

English summaries

Björn Haglund, 2003: Stimulated Recall – Some notes concerning a method of generating data /Stimulated Recall – Några anteckningar om en metod att generera data/. Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige, Vol 8, No 3, pp 145–157. Stockholm. ISSN 1401-6788.

This article is based on a literature survey with the aim of highlighting stimulated recall, as a method of generating data. Stimulated recall involves showing people recorded portions of their lives and inviting them to comment on these. It is one of many methods where the comments a respondent gives concerning their work is used as data. The recorded person may see or hear a tape shortly after it was recorded. The tape is intended to be a stimulus for recall, which will help the interviewee to relive the original event.

The origin of stimulated recall seems to be located to the early 1950s but the use of the method did not become common until the late 1970s. It was also during the 1970s that the so called Teacher Thinking research became common and the Teacher Thinking tradition has, so to say, incorporated stimulated recall as a method.

Regarding the literature survey, it seems that one cannot speak about stimulated recall as *the* stimulated recall method. The use of stimulated recall varies depending on, for example, methods used during the interview, the use of the recorded material and the interviewee's possibilities to get acquainted with the recorded material before the interview. It is not only the use of the method that varies between different research projects. The focus of interest for the researchers also varies in those projects that have used stimulated recall. Since there is a variation of both how to conduct the research and what to research it might be better to speak about a stimulated recall method instead. Therefore it seems that the use of stimulated recall to a large extent is a product of the individual researcher's intentions. Common to all efforts, however, is the aim to gain insights into people's thinking.

An important question is whether the results of these efforts really are interactive thoughts that the interviewees remember or thoughts that are created in the time of hearing or viewing the recorded material. This latter assumption challenges the former and original thoughts about stimulated recall since it questions what the interviewees are able to verbalise. Representatives for this movement advocate that it is impossible for the interviewees to describe such cognitive processes and that a lot of one's actions are automated and therefore very difficult to verbalise. According to this way of reasoning the thoughts, that the interviewees refer to, are a combination of

cognitive processes during the original occasion and responses that occur when viewing the recorded situation. Stimulated recall could therefore also be seen as a method to gain insights about, for instance, teachers' professional knowledge or beliefs about teaching in a retrospective way.

In conclusion, this article has focussed on presenting stimulated recall as a method. The main point is that the method varies concerning methodological points of departure and that these are divergences of opinions regarding basic assumptions as to what interviewees are able to verbalise by the means of stimulated recall. Because of this it is important for the researcher to express his or her position, when stimulated recall is used, and as well carefully describe how his or her inquiry has been done. This of course applies to all methods of inquiry.

Owe Lindberg, 2003: Conversation or parallel monologues? Swedish treatises on teacher education during the period 1953–2000 /Samtal eller parallella monologer? Svenska avhandlingar om lärarutbildning perioden 1953–2001/. Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige, Vol 8, No 3, pp 158–183. Stockholm. ISSN 1401-6788.

This is a study of all PhD theses and licentiate theses on teacher education ever written and defended in Sweden at the time of the study, that is 2001. Research on teacher education is one of the bases for our understanding of teacher education and, as an extension, also for the way we talk about teacher education. From this vantage point the question of how research on teacher education takes shape becomes important, both in relation to the issues that research focusses upon and in relation to how the field of research on teacher education constructs itself. Of special interest is the question of how talk about teacher education, produced in and through teacher education, research is constituted in terms of parallel monologues or dialogues.

In order to establish a register of previous theses I have used LIBRIS, the catalogue of Swedish libraries. Although LIBRIS is a comprehensive and well-structured database there is no single royal road that guarantees the outcome of database searches. Different search routes produce different results. However, by combining the three main search entries – keywords, subject and classification – it was possible to establish a register of 47 theses.

The first thing that can be noticed is that the volume of teacher education research has expanded. Until the 1990s research that was reported in theses was a minor enterprise. Only 11 theses were written, with Gustaf Ögrens thesis *Trends in English Teachers' Training from 1800 to 1953* as the first. From 1990 onwards we see a substantial expansion with 36 theses within the span of 12 years, that is three theses per year.

Secondly we can say that the 11 early theses are almost completely unaccounted for in the latter theses. Only two of them can be found as references in the five theses from the new millennium. You can easily find a number of reasons for this, for example that research issues have changed, as have research methods, which make references to earlier research less important. But the lack of recognition of earlier research can also be part of a more general pattern.

The 36 theses from 1990 onwards are categorised in relation to two dimensions which can be labelled *central* versus *peripheral* and *general* versus *specific*. By combining the two dimensions you get a table with four cells: »central and general«, »central and specific«, »peripheral and general«, and »peripheral and specific«. The different cells can be said to represent different conditions for interrelation between the different theses within the cells. The only cell where it is reasonable to expect a more elaborate pattern of interrelation between the theses is the first cell. I have therefore chosen to make that cell the focus of further analysis. One third of the theses (12) fall in this cell. These theses deal, almost entirely with two aspects, (i) how teacher education programmes are constructed, have been constructed and could be constructed and (ii) how future teachers apprehend the world, primarily their own teacher education programme.

These 12 theses contain a bit over 2000 references. 106 references appear more than once which means that the number of referred texts is roughly 2000. 106 shared references out of a total number 2000 references is a very small figure and there is subsequently not many common orientation points – that is ideas, theories, methodologies etcetera that are mutually recognised although not necessarily commonly understood – that can help to interrelate the 12 theses in this field. In addition to that one can see that no single reference appears in more than six theses.

Seen as orientation points these references, however few, are mainly external to the teacher education project and deal with general methodological, theoretical or philosophical issues, issues like the construction of knowledge, from both a micro and a macro perspective. Only two out of 106 shared references deal with basic issues in relation to ideas about teacher education and the construction of teacher education programmes.

The first 6 theses on teacher education had a male author. Since then the situation has changed substantially. Today female researchers dominate the production of theses on teacher education. Within the cell »central and general«, eight of the theses are written by female researchers. In terms of points of orientations, however, research on teacher education is still a predominantly male enterprise. Only 15% of the references are references to female researchers. So, while the field of research on teacher education is being feminised its points of references, to the extent that such points exist, are in significant ways still set by men.

There is a risk that my choice of theses as the empirical basis will produce pictures that, in relation to the field of research on teacher education as a whole, are too narrow, limited or distorted and to get an external point of reference I have compared my study with a study on research on teacher

education in Sweden from the mid 1990s, Ahlström and Kallós (1995). Three aspects of similarities and differences should be mentioned. Firstly, most of the studies that Ahlström and Kallós discuss are theses. There is very limited non-theses research that is accounted for in their study. Therefore my explicit choice of theses doesn't make a big difference. Secondly, we to some extent, include different texts in our studies. 12 theses, put forward during the period that Ahlström and Kallós' study covers, which in LIBRIS are classified as research on teacher education and therefore included in my study are absent in the study of Ahlström and Kallós. On the other hand, only nine of the 17 theses that Ahlström and Kallós discuss are classified as teacher education research in LIBRIS and subsequently included in my study. Thirdly, despite these differences, the overall picture that emerges and that I try to highlight is very similar. Both studies result in pictures of a field with a low degree of interrelation and thereby more of »parallel monologues» than dialogues.

What then is the potential for research on teacher education to contribute to a more elaborated way to talk about teacher education? In relation to the situation delineated above the answer must be »poor». What we need, in order to change that situation, I would argue, is research on teacher education that focuses on basic aspects of the problems and dilemmas of the teacher education project. Such research would also create better conditions for interrelation between researchers within the field and for strengthening the field as a whole.