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Abstract

This chapter traces the history of the relation between pedagogy and the humanities from a long time-perspective, spanning the 1860s to the 1960s. Focusing on boundary drawing processes, we distinguish two major shifts in which pedagogy established itself as a distinct discipline. The first consisted of a separation from philosophy, the second of a separation from psychology. Through and along this process, pedagogy became increasingly separated from the humanities and ended up in the new social science faculty in the 1960s. As pedagogy also got a central role in the new professional teacher education outside of the universities, its position as a non-humanistic discipline became manifest.
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Introduction

This chapter concerns the relationship between pedagogy and the humanities in Swedish university history. Today, the discipline of pedagogy is formally separated from the humanistic disciplines. In the Swedish academic organization, there is generally a clear line between the faculty of social sciences, where pedagogy is commonly included, and the faculty of humanities. But historically, the organization of knowledge was different, and the relationship between pedagogy and the humanities has not always been the same. During the nineteenth century the humanities
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were, in fact, significantly linked to the establishment of pedagogy. As the main educational task for the Faculty of Philosophy was the education of secondary school teachers, one central issue of discussion about university education in the nineteenth century concerned the question of whether the future teachers in their education needed to gain any specific educational knowledge and, if so, how it should be organized. One response to this was the introduction of one year of teacher training at a school after the university studies. Other responses included theoretical and historical educational courses and, eventually, separate chairs in pedagogy. Thus, the very creation of pedagogy is clearly linked to the humanities. Ever since, a feature of pedagogy has been its strong connection to teacher education, whereas the connection to the humanities has decreased, albeit not disappeared altogether. As pedagogy, in contrast to most humanistic disciplines today, has access to a mass-market of future teachers, this historical process meant that the humanities lost one significant link to a large audience of future teachers. Understanding the relationship between pedagogy and the humanities is therefore of central relevance for the understanding of the humanities and their role in modern society.

This article traces the history of the relation between pedagogy and the humanities from a long time-perspective, spanning the 1860s to the 1960s. We will highlight the boundaries that were brought to the fore in the development of the pedagogical discipline when it comes to its relation to the humanities. This will allow us to discuss the relationship between pedagogy and other disciplines inside and outside the field of the humanities and show its changing and historically contingent character. This means that we are interested in the organization of academic knowledge where pedagogy as well as other disciplines are delimited and grouped in varied ways over time. Academic boundaries are drawn and re-drawn both within and around disciplines and faculties. They constitute a map of knowledge, which is an important aspect of the social structure of science and whose changes may be regarded as a characteristic feature in the history of knowledge. From historical studies it becomes clear that boundaries can be influential in different ways. Often historical actors discuss or relate to existing boundaries, but they might also engage in establishing new or dissolving old boundaries. As Beckman et al. have pointed out, boundary-work does not necessarily

mean conflict or distancing, but can also rhetorically be used to emphasize cooperation and positive interconnections.\(^2\)

Boundary drawing is a continuous process, but at certain moments in time, discussions about boundaries are intensified. One such example is when a new discipline is created or recreated in a formal sense, resulting in discussions about creating chairs, splitting disciplines or changing the academic knowledge organization in some other way. This is the kind of examples from the history of pedagogy as a university discipline that we give attention to in this chapter. The empirical material consists of public inquiry material – including commission reports, expert comments [remissyttranden], government proposals and, for the nineteenth century, parliamentary debates – on university issues focusing on the position of pedagogy in the academic landscape. With the help of a database of newspapers at the National Library of Sweden, searchable by subject words and time periods, the official material has been supplemented with daily press material containing debate and views about proposals or measures taken. The covered time period begins in the middle of the nineteenth century with the discussions that arose about teacher education at the Faculty of Philosophy. It ends in the 1960s when the establishment of separate faculties of Social Sciences and Humanities created a boundary between pedagogy and the humanistic subjects that still prevails. The analysis of the material thus identified has focused on the boundaries that can be detected in the relationship between pedagogy and the humanities. Previous research on the Swedish case has neglected this issue, but as international comparisons show there is considerable variation regarding the relation between educational research and the humanities. For example, in Germany there was for a long time a close connection between philosophy and education. It was common with chairs in both philosophy and education – a complete dissociation between the chairs was not achieved until the beginning of the 1960s. In the Swedish case that dissociation happened earlier, as we will see.\(^3\)

Since this analysis concerns a period of more than a century, concepts and terminology is a complex issue. Both pedagogy and the humanities are terms that change their conceptual content over time. We have strived to be careful

\(^2\) Beckman et al., “Inledning,” p. 15.

\(^3\) Previous research on the history of pedagogy in Sweden include Dahllöf, Problem i den pedagogiska forskningens utveckling; Härnqvist, “Educational Research”; Kroksmark, Pedagogikens vägar; Lindberg and Lindberg, Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige 1948–1971; Nystedt, Till andlig och kroppslig hälsa. For international perspectives, see e.g., Lagemann, An Elusive Science; Lawn, An Atlantic Crossing?; McCulloch and Cowan, A Social History; Whitty and Furlong, Knowledge and the Study.
and sensitive about the meanings of the terms in the different contexts at stake. In particular, it is important to be aware that the humanities as a term has a historically contingent meaning. The humanities, perhaps not called by exactly the same wording, was a wider concept in the nineteenth century than later. Although many disciplines of today were not created back then, other disciplines that we today regard as not belonging to the humanities were included. We regard the disciplines included in the nineteenth-century Faculty of Philosophy as the humanities of that time, a field that later was delimited through disciplinary specialization, fragmentation, the emergence of new knowledge areas, and the boundary work performed throughout the processes. However, it is necessary for the reader to keep in mind that the terms we use to talk about the relation between pedagogy and the humanities are, and have to be, to some extent ambiguous.

Institutionalizing Pedagogy: Educational Knowledge Between Philosophy and Psychology

Swedish pedagogy became institutionalized as an academic discipline in the early 1900s, when the first three chairs were created, in 1910, 1912, and 1919 respectively. From an international perspective, this was a relatively late development; several European countries received their first chairs during the nineteenth century. In the Swedish case the emergence of pedagogy can be related to the boundary between philosophy and pedagogy. In order for pedagogy to appear as a separate discipline, it needed to successfully show that it had an exclusive field of knowledge that it alone could master.  

A parliamentary debate in 1867 suggests that this process was yet to happen. In that year, the minister for ecclesiastical affairs F. F. Carlson suggested in a proposition to the parliament that a new professorship in pedagogy should be established at Uppsala University. The background to the proposal had to do with the education of teachers at grammar schools. Traditionally these teachers had only studied the subjects at university and had no teacher specific education whatsoever, but recently a reform that secured practical training for a year at a school [provåret] had been introduced. By appointing a professor in pedagogy it would be possible to supplement practical training with theoretical training as well.

The proposal met considerable resistance in the Second Chamber of the Swedish parliament. A recurring argument was that pedagogical

4 Gieryn, Cultural Boundaries.
knowledge encompassed too many school subjects for one single person
to master. Among the opponents to the idea of a professorship was the
former principal P. A. Siljeström. Siljeström, known as a dedicated sup-
porter of educational reforms, did not believe that a professor would make
a valuable contribution to the development of secondary schools. This
was because the knowledge a professor could contribute would either
be too all-encompassing or too general. In terms of teaching methods
it was unrealistic to think that one single professor could master the
different techniques required of the different school subjects. Instead,
it was the more general principles of pedagogy that a professor could
potentially possess knowledge about. However, Siljeström questioned
whether those general principles were specific enough to legitimate a new
professorship. If understood as the philosophical foundations, one was
completely entering philosophical territory, and the professorship would
in effect be “nothing but a new chair in philosophy.”5 As a consequence,
the discipline of philosophy would expand at the expense of other, more
neglected disciplines: “the result would be that the university got three
professorships in philosophy, while completely lacking chairs in some of
the most important contemporary sciences.”6

What we see here is a discussion about the academic map of the disciplines
at the universities. It can be seen as a reflection concerning the division of
knowledge within the Faculty of Philosophy. Apparently, Siljeström did not
see how pedagogy could be a knowledge area of its own of the same kind
as the other humanities disciplines.

Over time the boundaries between the humanities and pedagogy shifted,
as illustrated by the eventual institutionalization of pedagogy. At the begin-
ning of the twentieth century, there was a renewed interest in creating
a professorship in pedagogy. At this time the argument that pedagogy
was essentially philosophy was harder to sustain. The failed attempt to
separate pedagogy from philosophy in 1867 was referred to in a 1905 motion
to the parliament, written by two elementary school teachers, Fridtjuv
Berg and Emil Hammarlund. They argued that since 1867, pedagogical
research had developed in a much more empirical direction than earlier.
“The pedagogy of our time is not a branch of speculative philosophy; it has

5 Riksdagens protokoll 1867:401, Andra kammaren, p. 147. “icke blifva annat än en ny lärostol
i filosofi.”
6 Riksdagens protokoll 1867:401, Andra kammaren, p. 147. “Resultatet blevfe således att man
vid universitetet finge tre professioner i filosofi, under det man ännu helt och hållet saknar
lärostolar i en och annan bland nutidens vigtigaste vetenskaper.”
assumed a modern, scientific character.” They exemplified this tendency with recent publications by two German scholars: Wilhelm August Lay’s *Experientelle Didaktik* and Ernst Meumann’s *Sammlung von Abhandlungen zur psychologischen Pädagogik*, works that were said to be valuable in terms of “solving” important issues of education. A few years later, it was decided that the first professor in pedagogy should be appointed.8

The proposals for a professorship in pedagogy from 1867 and 1905 thus had different outcomes, which raises the question of how to understand the difference. One way of describing the successful introduction of a new discipline is in terms of shifting boundaries between disciplines. In 1867, pedagogy could not be a discipline, it was argued, since it was essentially philosophy. By the turn of the new century, such confusion was less likely. In a situation of increasing disciplinary fragmentation and development, where experimental psychology and child psychology had emerged, pedagogy had got access to a new scientific base that was partly unrelated to philosophy.9

However, the departure from philosophy and the emergence of an alliance between pedagogy and psychology was a protracted process that spanned decades. Ingemar Nilsson has noted that the separation of psychology from philosophy was an uneven process that in different national contexts could happen either abruptly or gradually.10 As the first Swedish professorships in education testify, there were still elements of philosophy in the emerging discipline of pedagogy. This is partly indicated by the different titles of the chairs. The first three professorships were in pedagogy (Uppsala, Bertil Hammer 1910) psychology and pedagogy (Lund, Axel Herrlin 1912) and philosophy and pedagogy (Gothenburg, G A Jaederholm 1919). Given this coexistence, it is of interest to explore in more detail how the boundaries between pedagogy, philosophy, and psychology were drawn in the respective contexts during the formative years of pedagogy.

**The First Professors: Choosing Disciplinary Paths**

The professorship in Uppsala provides a good illustration of the fluid and slightly changing boundary between disciplines during the early years of the
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7 Motion, Andra kammaren 1905:152. “Vår tids pedagogik är icke en gren af den spekulativa filosofien; den har alltmer antagit en modernt vetenskaplig karaktär.”
8 Kroksmark, *Pedagogikens vägar*.
9 Lagemann, *An Elusive Science*.
10 Nilsson, *Själen i laboratoriet*, p. 11.
twentieth century. The person who many expected would get the chair in pedagogy was the philosophy professor Frans von Schéele. He had been an active promoter of the idea of a professorship and was also the responsible teacher for the theoretical course for future secondary school teachers. His former teacher, the philosopher Karl Reinhold Geijer, urged Uppsala University to call von Schéele to the professorship. Interestingly enough, Geijer admitted that von Schéele’s pedagogical publications were relatively limited for a professor, but that his philosophical and psychological writings compensated for that.11 When the university instead announced the position as professor, von Schéele decided not to apply, making it possible for another scholar, Bertil Hammer, to get the chair. Hammer had recently earned his doctorate (in 1908), on a thesis about the psychology of attention, and had in general a more psychological approach to research.12 A few years into his professorship, it was suggested by a philosophy professor at the university that the name of the chair should be changed from “pedagogy” to “psychology and pedagogy.” The proposal was, it seems, not primarily motivated by the needs of pedagogy, but was rather an attempt to demarcate philosophy from experimental psychology. The proposal ultimately failed.13

By contrast, at the second university – in Lund – the chair was in psychology and pedagogy. The title of the chair indicated a psychological direction, and the holder – Axel Herrlin – certainly had such interests, for example in abnormal psychology and experimental psychology. However, Herrlin’s background was in philosophy and he had indeed aimed for a philosophical career. He was a docent in theoretical philosophy and had applied for chairs in both theoretical and practical philosophy, and had been assessed as qualified in both subjects.14 As a philosopher, Herrlin stressed the close connection between philosophy and the specialized sciences.15 In terms of pedagogical writings, Herrlin wrote a work on the pedagogical aspects of memory and a short book about pedagogical thinking. These works were

11 Geijer, Förslag om kallelse.
12 Kroksmark, Pedagogikens vägar, pp. 133–136.
14 Handlingar rörande tillsättandet, p. 12.
15 Herrlin, Filosofi och fackvetenskap.
produced shortly before he got his professorship in Lund 1912. After his appointment he did not write much, and his only major work represented a return to philosophy, on Kant.\(^\text{16}\)

The professorship in Gothenburg covered philosophy and pedagogy. Such a combination of disciplines was not self-evident at a time when increased differentiation and new boundaries within and between disciplines were emerging. The unusually complicated process of appointing a professor – it took five years – indicates that the two disciplines had indeed drifted apart quite a lot by this time. The process started in 1914 when appliances were sent in, and ended in 1919 when GA Jaederholm was appointed. The relationship between pedagogy and philosophy became a matter of public debate already in 1914, when a media debate arose regarding Jaederholm’s philosophical credentials. The debate was centered around a translation of Schopenhauer that Jaederholm had conducted about a decade earlier. The second edition of the translation had recently been published and was reviewed in one of the leading national newspapers. The reviewer of the book did remarkably enough not comment on the actual text by Schopenhauer – instead he focused entirely on the translation, which was depicted as unbelievably lousy. This alleged lack of quality was commented upon in relation to the process of appointing a professor in Gothenburg. The translation was, the reviewer stressed, not the fever phantasies of a school boy, but the product of a man who had managed to merit himself to apply for a professorship in philosophy and pedagogy. His translation, however, revealed him rather to be a “mystagogue.”\(^\text{17}\)

When it was time to judge who was qualified for the chair it proved difficult to find the right candidate. The majority of the university’s teacher council assessed all of the applicants to be unqualified. The root of the problem was the coexistence of pedagogy and philosophy in one single professorship: none of the applicants were deemed qualified in both subjects.\(^\text{18}\)

A minority of the teacher council claimed that there actually were applicants who could be categorized as competent. Belonging to this minority was the philosopher Vitalis Norström who claimed that the

\(^{16}\) Herrlin, *De klassiska riktlinierna*.

\(^{17}\) Collinder, “Också en Schopenhaueröversättning.” The review sparked a debate resulting in at least five newspaper articles. Apart from a reply from G. A. Jaederholm, John Landquist (following instructions in several letters from Jaederholm), published a lengthy defense of Jaederholm. Landquist depicted Collinder’s attack as an obvious attempt to influence the appointment of a new professor in philosophy and pedagogy, and defended Jaederholm’s abilities as a translator.

\(^{18}\) “Göteborgs högskola.”
philosopher Malte Jacobsson was the most suitable candidate. His argument for this was not based on an assessment of his credentials as pedagogue. Instead, Norström stressed that the whole construction of the professorship, combining pedagogy and philosophy, was inappropriate given the expansive nature of modern pedagogy, with its base in psychology and natural science and its increasing practical and technical complexity. It would have been better if the existing professorship in philosophy could have been divided into two chairs, and an altogether new one in pedagogy, or pedagogy and psychology. Given the character of the existing professorship, Norström maintained that the demands on the applicant had to be slightly lower than normal, and that knowledge in philosophy was more constitutive for the chair than the “quasi-scientific” discipline of pedagogy.

As these three examples of the first professorships in education indicate, pedagogy as a discipline had started to drift off from philosophy, but the demarcation was not complete. There was still a connection and, for example, when a major philosophical lexicon was produced in 1925, several of the contributors had a pedagogical background. Nonetheless, the historical tendency was one in which philosophy and pedagogy gradually drifted apart, while psychology and pedagogy increasingly became allied, at least by name. An example of this process was the fusion of two scientific journals. The psychological journal Psyche and the pedagogical journal Svenskt arkiv för pedagogik [Swedish Archive for Pedagogy] were merged into a new pedagogical-psychological journal called Arkiv för psykologi och pedagogik [Archive for Psychology and Pedagogy]. This fusion happened in 1922, and two of the professors of pedagogy, Axel Herrlin and Bertil Hammer, edited it together with the former editor of Psyche, the psychologist Sydney Alrutz. Two decades later another scientific journal with a similar name was released, also combining psychology and pedagogy in its title (Tidskrift för psykologi och pedagogik [Journal for Psychology and Pedagogy]), and a scientific institute, Statens psykologisk-pedagogiska institut (SPPI [the Swedish Psychological and Pedagogical Institute]) was founded in 1944. At about the same time a major reference book, Psykologisk-pedagogisk uppslagsbok [Psychological-pedagogical reference book], consisting of four volumes, was published. The first volume of the book series Psykologisk-Pedagogiskt bibliotek [the Psychological-Pedagogical Library], featuring the best-selling dissertation Svensk ungdom [Swedish Youth] by Torsten Husén, was released in 1944.

19 “Professuren i praktisk filosofi.”
20 Ahlberg, Filosofiskt lexikon.
This historical tendency toward a tighter alliance between psychology and pedagogy was partly a result of the appointment of new professors in the 1930s. The decade saw the birth of a second generation of professors of education. Due to the death of previous professors and the creation of a new chair in Stockholm, four new professors entered the scene. This sudden shift coincided with a slight tendency toward standardization in the chairs. In Gothenburg, the name of the chair changed from “Philosophy and pedagogy” to “Psychology and pedagogy,” indicating an increased autonomy in relation to philosophy. In Uppsala there was in 1930 renewed proposals from philosophy professors (Hägerström and Phalén) to change the name of the chair in pedagogy into “psychology and pedagogy,” in line with what it was called in Lund. However, resistance was raised from dominant actors – the Royal Board of Education and large teacher organizations – and no change in name occurred. The professorship in Stockholm was named after the donor (Eneroth) but encompassed pedagogy and psychology.

Three of the newly appointed professors had a distinct psychological character, focusing on issues such as intelligence, statistical methods (Anderberg, Elmgren), and perception (Katz). An important exception to the tendency was John Landquist whose academic background was in philosophy and who had worked primarily as a literary critic. The fact that he managed to get a chair in psychology and pedagogy, more or less completely lacking previous experience in the field indicates that the transition toward a discipline based on an alliance between psychology and pedagogy was not complete. Nonetheless, Landquist quickly managed to create an environment in which several leading scholars emerged, among them the pedagogue Torsten Husén. In terms of Landquist’s own production as a scholar in the field of pedagogy, his main work is arguably *Pedagogikens historia* [The History of Pedagogy] printed in nine editions between 1941 and 1973, and used in teacher education courses, an example of the enduring role of historical perspectives in teacher education.

In sum, the formative years of pedagogy as an academic discipline must be understood in relation to changing boundaries to its neighboring disciplines within the humanities. Pedagogy was established when a certain, but not total, autonomy from philosophy was achieved. As we have seen there was
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21 Anderberg (1932, Uppsala), Landquist (1936, Lund), Katz (1937, Stockholm), and Elmgren (1939, Göteborg).
still a lingering connection to philosophy during the first professorships. But gradually pedagogy loosened its relation to philosophy while it consolidated its already strong bonds to psychology. The relationship between the two disciplines became indeed a close one, as illustrated by the hyphen that connected them, making them distinct but intertwined. Pedagogy and psychology never merged into one single word, or one unified science. They kept their semantic individuality, even when they appeared as Siamese twins. Soon that relationship would face a test.

**Dividing Pedagogy After 1948**

In the mid 1940s, there was a consensus about the need for expanding Swedish universities. The government decided to split several of the existing university subjects and assign one professor to each part. Since every discipline in the Swedish university system by this time normally had only one professor and one or two assisting employees, this was an effective way to double the teaching capacity. The professors of psychology and pedagogy at each of the four universities had called for a partition of this kind, motivated by the expanding field of academic educational knowledge and the increasing need for it in society, together with the rapidly growing number of students. Also organizations for teachers had called for additional professors in pedagogy pointing especially to the lack of research in child psychology and practical pedagogy.

Thus, there were possibilities attached to the separation between psychology and pedagogy. However, the process of dividing an existing discipline into two was far from straight-forward, and raised numerous questions about how the two fields were to be understood and related to each other. The hierarchy between the respective traditions and what kind of knowledge each discipline should encompass were issues of intense discussion. As we will see, different actors – including the existing professors in the field – expressed different views when commenting the proposal, which reveals that the boundary between pedagogy and psychology was not self-evident. One of the overarching questions was the distance between psychology and pedagogy. Should the division result in two radically different disciplines – two cultures – or should they share some kind of scientific base?

26 Proposition 1947:272, p. 123.
Unlike the older discussions, where the boundary to philosophy had been at stake, it was now the historical parts of pedagogy that were problematized. Professor Anderberg at Uppsala University had a clear vision of history as the core of pedagogy. He suggested that one of the two chairs should concern psychology and educational psychology and the other one pedagogy, especially historical pedagogy. The main argument for this division was the crucial differences between historical and experimental research methods.27

Landquist preferred a less clear boundary between the two disciplines. As opposed to Anderberg, he claimed that a division between psychology and a historically oriented pedagogy would be unfortunate as it would turn the chair in pedagogy into one in mainly history. If so, the pedagogical perspective would not be at the center of interest for the professor in pedagogy. It would also risk to disappoint the students, who devoted their “precious years of youth” to gain pedagogical insights, if the professor mainly focused on the pedagogy of the sixteenth and seventeenth century and lost the connection to contemporary educational thinking. According to Landquist, the history of pedagogy should be included in the realm of the chair in pedagogy but only as one of its areas and not as its main focus.28

Instead, Landquist claimed that pedagogy had its scientific base in and was inseparable from psychological research. However, a chair devoted to psychology could also risk disappointing the students, as its holder might totally ignore the pedagogical point of view. Therefore, Landquist argued for a solution with two chairs that both encompassed pedagogy and psychology, but with different specializations. Both chairs should keep the name “pedagogy and psychology,” but one should have a theoretical and the other a practical orientation. That would keep both the pedagogical interest and the psychological base at the center of both. Thus, the boundary brought to the fore here was one between theory and practice.

Based on the opinions of the existing professors, the commission discussed possible alternatives and ended up with a suggestion that later became decided and realized. On the student level the subject was divided into psychology and pedagogy while the chair was divided into one in psychology and one in pedagogy and educational psychology. The suggestion was based on the idea that pedagogy had to be anchored in both experimental psychology and the theory and history of pedagogy.

27 Also the professors Elmgren and Katz proposed to split pedagogy and psychology with reference to the differences in method and focus, however without especially pointing out historical pedagogy as a distinguishing feature of pedagogy.
However, it is clear that the commission was most eager to secure the link between pedagogy and psychology. They stressed that “the subject of pedagogy must not turn into a pure humanistic discipline.”  

It is clear that the commission put a lot of trust in Landquist’s view as the text concluded that a pedagogy isolated from psychology could easily turn into a “quasi-philosophical dilettantism” or end up as a historical discipline “with lack of contact with modern educational problems.” It is an interesting paradox that it was John Landquist, who had a weak experience in psychology and a firm background in the classical humanities of philosophy and literature, who came to be associated with this proposal. It seems relevant to describe his actions as an example of boundary-work through positive connection to a “foreign” area. The reactions to the proposal of dividing pedagogy was mostly positive, both regarding the need of splitting the subject and how the boundary between the new subjects should be drawn.

In the division process, the existing professors were offered to choose which subject they preferred to represent in the future. All of them chose psychology. This is indicative of how the representatives of the former united discipline of pedagogy actually perceived their own scientific competence and their main research interests, not mainly as of a philosophical or historical kind but as a kind of psychology.

As we have seen, it was not self-evident how the boundary should be drawn between psychology and pedagogy when a united subject was to be divided. Psychology was by many regarded as being the scientific base for pedagogy. Psychology had supported pedagogy with a legitimacy that was essential when the first professorships were created in the 1910s. With that in mind it is perhaps understandable that the professors of the 1940s wished to stick to the psychological side. However, this meant that even though the new discipline of pedagogy was given its scientific base in psychology, new academic leaders were required and the new establishment had to be done without the status of or help from already reputable professors.

33 Landquist had retired before the division was realized at Lund University, why his successor Herman Siegvald was the one who was offered to choose. As the other three, he chose psychology.
After the division, all four chairs in the new subject pedagogy and educational psychology were to be filled with new people. The governmental decision included that professoriates would not be advertised and appointed before competent applicants could be counted on. Therefore, not all positions were advertised immediately, but after about a decade a new generation of pedagogy professors was installed.\textsuperscript{34} Two of the new professors had strong pedagogical historical interests, while the other two had a psychological-pedagogical orientation. Thus, one can say that the thoughts behind how the boundary between psychology and pedagogy was drawn – that pedagogy needed anchoring in both experimental psychology and pedagogical theory and history – were reflected in the research interests of the first post-war generation of professors.

Yet, it must be noticed that even if a historical focus was discussed it was not given any essential role in the disciplinary formation, neither as positive nor negative example. As we move forward to the 1960s, we will see how the historical perspectives became even more obsolete as parts of the disciplinary field of pedagogy. But before doing that, we will discuss the effects of a new teacher training on the separation between pedagogy and the humanities.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the Swedish school system, together with teacher education, underwent a huge transformation based on ideas presented by a social democratic school commission in the 1940s. The commission argued that the school reform had to include a reform of teacher education.\textsuperscript{35} For decades, the subject studies within the humanities had been criticized for not addressing the teachers’ specific educational needs. The universities had strongly resisted any influence from the Royal Board of Education \textit{[Skolöverstyrelsen]} over the content of the courses or grades for teachers, which is why the university education of teachers corresponded very little to what the teachers were to do in the schools.\textsuperscript{36} Based on this, the commission suggested that all actual vocational teacher training should be arranged in new teacher training.

\textsuperscript{34} In Uppsala, the new professor position was announced immediately and received three applicants. Wilhelm Sjöstrand, who had been acting as temporary professor during the appointment period, was given the position and took up the office in 1950. In Stockholm, the new professorship was announced in 1953 and came to be occupied by Torsten Husén in 1953, succeeded by Arne Trankell in 1957. The new chairs in Lund and Gothenburg were created 1956 and were filled with Sven Edlund in Lund (1957), and Kjell Härnqvist in Gothenburg (1959).


colleges, which would complement the university based subject studies.\textsuperscript{37} The actual teacher training at these colleges had its academic base in psychology and pedagogy, according to the commission. Thereby, the rest of the humanities did not have to engage in teacher vocational training, and the development of the school system could be academically associated with the new colleges instead. New chairs in “practical pedagogy” were assigned to these colleges.

This implied that the area for the discipline of pedagogy and its boundaries were formed not only in relation to psychology, philosophy, and history, but also in relation to a new area of practical educational research associated with the new teacher training colleges.\textsuperscript{38} How the boundary was drawn between theoretical and practical pedagogy became very much inscribed in the new organizational frames, so that practical pedagogy was understood as relevant to teacher training or school related issues, such as syllabi, differentiation, and educational choice making.\textsuperscript{39} However, the dependence on psychology was strong also in practical pedagogy. As Kjell Härnqvist has noted, all of the new chair-holders at the new teacher training colleges in Stockholm, Malmö, Gothenburg, Uppsala, Umeå, and Linköping had mainly psychological-pedagogical research interests.\textsuperscript{40} Thus, the expansion at both the universities and the teacher colleges in the 1960s and 1970s led to, or coincided with, an even stronger dominance of the psychological-pedagogical orientation.\textsuperscript{41}

For the field of humanities, this was significant. While the discipline of pedagogy became occupied by discussions concerning the boundary between theoretical and practical pedagogy, other humanities disciplines became disassociated from the discussions about teacher education and school reforms. The long-term effects of this was that the humanities lost their historically strong link to teacher education, even if a great part of the humanities students were still enrolled in teacher education programs.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{38} Edfeldt, “Pedagogik i Stockholm,” pp. 210–211.
\textsuperscript{39} Trankell, “Pedagogisk forskning,” p. 215.
\textsuperscript{40} Härnqvist, “Educational Research,” p. 238.
\textsuperscript{41} We must remember that also “psychology” meant different things at different times although we cannot develop this further here, cf. Kivelä and Siljander, “Psychologism in Finnish Educational Science,” pp. 369–384.
\textsuperscript{42} The development in Norway, however mainly in a later period, has been explored by Vidar Grøtta in \textit{The Transformation of Humanities}. 
Dividing the Philosophical Faculty in the 1960s

At the beginning of the 1960s, a major organizational change at Swedish universities – the division of the philosophical faculty – once again brought the relation between the humanities and pedagogy to the fore. The division implied that the philosophical faculty should be divided into two, one for the humanities and one for the social sciences. Following the construction of a new faculty was the question of which disciplines belonged where. According to the commission, the social sciences included economics, sociology, statistics and political science, as well as business administration, economic history, and economic geography. In addition, the commission wanted to include psychology and pedagogy, despite their methodological proximity to “the experimental sciences.” Psychology and pedagogy thus appeared to be the least obvious subjects in the social science subject group. This view was also illustrated by a group of professors in Lund who suggested a social science section including economic history, cultural geography, economics, sociology, statistics, political science, and business administration – but not psychology and pedagogy. However, it was apparently not their proximity to humanistic subjects or their methodological connection to philosophy or history that was problematized, but the use of experimental methods. The frontier against the humanities thus appears to have been unproblematic or inessential.

This is further demonstrated in discussions about the methodological difference between disciplines. The commission acknowledged the difficulty of separating the social sciences from the humanities on a methodological basis and provided two illustrating examples. First, they stressed that not only the designated social sciences used statistical methods, and secondly they mentioned that many branches of the social sciences were concerned with historical problems and used historical methods. The second example was specified by reference to political science and economic history. Here we can note that pedagogy was not mentioned among the occasionally historical subjects. This reinforces the impression that the boundary between pedagogy and the remaining humanities was not perceived as problematic.

Although the investigators saw some disadvantages of dividing the philosophical faculty, and recognized the difficulty of separating a group of social science subjects from the humanistic disciplines, they still proposed a new

social sciences faculty. One reason stated was that there was a tendency for division already. When, for example, licentiate and doctoral scholarships were established in 1947, a social science group had been distinguished although psychology and pedagogy were not included. Another example was the establishment of the Swedish Council for Social Research in 1959, in which the older Social Science Research Council (founded in 1947) and the State Psychological-Pedagogical Institute (founded in 1944) was incorporated. A third significant argument was that the social science area needed to be strengthened and expanded, and would benefit from a separate organization. Throughout their work, the commission explicitly stated that pedagogy should be counted as a social science. Although the commission suggested different names and allowed for the social science faculties to include slightly varying disciplines at different universities, the pedagogical discipline was included in all.

The subsequent governmental proposition shows that the proposal for the division of the philosophical faculty received a mixed reception by the referral bodies. The most critical objections came from the universities, and the objections mainly concerned the difficulty of delimiting the social sciences. Several argued that it would be easier to separate the linguistic sciences, as they constituted a more distinct group, and had already been conceived of as a separate branch of subjects within the faculty. The historical-philosophical section at Uppsala University stated that problems and methods could not be divided in the way the commission suggested as social science problems and methods existed in a number of humanistic subjects, and conversely, the social sciences needed to engage with historical and philosophical problems and methods. If the proposed division was to be carried out, they argued, further investigations were necessary in order to decide where to place such subjects as historically oriented political science, ethnography, cultural geography, pedagogy, psychology and practical philosophy. The Faculty of Humanities at Lund University did not reject the proposal but resisted “the notion that there is a marked and consistent difference between the social sciences and other humanities subjects, either in

research methods or in research direction.” Instead, they emphasized that the boundaries were “completely fluid.” The Faculty of Humanities in Stockholm made similar arguments. After presenting the referrals in the proposition, the head of the department, minister of education Ragnar Edenman, acknowledged the obvious difficulties of demarcation, but still followed the committee’s proposal on how to divide the faculty. This proposal, resulting in a new social science faculty, was soon decided and implemented.

In summary, pedagogy’s relationship to the humanistic field was not an issue when the faculty division was discussed. While the boundaries between the social and humanistic faculties were considered fluid, few feared that pedagogy would float into the field of humanities. Although pedagogy’s belonging to the Faculty of Social Sciences did not appear as self-evident, it was not the boundary to the humanities that was at stake. The question of the philosophical basis of pedagogy was obviously not relevant or problematic in this context. Neither did, apart from the referred viewpoint of the Faculty of Humanities in Uppsala, the historical parts of pedagogy appear to be problematic. As we have seen, this corresponded to the ongoing shift in the discipline as more and more of the professors had a psychological-pedagogical orientation.

These changes can be viewed from a wider perspective and understood in the light of shifting knowledge politics. With the changed university organization during the first post-war decades, the social and natural sciences were increasingly perceived as the ones that offered a relevant knowledge base for the future society, while the humanities ended up outside this vision. The social sciences developed and expanded in close symbiosis with institutions of the welfare state. This is evident in the case of pedagogy, which was heavily involved in the major school reforms. The research conducted at the university institutions was largely financed by state commissions and authorities, while a large majority of the students were prospective teachers, many taking the compulsory half-term course for subject teachers. As has been found by many of those

52 Proposition 1964:50, p. 351. “uppfattningen att det föreligger någon markant och konsekvent skillnad mellan de samhällsvetenskapliga ämnena och övriga humanistiska ämnena vare sig i fråga om forskningsmetoder eller forskningsinriktning.”
53 Proposition 1964:50. “fullständigt flytande.”
54 Proposition 1964:50, p. 357.
56 Wagner, Wittrock and Whitley, Discourses on Society.
who have scrutinized the development of the discipline of pedagogy in Sweden, the discipline was strongly influenced by this “instrumental pressure.” This led to a strong sense of “operationalism,” where theoretical, historical, and self-reflexive knowledge development was given very little space.57

**Conclusion**

The boundaries between the humanities and other disciplines is a historically changing one. Many disciplines have emerged out of the humanities, and the demarcation between the humanities and the sciences has not always been as clear as it is today.58 The case of pedagogy shares many of the features of this general process. The faculty of philosophy, with its roots stretching back to the medieval four faculties comprising the seven *artes liberales*, included all disciplines that were seen as freely theoretical, irrespective of their object of knowledge being nature or human life. As educating teachers for secondary/grammar schools was a main task for the faculty, pedagogy had a practical role in relation to all disciplines within the faculty. The disciplinary career of pedagogy constitutes an example of the dissociation of disciplines from the field of the humanities. It has equivalents in the trajectory of, for example, political science, psychology, sociology, and statistics. One factor that distinguishes pedagogy from the above mentioned disciplines, is that it has been connected to the potential mass-market that is teacher education.

The story we have told is one in which pedagogy established itself as a distinct discipline in two stages: first a separation from philosophy, then a separation from psychology. The first separation can be understood as an initial step away from the humanities, and it had to do with finding a different scientific base than philosophy. The second one seems mostly terminological. Although pedagogy was to be formally separated from psychology, it should keep its scientific base in psychology instead of, for example, strengthening its historical parts. Pedagogy thus continued its path away from the humanities as psychology also drifted away through its proponents’ efforts to make it a behavioral or social science by emphasizing

58 Krämer, “Shifting Demarcations.”
its experimental and operationalist strands. The unwillingness of the humanities to engage in vocational aspects of teacher training seems to have contributed to the development of a separate organization for teacher education. As a result of these interrelated processes, the humanities ended up outside of and seemingly irrelevant to the huge expansion of the welfare state school system. As it seems, the humanities in Sweden still have to struggle with this legacy.
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