field is in part linked to its capacity to educate, initiate and socialise future professionals acting in its domain. Different means contribute to socialisation: academic programmes giving access to diplomas for researchers and recognised by them; networks, associations and congresses that favour communication and discussion of work. Textbooks are a privileged means of socialisation in which known representatives give a condensed version of the main contents of a disciplinary field in the form of popularised syntheses.

For a long time educational sciences have produced such textbooks, often even before other means of socialisation existed (notably academic programmes). As in other disciplines, these textbooks are written for novices and persons entering the field and for social actors whom they educate. At the same time, they contribute to the definition of the contours of the field and they give it a certain legitimacy in the disciplinary system. The analysis of the first textbooks that can be considered as belonging to the field of ‘educational sciences’ shows their hybrid form; and it is very difficult to know which of them belong to the disciplinary field and which do not. This reflects as much the composite and moving form of the emergent disciplinary field as the uncertainties concerning what constituted it during the previous century. The textbooks were often written by persons trained in psychology who were interested in the analysis of educational phenomena, or by pedagogues eager to promote educational reforms. Their content borrows heavily from other disciplinary fields and mixes pedagogical and scientific intentions.

It is most interesting to compare these textbooks with their predecessors; namely, the ones written to be used in normal school in teacher education. In her study focusing on French textbooks from the nineteenth century, Roullet (2001) shows that their authors are torn between a naturalist approach, borrowed from psychology to comprehend rationally and scientifically the human being, and a humanist approach, aimed at reforming the human being
and at strengthening the republican spirit; they risk, thus, confounding description and moral exhortation. These textbooks provide most interesting pointers to proceed to what Roullet calls an ‘anamnesis’ of pedagogy made up of psychology and spiritualism (the philosophical school concerned with the human spirit), and to knowing which knowledge is considered necessary to educate the teaching profession in an efficient way. At the same time, the textbooks influence without doubt the process of disciplinarisation, a process that is made partially visible through the evolution of their ambitions, forms, genres and contents.

This is also what makes Nisbet’s study interesting. It is focused on textbooks edited at the beginning of the twentieth century, on their authors and content; in other words, on a certain mode of socialisation of the members of the disciplinary field. These textbooks, says Nisbet, are our ‘unacknowledged concept-builders: they shape our perceptions of a subject area or discipline’. His contribution sheds light on the editorial effervescence of the first decades of the twentieth century, at a moment when it is still difficult to determine the contours of the field: an important number of textbooks are edited by leading figures; they are often re-edited and become more and more voluminous; the dynamics appear also through their constant reorganisation and the evolution of their titles. All this shows that increasingly the empirical dimension is privileged compared to the philosophical, the pedagogical approach compared to the psychological.

If one takes Europe, Lay, Meumann and Claparède aim to define the contours of this experimental pedagogy or didactic, which they try to orient towards experimental and quantitative approaches, inspired by the paradigm of experimental psychology. This paradigm was to dominate the field in several countries and regions and to contain the influence of philosophical pedagogy. In Scotland, for instance, Rusk’s textbook, published in 1913, very close in its structure and content to Meumann’s, would forge the representations of education in many students until the 1960s, when other paradigms, focused on sociology, case analysis and the concept of teacher-researcher would become new references.

The first textbooks were often written by philosophers, psychologists or professionals of educational action. In the second half of the twentieth century, however, the number of textbooks increased significantly; they were written by representatives who were institutionally legitimated by the discipline, and had titles referring solely to this, although they were multidisciplinary and strongly oriented towards practical educational fields. And the disciplinary field has now also produced new impressive means of capitalisation of its knowledge, namely, encyclopaedias (Debesse & Mialaret, 1969-78; Husen & Postlethwaite, 1985-90; Lenzen, 1982-86).
Institutions Devoted to Research

The emergence of institutions whose mandate includes research and which allow the constitution of a body of professionals specialised in the systematic production of new knowledge is another indicator of the process of disciplinarisation. Such institutions of knowledge production are the more secure and enduring as their existence no longer depends on isolated individuals and as they are able to synergise researchers and to guarantee important human and financial resources and legal legitimacy (Clark, 1972; Weingart, 1974).

Hamel & Larocque focus their attention on the history of institutions in Quebec. It is interesting to point out that this contribution, like others that mention the evolution of institutions where educational sciences have their roots (Lindbeg; Nisbet), directs our attention also to parallel institutions that are at the margin of the scientific field and of official institutions, and even at the margin of the educational field itself. These studies refer to the history of the teacher education institution and of teacher trade unions that have constituted, since the nineteenth century, a central moving force for the creation and evolution of institutions dedicated to educational reflection and research (Drewek, 1998). And from the beginning of the twentieth century, some studies mention extra-university institutions (like the Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau [Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 1998]; or the Hamburg institute founded by Meumann and developed by Stern [Dudek, 1990]) that allow the crossing of certain disciplinary frontiers, but also look to the history of other disciplines like philosophy and, above all, psychology, whose laboratory work took the educational field as a domain of application (the Vienna Institute of Psychology [Benetka, 1995]).

Hamel & Larocque present a history of teacher education institutions in which they look for the beginnings of a culture of research in education in Laval. In other words, the emergence of the disciplinary field is analysed by examining the progressive articulation between professional education and research. Three types of institutions are studied whose chronologies overlap: first, the Ecoles normales for primary teachers, in which no sign of a research culture can be detected, and then, two schools integrated in the university. The first one, specialised in secondary teacher education and the education of professors for normal schools (Ecole normale supérieure, ENS), has no research mandate and does not recruit its professors according to criteria linked to research activity. Teacher education is conceived of following the classical structure of secondary teachers (see also the article by Späni, Hofstetter & Schneuwly), i.e. education in the discipline of reference, and practical and theoretical professional education. The second one, the Ecole de pédagogie et d’orientation (EPO), created in 1943, has had a research mandate since 1946, is granted funds for doing research and considers education and vocational selection as empirical sciences. It is most interesting to note that this institution, contrary to the other two, is charged with education for different professions (vocational selection, psychotherapy, teaching), like a number of
other institutes in North America and Europe (Hamburg, Vienna, Geneva). All of them have initiated an important movement in favour of an empirical, essentially psychological, approach to educational phenomena. One can thus ask if an increasing number of professions concerned in an institution favour a scientific approach to educational phenomena and, moreover, the institutionalisation and the recognition of the disciplinary field ‘educational sciences’.

The quiet revolution of the 1960s transformed fundamentally all domains of society in Quebec, and more particularly the educational system. Faculties of education were created, and teacher education integrated into the university in 1969. Various indicators (publications, qualification of professors, subsidies for research) show a spectacular increase in research in these new institutions. At Laval University, the EPO immediately became part of the Faculty of Education, whereas the ENS, given its relationship to the teaching disciplines, tried to maintain its autonomy. The relationship of the different professions to the field of ‘educational sciences’ has not evolved in the same way for all. Secondary teachers have seemed to be the most reluctant, torn as they are between allegiance to the teaching of their subject discipline and educational sciences for their strictly professional, i.e. pedagogical, contributions.

Note that the evolution of the Faculty of Education in Laval is part of a more general movement that concerns most occidental countries from the second half of the twentieth century (Criblez & Magnin, 2001). The expansion of the educational system and the increase in professional qualification requirements result in the restructuring of the institutions at the high school level (see the above mentioned literature on the evolution of educational sciences in the last quarter of the twentieth century). Institutions specialised in educational research grow in number, as much in the classical disciplinary forms (departments, institutes, faculties) as in institutions linked to local or national, and even international, administrations (see the above mentioned studies on the recent development of educational sciences).

Publications

The elaboration and diffusion of scientific knowledge is possible through different means of communication, among which specialised journals are particularly significant (see, for instance, Weingart, 2001, pp. 99 ff.) The networks of communication are considered by certain historians and sociologists of science to be the defining element of the discipline as a particular social form (Stichweh, 1987; Schriewer & Keiner, 1992; Keiner, 1999). They actually allow the capitalisation of produced knowledge and its communication and critical discussion among the scientific community; they contribute to a synergetic movement among researchers, groups and institutions at the local and the international level and to the building of a
community which recognises itself over institutional, temporal and geographical frontiers.

Series of journals belonging to educational sciences constitute, as Keiner shows, indispensable empirical data for anyone who wants to analyse the history of this disciplinary field, as much in its institutional as cognitive dimensions. And anyone who retraces this genesis will be intrigued. In the nineteenth century, one can observe a real explosion of pedagogical publications (Caspard, 1981; Depaepe, 1993; Stross, 2000); many specialised journals appeared, directed towards the professionals in educational practice, in which the voices of practitioners, of pedagogues and of scientists intermix. From the first decades of the twentieth century on, one can observe a progressive differentiation of discourses and alignments, and parts of educational research became professionalised (see also Nisbet). But the distinction between scientific and pedagogical journals remains difficult since the disciplinary field is still interwoven with the professional fields of reference and with other disciplines. The differences become more and more clear during the twentieth century and many new specialised journals in educational sciences have appeared.

Relying on an analysis of the development of the three principal journals in educational sciences in post-war Germany, Keiner presents in detail the internal evolution of the disciplinary field. He focuses his attention on two indicators: the socio-professional origin of the authors and the concepts used in the titles of more than 5000 articles. Two apparently contradictory results appear that are difficult to interpret.

The professional origin of the authors of the articles changes drastically: the practitioners, who are in the majority before 1956, become a minority after 1956, and they constitute no more than a small number of the authors in the 1970s. This evolution shows a most important redefinition of the relationship between discipline and profession in the sense that the functions of researchers and practitioners are differentiated. Curiously enough, this evolution is not immediately combined with the development of research institutions, but seems to anticipate and even to prepare the role the discipline will play in the context of the fundamental school reforms of the 1960s, and of the changes in teacher education in the 1970s when it was integrated into the university.

This differentiation of functions is not paralleled with an evolution in the degree of specialisation of research. Although it is recognised by professionals, research remains fundamentally oriented towards practical questions and anchored in everyday concepts that are relatively vague and issue from practice.

Educational sciences as a disciplinary field seems therefore to be specialised in functions and institutions, but not in discourses and contents: would this be a way to resolve the constitutive tension between social demands and disciplinary constraints?
Educational sciences are the object of discourses, prescriptions, forecasting brought about by the discipline itself, from inside as it were, and by state organisations, from outside. The discourses produced inside the discipline, like recruitment reports, have a regulative function. In evaluating persons, they contribute to the definition of rules and social conventions that allow place and hierarchy in the discipline to be determined (Bourdieu, 1997), and to a certain degree they legitimate the contents themselves of the discipline.

Probably more than other disciplines, educational sciences are also the object of discourses produced outside the discipline and the disciplinary system, mainly by the state and its institutions (parliament, commissions, etc.), but also by experts and even researchers, the border between inside and outside being sometimes unclear. These discourses are numerous because the disciplinary field is conceived of as having to contribute, among other things, to the administration of the school system and to teacher education. They heavily influence what the discipline can be; they contribute to the determination of its size, its material resources, its place in the university and outside. At the same time, these discourses are also the result of the evolution of the discipline itself. Discourses in and on educational sciences are thus most interesting indicators of their state and development.

Although using other indicators, such as publications and inaugural lessons, Lindberg relies mainly on discourses produced inside (reports on appointments of professorships) and outside (reports of commissions and parliament) the discipline to analyse the disciplinary field in Sweden. On the basis of his empirical material, one can distinguish three main configurations of educational sciences. Recruitment reports show that, in the university at the beginning of the century, an essentially philosophical pedagogy emerged that had the function of guaranteeing the theoretical education of secondary teachers (a phenomenon also observed in Swiss-German and German universities, and, to a certain degree and in a particular form, also in France at the beginning of the twentieth century). The fundamental school reforms in the 1950s concerning the comprehensive school and the correlative transformation of teacher education resulted in a fundamental change of pedagogy. Parliamentary reports redefined its role, which now consisted above all in giving data and information in order to guide the school system. New institutions of school research and teaching of pedagogy were created in the teacher colleges. Recruitment reports, but also analyses of publications, indicate that neo-behaviourist approaches, strongly influenced by psychology and its instruments, for example, tests, became dominant. At the end of the twentieth century, teacher education became part of the higher education system and even of university. Pedagogy also changed fundamentally in that it became more and more linked to the educational terrain, included more sociological dimensions and adopted approaches influenced by action research. Its role in teacher formation increased and it had to contribute to a more secure professional identity, as demanded by parliamentary reports. This has
as a consequence, explicitly stated in several discourses on the discipline, that pedagogy is becoming multi- and even interdisciplinary. Its relative homogeneity, guaranteed by the dominant empirical-psychological paradigm is increasingly breaking up.

This leads Lindberg to ask if pedagogy in Sweden was a phenomenon of the twentieth century. Inversely, one could also ask if the evolution described could also be considered as a normalisation corresponding to international developments in educational sciences.

Two Overarching Questions: a discussion

Several questions cut across the articles in this issue. Two of them seem to be particularly acute and enduring, and consequently important in order to understand the changes that took place in the past and are occurring today.

The Educational Sciences and their Interweaving with the Professional Fields of Reference

Educational sciences have been built on the basis of knowledge elaborated previously in different professional spaces, and in a strong interaction with the reforms of the schools systems. They have thus ever since been heavily influenced by the social demands linked to educational fields and to socio-professional questions. Following different periods and contexts but due to the professional fields and scientific objects concerned, the interweaving between the disciplinary field and the social world takes different forms. It is particularly acute concerning the relationship between discipline and profession (Apel et al, 1999), and more particularly teacher education, in so far as the evolution of both cannot really be dissociated (Bourdoncle, 1993; Nóvoa, 1998; Criblez, 1998; Hamel, 2000; Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2000a; Rinne, 2000). Obviously, one of the moving forces of the process of disciplinarisation is the growth of professional qualification requirements, although profession and discipline are submitted to constraints that are, at least partially, contradictory. This paradox takes different forms. On the basis of the articles in this issue, one can schematically distinguish two forms.

In the first form (France, German-speaking Switzerland, Sweden during the first half of the century), the institutional relationship between discipline and professional education could be described as exterior. The intervention of educational sciences takes essentially the form of an ethical or moral discourse that founds educational principles. The concrete and practical educational acts are the object neither of discourse nor of research. Discourse and research remain philosophical or even speculative, i.e. concern the human being or the child and the educational intervention in general. It is as if there were two parallel worlds: the academic discourses and research do not treat the real heart of the teaching practice; education as practice remains the affair of the
profession, which respects – or ignores – the philosophically founded pedagogical discourse.

An open question remains: is this dissociation of roles the result of the paradox mentioned earlier? Profession and discipline – depending on each other and having to respect partially incompatible constraints – have to act together and at the same time assume fundamentally different functions with the risk of mutual exclusion.

In the other form (Geneva, Sweden since the 1950s, Scotland, Quebec from the 1960s on), the disciplinary field takes a more empirical, and even experimental, form and its relationship to the profession can be described as more intimate. As seen earlier, it is generally allied with movements that support school reforms and it legitimises the social claims of the professionals. It can play, and in fact plays, a different role in professional education and in school reform in general, precisely because it is empirical; it enters (or at least pretends to do so) into the school, into the core of the educational and teaching act and into the learning processes. Nurturing each other, discipline and profession move towards a closer articulation which could paradoxically result in new tensions because they share the same objective and try to define the same reality, namely, the teaching act and its social and institutional constraints. As complementary as they can be, their attitudes and contributions are divergent and even competitive, as both tend to define what the legitimate knowledge is.

As Keiner claims, the so often denounced conflict between theory and practice is one form, doubtless the best known, of the relationship between profession and discipline. The consequences of this interweaving on the process of disciplinarisation of educational sciences have still to be studied in detail. It seems, nevertheless, interesting to see that all the articles in this issue, in one way or in another, mention the tendency of the field to move towards certain forms of interbreeding: actors, mandates, publications, interlocutors with mixed profiles, discourses and concepts ‘in between’. Although educational sciences, institutionally speaking, take the classical social form of the disciplinary system, they remain very near to the social world and have to honour its demands. Have they succeeded in adjusting their contributions to the criteria of social and scientific norms? Are they really recognised as legitimate interlocutors by the main actors of educational fields, be they professionals or stakeholders?

Educational Sciences as Interlocutor of Other Disciplines – Perspectives

The question of the relationship to other disciplinary fields crosses the whole history of educational sciences. Although this question belongs to every discipline, since they are constituted by differentiation from others, educational sciences are particular – as are all fields referring to clearly pre-existing professions – in so far as the process of differentiation and autonomisation from others is always at the same time, paradoxically, a
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...process of integration of parts of what they are separating from (Hermann, 1977; Lautmann & Meusser, 1986; Beillerot, 1987; Schubeius, 1990, 2002; Bauer & Marotzki, 1995; Friedrich, 1998; Stross, 2000). The articles in this issue show this movement and its local and international dynamics. We will discuss some of these elements in trying to propose, at the same time, some rudiments of a periodisation and a sort of necessarily schematic synthesis.

In the occidental nineteenth century, a body of professionals specialised in pedagogical action and reflection was constituted (see Keiner, who evokes the elaboration of a state school system and the constitution of a profession – teacher – by ‘differentiation between educational profession and laymen’). In articulation with these school reforms and constructions – with their needs, knowledge and actors – a disciplinary field was progressively institutionalised; that is, specialised in pedagogical reflection and research (process of ‘secondary professionalisation’; see Stichweh [1987] and the discussion of this concept for educational sciences in Hořtetter & Schnewly [2000b]). This process had from the outset an international dimension and took the institutional form of pedagogical – very often, in fact, philosophical–pedagogical – chairs and courses during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Pedagogy was actually conceived of as, above all, a moral science, attached to the faculties of arts and dedicated to philosophers (see the articles by Gautherin, Lindberg, Nisbet, and Späni, Hořtetter & Schnewly, and some remarks in Keiner; as Hamel & Laroque’s article demonstrates, Quebec seems to be an exception, for reasons that have to be explicated). In this mainly speculative pedagogical science, one can nonetheless observe a movement towards a progressive differentiation from philosophy. The establishment of a science of education is claimed as being necessary and in several parts of the world it is settled in one institutional form or in another, although this process does not result in an autonomous paradigm (see the evolution in Germany and in German-speaking Switzerland; in France, the process seems to have been interrupted before the discipline had time for ‘autoreproduction’).

Parallel to this process, from the end of the nineteenth century, a strong empirical–psychological movement appeared. It also contributed to the institutionalisation of the disciplinary field, redefining at the same time its forms, objectives and approaches. International in nature, it was received very differently, following countries, regions and academic traditions. It has been present during the whole period in Scotland (Nisbet), privileged, for particular local reasons, since the beginning of the twentieth century in Geneva (Späni, Hořtetter & Schnewly), present and then eliminated between the two world wars in the German speaking countries (Keiner, Späni Hořtetter & Schnewly), introduced quite recently, after the Second World War, in the context of school reform in Sweden (Lindberg), and developed in a niche in Laval in Quebec (Hamel) (see also De Vroede, 1977; Depaepe, 1993; Hameline, 1998).

In its initial developments, experimental pedagogy claimed a clear separation from the philosophical paradigm and relied strongly on...
psychological concepts and methods (see the textbooks presented by Nisbet, the evolution of the disciplinary field in Geneva briefly discussed by Späni, Hofstetter & Schneuwly, and the form of pedagogy adopted during the 1950s in Sweden described by Lindberg). These two domains of research – psychology and educational sciences – were not clearly distinguished for a long time. As a consequence, forms of psychological thinking were spontaneously and predominantly adopted in reflection on education [5] and other disciplines remain enduringly at the margins of the field of research on education.

A dimension one can call retrospectively ‘pluridisciplinary’ also characterises pedagogy from very early on. As the first holders of the chairs at the turn of the twentieth century thought, educational science could refer to philosophy and to psychology, but also sometimes to physiology, to biology, if not to anthropology, to medicine, and so on: ‘Psychology, biology, sociology’ claimed Bovet (1912), co-founder of the Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Geneva in 1912. This could be an echo of the first and unique congress of pedology with sections of biology, anthropometry, school hygiene and medicine, psychology, pedagogy and sociology, and communications on psychoanalysis, criminology, law, for example (Ioteyko, 1912; Depaepe, 1987). In the first decades of the twentieth century, this disciplinary plurality first means, often, essentially an allegiance to psychology, as shown by the examples of Geneva, Sweden and, some decades later, Quebec. The contributions of other disciplines (more particularly sociology) that also claim a legitimacy to intervene in educational research will become more and more important during the twentieth century. Although pluridisciplinarity was quite common even in the first institutional forms of the field, it has become a dominant characteristic during the last 30-40 years (see, for instance, Nisbet and Lindberg; Hamel mentions the organisation of the faculty of sciences of education – the name is most meaningful – in six departments and the incentives given to constitute interdisciplinary groups for research).

But one does not know the true impact of pluridisciplinarity, for instance, in scientific practice and production. The psychological paradigm remains most important and the speculative and moral (or ethical) dimension, linked to the question of values, is still heavily present.

This overview, as schematic and synthetic as it may be, evidences nonetheless another tension that acts strongly on the disciplinarisation process of educational sciences; namely, the one between local, including national, and an international pole of attraction (concerning the question of local constraints, see Langewand & Prondczynsky, 1999). Educational sciences as a disciplinary field necessarily have their origin at a local level since they emerge in strong articulation with the needs of the educational system that is locally situated. As we have seen, they appear when pedagogical reflection takes a disciplinary form and becomes a more and more professional and specialised
function, a process we have called secondary disciplinarisation. But, precisely,
in taking a disciplinary form, educational sciences are strongly articulated to
international debates on education and they have to justify their assumptions
and findings, often still embedded in local traditions, in taking into account
discourses coming from outside. Additionally, one can observe important
waves of school reforms that appear in comparable moments in different
countries, linked probably to phases of economic, social and political changes
(last quarter of the nineteenth century; after the First World War; in the 1950s
and 1960s) that heavily influence the educational sciences in creating
paradigms that are internationally very influential. As shown by Schriewer et
al (1999; see also Schriewer, 2002), phenomena of globalisation are integrated
in most differentiated local webs of meanings that actively appropriate new
discourses in transforming and integrating them.

The result is this most fascinating European (and worldwide)
configuration of educational sciences: manifold forms, structures, institutions,
contents that all have their roots in history. They meet now a new challenge:
the construction of a European space of research (Busquin, 2000; Lawn, 2001;
Grüber, 2001; more generally Stichweh, 2000) that reinforces most heavily the
international pole of the tension. Only if the deep-rooted forces behind the
configurations are known and understood by the actors in the field can they
avoid the reinforcing of this construction by already dominant paradigms so
that it can become a process of integration and mutual enrichment. This issue
of the *European Educational Research Journal* is a contribution to this process in
which the EERA has to take a leading role in promoting differentiated
knowledge about this necessarily multifaceted, because also locally
determined, field.
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*Notes*

[1] The articles were presented at the European Congress of Educational Research
(ECER) organised by the European Educational Research Association (EERA)
and the Association des enseignants-chercheurs en sciences de l’éducation
(AECSE) in September 2001 in Lille. They are from the symposia ‘Sources of
emergence and of recent development of educational research as an academic discipline: an answer to the demands of increasing qualification for the educational professions? (1. 1890-1950, 2. 1950-2000) of the network 17, ‘History of education’. For the present issue, the articles have been fundamentally revised. Marc Depaepe kindly agreed to be discussant, who we asked to try a first comparative analysis of the contributions.

[2] We prefer this term to ‘discipline’ when we want to underline the uncertain, manifold and moving contours of educational sciences, their interweaving with other professional and disciplinary fields, particularly evident during the period of their emergence, as the different articles in this issue show. These characteristics of the field are also a consequence of the fact that they result from a process of secondary disciplinarisation.

[3] The contributions were not solicited to be compared with each other; given their diversity, a comparison is not possible and would be in any case untimely. In his discussion, Marc Depaepe treats this difficult question of comparison.

[4] When we mention authors without giving a date, we refer to the contributions to the present volume.

[5] Note that this form of thinking was already dominant before (Charbonnel, 1988), and reinforced the spontaneous adoption of empirical-psychological approaches. These phenomena need a more thorough analysis.
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