

The Future of European Teacher Education in the Heavy Seas of Higher Education

Pavel Zgaga

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to reconsider recent pan-European developments in teacher education and to discuss some aspects of its future. Teacher education across Europe has been largely 'universitised'; therefore, both its present and future should be discussed within the context of the general changes in European Higher Education deeply marked by the Bologna Process and the emerging European Higher Education Area. We rely on J. Goodlad's and B. Clark's discussion of teacher education from a higher education perspective (1999) and try to continue in the context of European higher education reforms of the past decade. The central controversy of these reforms has concerned the length of traditional undergraduate courses at universities in most continental countries (4 to 5 years), particularly with regard to the relationship between 'academic' and 'professional' higher education. Until today, most teacher education institutions have adapted to the new system of two 'Bologna' cycles (Bachelor and Master). However, the reforms have led to different interpretations and their implementation has varied in different countries, thus opening new dilemmas about the future of European Teacher Education.

Key words: teacher education in Europe; the Bologna Process; higher education reforms; 'scientisation' and 'universitisation' of teacher education; academic vs. professional higher education

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to reconsider recent pan-European developments in Teacher Education and to discuss some aspects of its future. Traditionally, there was no 'European' teacher education; it was an area jealously guarded by individual nation-states (Zgaga 2010, 174). However, in the post-1990 period it is "increasingly being influenced by developments at European level" (Biesta 2012, 8). Parallel to this, research on European teacher education has been strengthened importantly but remains predominantly focused on its internal issues. Another aim is to approach teacher education from the perspective of higher education at large; in doing so, we will be assisted by some of the findings of our research on the internationalisation of European higher education (CEPS 2012). Our premise is that today we cannot discuss the present and future of teacher education in Europe outside the context of the general changes in European higher education of the last decade. These changes have been very deep and suggest that the future will be dynamic as well.

The changes have been connected to two main policy strands: the Bologna Process and the emerging European Higher Education Area (EHEA) on one hand, and the EU strategies in education and research (Lisbon Strategy; E&T 2010 and 2020¹) on the other. These two strands are often regarded as an integral agenda but important differences between them can be identified; last but not least, one strand relates to Europe at large ('Europe 47') while the other relates to the European Union (EU-27). It is necessary to stress that these two strands

are, therefore, *international* (or trans-national) in their very nature. In contrast to this, teacher education policy – related to national systems of pre-tertiary education – remains to a large extent *nationally-based*.

Finally, teacher education as a study area within higher education is *relatively new*; it joined the traditional academic and professional areas in the period of the emergence of mass higher education, i.e. during the last thirty years of the previous millennium. In the past, it was predominantly located in specific institutions outside universities and under direct state control. If there were special departments or chairs at universities, their main purpose was not teacher education as such or, as in many cases, it was limited to teacher training for upper secondary schools. The gradual penetration of teacher education colleges (‘normal schools’; their names in national languages vary greatly) into universities has led to the restructuring – and entanglement – of the entire area.

Teacher education from a higher education perspective: First as an American debate

Teacher education is a complex and complicated subject of investigation. From a higher education perspective, this complexity has rarely been discussed but this was done in an inspiring way 15 years ago by two American scholars – John Goodlad and Burton Clark. This was an American discussion but it contains issues of a general nature which are also important for our analysis.

In his article *Whither Schools of Education*, Goodlad included a provocative statement that ‘schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) [...] were born with a congenital malaise, into an inhospitable surround, or both’. SCDEs were put into the strait between their ‘teacher education function’ and their ‘academic function’. In the academic environment, they were understood as ‘an affront to the traditional departments that saw themselves also in the business of education’. Further on, Goodlad analyses this ‘malaise’ or even ‘schizophrenia’ in detail. What attracted our attention is his position that the ‘evolution of SCDEs in the 20th century is, of course, closely tied to the evolution of higher education’ (Goodlad 1999, 325, 327).

Apart from the sciences and humanities, Goodlad treats teacher education as education for the profession; however, when comparing it with other professions it appears quite different. For example, medicine, engineering or architecture have ‘had little problem in establishing their own curricula and degrees’ in relation to the inner academic court of arts and sciences; on the other hand, the ‘arts and sciences distanced themselves from the SCDEs, charging them with conducting Mickey Mouse courses’ (328). Being pressed between the arts and sciences (due to their hegemonic roles about the *content* of the school curricula) on one hand and specific requirements of the *teaching profession* on the other, SCDEs acquired a marginal role within academia: ‘the teacher education purpose of schools of education connected them with the curricular component provided by the arts and sciences and probably contributed to their not seeking the greater autonomy enjoyed by most professional schools’ (331-332). This development was not very different from developments in Europe.

Even within the US research universities there has been no better luck for schools of education: turned ‘toward scholarly purpose for its own sake’ they have been better positioned but disconnected from elementary and secondary schools as their ‘laboratory’. Goodlad brings his merciless analysis of the SCDEs’ positioning within higher education to somewhat

expected outcomes. His views and recommendations can, perhaps, be best understood through his quotation from S. B. Nuland,ⁱⁱ an analyst of medical education in the USA (here Goodlad suggests we substitute words such as ‘teaching’ or ‘teacher education’ for ‘medicine’ and ‘medical education’):

The expanding ‘scientization’ of medicine has led, more and more, to the worsening dehumanization of medicine. It is time once again to address the role of medical education in dealing with ‘the manifold and various relations of the thoughtful individual person to the ever-changing world’. Unless the liberating influence of the entire university can be brought to bear, we in the medical profession will continue to deserve – now more than ever before – the pejorative description of ‘doctor technicians’, better at curing than caring, better at understanding pathology than understanding the distressed men and women who come to us to be healed (Cited in Goodlad, 334).

Goodlad is asking difficult questions and discussing important dilemmas which we in Europe – or other world regions – perceive to be no less difficult and vital than colleagues in America. Of course, there are also substantial differences but here we will leave them aside. Goodlad’s paper initiated a discussion with Clark and we are now going to recapitulate it briefly.

Clark reflected on Goodlad’s ideas in the same issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* (Clark 1999), focusing on the ‘constraint and opportunity’ in teacher education. To him, all professional schools at American universities are subjected to constraints but schools of education are subjected not only to those which are common to schools ‘representing minor professions’, but there are also constraints which are unique to the ‘profession of school-teaching’.

This unique constraint is the:

constraint of a profession organized around multiple subjects – school subjects – which are, at the university, in the hands of letters and science departments. [...] Goodlad took note, in passing, of this special feature of school-university parallel subjects, when he observed that for students going on to medical or law schools the undergraduate work is precurricular, while for those entering school-teaching it is preservice. The first is a major source of autonomy; the professional school can go somewhat its own way once it has its hands on the students. The second posture entails a unique dependence on the arts and science departments. What the school of education does must necessarily build upon, and preferably meld with, is the subject preparation that is largely in the hands of others (Clark 1999, 353-354).

Against this background, Clark sees ‘no way that these three levels of constraint upon schools of education in universities can be waved away’ but he also gives a consolatory tip: ‘But wait: Not all is hopeless’ (354). He refers to a discussion on ‘new forms of knowledge production’ (Gibbons et al. 1994) which was launched a few years before and includes the conceptual distinction *Mode 1* vs. *Mode 2* in the discussion on schools of education. Moreover, besides *Mode 1* (discipline centred) and *Mode 2* (transdisciplinary; applications-generated) he proposes a specific *Mode 1 ½* (interdisciplinary knowledge) ‘to add a little fine tuning’. To him, schools of education need all three streams:

For Mode 1, ... we turn to the psychology of learning and advanced research methodology; in Mode 1 ½ ... we find historians, sociologists, and economists And for Mode 2, we find an increasing amount of transdisciplinary work on crucial problems faced by practitioners. (Clark 1999, 354).

Clark identifies the key problem as ‘the organizational problem’: it is, ‘how to best interrelate these streams of knowledge, particularly in preparing practitioners – school administrators, schoolteachers, and other such school-based professionals – as school counsellors and school psychologists’. Within the extremely decentralised and diversified American higher education ‘there can be no one best way’ and only through ‘local experimentation [...] schools of education will have to find different pathways for their own general improvement and particularly for the strengthening of teacher education’. He locates ‘reasons for optimism’ precisely at this point and declares to be more optimistic than Goodlad. New patterns do not emerge overnight; they come out of ‘year-by-year trial and error’.

Consolidation of teacher education within European higher education

What to say about European teacher education in this context? In fact, can we speak about ‘European’ teacher education at all? Does its national locus preclude it from ‘being European’? Actually, during the last decade there have been efforts to gradually construct a kind of ‘European Area’ also in this field. However, these efforts must face the fact that (initial) teacher education and – even more – the regulation of the teacher profession have remained nationally-based. In this regard, we can identify two main trends.

On one hand, within EU countries the *open method of coordination (OMC)*ⁱⁱⁱ has contributed to the convergence of practices, at least in certain segments. A series of Eurydice studies^{iv} has been really helpful in providing the ‘whole picture’ of teacher education in Europe as well as in designing common reference points. In 2005, for example, the European Commission launched a drafting process of a document on ‘Common European Principles for Teacher Competences and Qualifications’. The draft document highlighted four common principles (a well-qualified profession; placed within the context of lifelong learning; mobile; based on partnerships) and three clusters of key competencies (to work with others; with knowledge, technology and information; with and in society) (European Commission 2005; European Commission 2007). After a testing conference and a series of consultations, the Commission proposed ‘a number of steps that could now be taken’ to improve the quality of teacher education – an action which is ongoing.^v

Parallel to the European policy cooperation, academic cooperation has strengthened as well. Many Erasmus^{vi} and other European developmental projects in the broad area of teacher education have been designed by consortia from universities and colleges in practically all eligible countries. Their impact has also been proven among non-EU countries via the dissemination of good practices promoted by transnational policy advice teams etc. Even on pure national bases, there has been a lot of experimentation. Altogether, ‘year-by-year trial and error’ has been firmly present during the recent period. It is perhaps even more important that a true European community of teacher educators and teacher researchers has gradually developed. People who in previous times were bound to their national and local environments – differently than their colleagues in traditional academic areas – have had an excellent opportunity to work together on the international level.

However, the internationalising of teacher education still seems to lag behind many other areas of higher education (Zgaga 2010, 177). Figures on student mobility illustrate this trend very well. According to a recent report, students from the teacher training and education science area, together with four other subject areas (science, mathematics and computing; agriculture and veterinary; health and welfare; and services) less often embark on Erasmus compared to ‘highly mobile’ areas. Statistics show that the absolute number of mobile student teachers is growing (e.g. 3,920 in 1998/99 vs. 6,314 in 2008/09) but their share within all Erasmus students decreased in the observed period (from 4.0% to 3.2%) (Teichler, Ferencz, and Wächter 2001, 6, 106).

The general statistical picture of mobility seems not to allow optimistic conclusions; nevertheless, it is important that teacher education is now involved in pan-European mobility schemes^{vii} whereas in earlier times it was kept behind national borders. Mobility ‘pioneers’ are now developing new opportunities for cooperation. Thus, to mention just one example, an Erasmus-sponsored project ‘European Teacher’ (EPTE) was recently accomplished and a one-year joint programme was launched in the 2012–2013 academic year.^{viii} Further on, several consortia have been working on developing a common framework for teacher education in Europe; one of them was active within the Tuning project^{ix} and produced pan-European ‘reference points for the design and delivery of degree programmes in education’.

Within this context, a trend towards ‘more comparability and compatibility’ (a slogan from the Bologna Process) in teacher education as an area of higher education has become visible during the last decade. This was a decade of important changes – also in the field of teacher education. Among other things, a consensus was built that initial teacher education takes place at universities or other institutions (e.g. ‘universities of applied sciences’ in some countries with a binary system) and is delivered not only at the undergraduate level.

Thus, Eurydice recently reported: ‘In all European countries in order to become a qualified school teacher, candidates are required to have undertaken academic studies, including a course of study in education which provides them with the theoretical and practical skills (including school placements) needed to join the teaching profession’. The concurrent and the consecutive models of initial teacher education are intertwined in all countries and ‘the number of countries offering the consecutive model of teacher education, in addition to the concurrent model, has increased for all levels of education’ over the last decade (Eurydice 2012, 109).

Nevertheless, countries may differ a lot in the ways they employ these two models. In general, the concurrent model seems to be more common with pre-primary and primary education and to be more frequently organised within specialised teacher education faculties or schools. However, in ‘Germany and Slovakia, the concurrent model is the only possible route into teaching at all levels of education. In France, only the consecutive model is available’ (Eurydice 2012, 109). We need to note that Eurydice compares 33 European countries only (EU-27, 4 EFTA countries and 2 candidate countries); if we take all the 47 EHEA countries into account these differences are even greater.

The minimum requirements for becoming a teacher differ markedly as well. Generally speaking, the minimum qualification level required at particular educational levels has risen across Europe in the last decade. For pre-primary teachers, in only a few countries it is still ‘either upper secondary (ISCED 3) or non-tertiary post-secondary level (ISCED 4)’ but the dominant practice is that teachers at all levels of education are now required to at least have a

Bachelor's degree (three or four years) or an equivalent. At higher levels, a Masters is required in a growing number of countries; in some countries this is also already regulated at lower levels and even at the pre-primary level (111).

Progress has been made as the area is now aware of its differences. European models of initial teacher education are far from being uniform and there has been no discussion on their 'harmonisation' so far. During the last decade, European teacher education has definitely consolidated its position within higher education while European higher education systems have been about to harmonise – whether we like this term or not – during the same period. What does this mean?

European teacher education on the waves of European higher education reforms

'Progressive harmonisation of the overall framework of our degrees and cycles' was an initiative of the Sorbonne Declaration (1998), one year older than the much better known Bologna Declaration (1999). There was much ado about 'harmonisation' and the term no longer appeared in any joint European policy documents. In 1998–1999 it was obviously understood in its strict legal connotation: the Treaty which was in force at that time provides that the 'Community action' should exclude 'any harmonization of the laws and regulations of the Member States' (Maastricht Treaty 1992, Art. 126). Responsibility for education at large has remained strictly in the hands of member states.

However, without any legal measure from above, European higher education systems have in fact been harmonised in that they have certainly become 'more comparable and compatible'. The policy development process is European while the necessary legislative measures are taken at the national and in some cases regional levels. The Bologna Process has been a *voluntary* activity. This led to its success as well as to difficulties: formally, the 47 countries' systems came closer together than one could have believed a decade ago, but there have been different interpretations and the implementation has led in various directions.

All of this affects teacher education as well. Many teacher educators across Europe understood the Bologna challenge from its early years very well: after important developments during the 1980s and 1990s it was another opportunity for the better positioning and profiling of their field. At the beginning of the previous decade, almost 80% of respondents were reasonably or very much aware of the Bologna Process and a similar share agreed it is essential that teacher education institutions take part in the EHEA (Zgaga 2003, 189-191). However, respondents were quite divided about adapting the new higher education structures, in particular about organising two new cycles of studies (Bachelor and Master): they were divided into two equal blocks around their duration – i.e., the '3+2' or '4+1' formulae – as well as with aims regarding the new degrees. We need to add that in early 2003 when the survey was carried out only about one-quarter of respondents reported that their institutions already had a two-cycle degree structure in place.

The idea to harmonise European higher education systems around two cycles was received with acceptance, rejection and embarrassment – depending on the disciplinary, institutional and country contexts. It seems that the process of acceptance was a little easier in the area of academic studies, in particular if compared with professional studies. Thus, a report from 2005 already noted:

Overall, however, the situation is remarkably different from two or three years ago, when not only medicine, but also teacher training, engineering, architecture, law, theology, fine arts, psychology and some other disciplines were excluded from the two-cycle system in many countries. ... Teacher training and certain other disciplines still pose problems, in some national contexts more than others, and here national systems are experimenting with a variety of solutions. (Reichert and Tauch 2005, 11)

The same report also warned that implementation of the two-cycle structure in areas like teacher education encounters another ‘serious problem’ which ‘arises at institutional level when there is a mismatch between national or regional provisions for some subjects (like teacher training) and the new Bologna degree structures’ (44). The Bologna Process was not only a challenge to teacher educators but also to those who are responsible for regulating teacher qualifications at the national level. In many countries, adjustments to this regulation were delayed, leaving higher education institutions in doubt about their expected curricular reform. The relationship between the Bologna requirements addressing higher education in general and the specific requirements of nationally regulated professions has proven in the implementation processes to be a particularly hard issue. Thus, in the area of teacher education there has been even greater opportunity for diverse interpretations and various ways of implementing the Bologna accord.

Five years later, in a similar review, we can see that implementation of the two-cycle structure in the field of professional studies has gone in two directions:

a majority of the institutions offering degrees in the fields of Dentistry, Medicine, Pharmacy and Veterinary Medicine do not currently apply the Bachelor/Master structure, although in the case of the latter two disciplines, this only constitutes a narrow majority. The professional disciplines which are offered in the two-cycle structure in the majority of cases are: engineering, law, teacher training, and nursing. (Sursock and Smidt 2010, 37)

It should be noted that there has been a lot of resistance also with law and engineering in some countries. It appears that in this regard a divide has been created between ‘traditional’ and ‘minor’ professions.

The EHEA was officially declared in 2010. Ministers celebrated the success but also recognised ‘that EHEA action lines such as degree and curriculum reform, quality assurance, recognition, mobility and the social dimension are implemented to varying degrees’ (Budapest-Vienna Declaration 2010). As yet, there has been no truly comprehensive study of the results of reforms in various areas of study but there are several reports on the implementation of reforms on the system level. Here we can also find a few interesting points about teacher education.

The most recent ‘Bologna Implementation Report’ (self-assessment of the Bologna Process) states that students who are studying in programmes corresponding to the new two-cycle system are now already an absolute majority (70–90%).

At the same time nearly all countries still have integrated long programmes in those fields which prepare for regulated professions and for which the EU directive 2005/36/EC (38) and/or national legislation requires five-six years of studies: medicine,

dentistry, pharmacy, architecture and veterinary medicine and to a lesser extent engineering, law, theology, psychology, teacher training. (EHEA in 2012, 32)

‘Integrated long programmes’ can be partly understood as a heritage: in the process of adapting to the new two-cycle system the duration of the old undergraduate programmes seems to pose a serious problem in most of the professional areas mentioned above. This is largely a result of the diverse national regulations of professional qualifications reinforced by harmonisation through EU directives. The two-cycle system observed from a perspective of traditional philosophies of qualifications seemed artificial and has even been understood as threatening to lower the professional standards already achieved.

However, a reference to the heritage cannot be fully applied to teacher education; here, ‘long programmes’ were traditionally truly exceptional – only for some teachers in upper secondary education. Nevertheless, in some countries teacher education has now joined this category, i.e. ‘programmes leading either to a first or a second-cycle degree and which ... can still be better characterised by duration in years rather than credits’ (35). Therefore, in some countries the total time required to obtain a teaching qualification has been increased through Bologna reforms – mainly from 4 to 5 years: the new programmes can either be divided into ‘two cycles’ or presented as an ‘integrated 5-year programme’. At a glance, it seems that teacher education in these countries has made a profit: now, at pre-primary level, ‘a master's degree is required in France, Portugal and Iceland’; in ‘the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, France, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Iceland and Croatia ... initial education for primary teachers is at master's level and usually takes five years’ and ‘for prospective upper secondary teachers, the minimum qualification required in the majority of European countries is a master's degree, except in 11 countries or regions’ (Eurydice 2012, 111).

Yet the extended duration has also brought new problems. Some are conceptual, others practical, e.g.: What should the new programmes aim for? Should the ‘exit’ degree allow for the continuation of studies, e.g. at PhD level? Should at least the fifth year be focused on an advanced (research) qualification? Should it be conceptualised as an ‘induction year’ on top of the previous ‘more theoretical’ four years of studies? If five years of teacher preparation is organised in two cycles: can graduates from other (non-teacher) areas enrol in the second cycle in teacher education – and acquire a licence to teach? How to apply the concurrent and consecutive models to the new structure? And so on. Experimentation with various scenarios which have been practised during the last few years should be thoroughly and comprehensively analysed in the light of these and further questions and dilemmas.

European teacher education in 2012 and its future

So far, such analyses are not yet available. Within a larger research project on the internationalisation of European higher education (CEPS 2012), we recently conducted a small survey which includes some questions on the state of teacher education in Europe. We incorporated some questions from the earlier survey (Zgaga 2003) in it to allow comparisons. The survey was conducted over the Internet in June 2012; we invited potential respondents – teacher educators and teacher researchers – from institutions in 40 countries to complete the questionnaire and to invite their colleagues to also do so. This is different from the 2003 survey when only one response per institution was collected (altogether 57 institutions from 33 countries). This time, we received responses from 524 colleagues in 38 countries. Our

main objective was to determine how teacher educators assess the results of the recent reforms and achievements and how they see the future.

Over two-thirds of our respondents work at a university, faculty of (teacher) education; together with respondents from other faculties, they represent three-quarters of our sample. The rest are respondents from universities of applied sciences, non-university colleges and other institutions. All categories of staff are included and fairly evenly distributed; almost two-thirds are female. More than one-half of them marked preschool, primary as well as lower and upper secondary education as their main priority field; one-third of them also marked special education. Adult education is also mentioned frequently (by 40%) as a training field but not a priority field. In size terms, the institutions represented by the respondents evenly cover a wide spectrum: from small to large. In our analyses below we refer to individual countries if at least five responses were received (four or less responses were received from eight small countries).

When reflecting on the past decade, the majority of respondents agree that their institutions played an active part (e.g. through research, expertise and as partners in policy development) in national educational reforms, they improved and advanced study programmes and importantly contributed to quality public education. However, this bright picture changes at two points. Responding to the question “which were the main obstacles to efforts to reform and modernise teacher education” they are unanimous: it is the inadequate *national legal regulation* and lack of *financial support* (mean scores 2.49 and 3.16; a six-level scale from 0 to 5, with 5 as a very high obstacle). There is quite a variety among the countries’ mean scores but there is no simple division between them: countries from west and east, south and north appear on the list.

Obstacles within institutions are ranked lower but differently in various countries. More complaints regarding a lack of internal cooperation with other faculties from a university were heard from France, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Spain, Italy, Germany and Serbia (scores between 3.23 and 2.40). Regarding a lack of academic autonomy in decision making (mean score 2.43), the respondents are fairly evenly distributed from “no obstacle” to a “high obstacle” (shares vary from 13.7% to 17.3% per option); they obviously have quite different experiences and views concerning this issue. A lack of academic autonomy is perceived as a higher obstacle in e.g. Slovakia and part of South-eastern Europe (scores between 3.80 and 3.11). Finally, a lack of cooperation with external stakeholders and a lack of international cooperation do not seem to be regarded as a real obstacle.

Are the respondents happy with the *system of initial teacher education* in their countries? The highest level of satisfaction with the present system is expressed in Finland (90%), followed by a group of countries with about two-thirds of respondents who agree (the Netherlands, Ireland, the UK and Switzerland) while a radical change was advocated by the majority of respondents in Kosovo, France, Croatia and Austria. However, the majority of respondents across Europe believe that neither complacency nor requirements for radical change have any basis. The respondents are in favour of further improvements which focus on one dimension or another of teacher education perceived in their eyes as ‘deficient’.

The respondents were also asked whether the Bologna Process has importantly contributed to the *quality* of their institutions. The picture that emerges is really colourful. About one-third is undecided (neither agrees nor disagrees), about one-quarter agrees while two smaller groups (of about 15%) either fully agree or disagree. The total of those who agree or fully agree

(40.5%) is almost double the total of those who disagree or strongly disagree (23.0%). Noticeable agreement (one-half to two-thirds) prevails in the Netherlands, Poland, Hungary, Finland, Switzerland and Ukraine, while there is noticeable disagreement (40% to 75%) in Croatia, France, Estonia and the Czech Republic. The largest share of the undecided (around one-half) can be found in Albania, Norway, Portugal and Slovenia. We noted that teacher educators rank the Bologna Process' contribution higher than colleagues from other areas of higher education.

Here we come to the point: *implementation of the new two-cycle system*. As we already noted, in our 2003 survey the respondents were polarised into two groups of identical sizes (42.8%) regarding the dilemma of '3+2' vs. '4+1'. Ten years later, the picture is quite different: the majority (55.0%) reports having a 3-year Bachelor followed by 2-year Master. However, this majority has moved just a little over one-half and the formula 4+1 has reached the second position (26.7%), while a combination – i.e., institutions are free to choose 3+2 or 4+1 – is the third (14.7%). In the respondents' additional comments we can learn about further variants, e.g. a 'combined teacher training and engineering programme, double diploma (5 year MSc, no BA possible)' (Sweden), '4 years of Bachelor followed 2 years of Master' (Lithuania), no 'BA in education, but a year-long course for students from various disciplines – some of them with BAs, some even with MAs, adding to their subject fields with a practical-pedagogic exam' (Norway) etc.

In Europe, *two-cycle teacher education* has become the prevailing model of initial teacher education; however, it is not consistently implemented everywhere. Behind the 'arithmetic' question of '3+2' vs. '4+1' there are more substantive issues. In various reviews of the implementation of Bologna it has been noted (Reichert and Tauch, 2005, 11-16; Crosier, Purser and Smidt 2007, 23-27; Sursock and Smidt 2010, 39-40) that, for example, the old 'long' degrees have often been redesigned as new 'two-tier' ones by simply cutting the old course into two pieces. There is a danger that the new teacher education programmes will become 'a mere extension of the old curricula' (Pantić 2012, 9). Therefore, it is important to know what have been the main aims of the new second-cycle (Master) degrees at European teacher education institutions. We already asked this question in 2003:

What should be differentia specifica between e.g. Bachelor in teaching and Master in teaching? Is it grounded to demark them using a split between teaching in primary and teaching in secondary education? What new possibilities can the two-cycle system offer to the overcoming of the traditional borders between 'subject-area', 'education/pedagogy' and 'teaching' in many countries? (Zgaga 2003, 197-198)

In 2003, over one-third of the respondents saw a Master's degree as an *optional advanced qualification* for all teachers. One-fifth of Bachelor graduates found it as an appropriate research qualification for teachers and as a career path to become a teacher of teachers. The idea of offering a Master degree to attract students from other ('non-teacher') study areas had touched less than a tenth of the institutions. On the other side, institutions without an answer here made up a noteworthy group of over one-fifth.

The picture has changed in our 2012 survey: an advanced qualification has become the predominant choice (77.8%) but it is closely followed by a research qualification (68.9%) and the idea of attracting students from non-teacher areas has taken hold strongly (57.8%). Almost one-third of the respondents confirmed that all students are taking the second cycle as a Master degree is now required in several countries to start working in schools. On the other

hand, almost one-quarter of them said that the new Master degree is now the ‘equivalent of a previous undergraduate degree’, i.e., from being optional it has become a *compulsory qualification*. In some countries, a legal provision has been adopted that the former *Diploma* (after four to five years of study) is equivalent to the new second-cycle qualifications (Master).

Future trends

Which *trends* can be expected *for the future*? We asked the respondents several questions which may provide a picture of trends expected in the next period. In this part, their responses are classified according to the probability (from “very possible” to “not possible”) or the direction of the trend (e.g. from “much higher” to “much lower”), ranging from +2.00 to -2.00.

They are almost unanimous about the future *organisational form* of their institution: a faculty of (teacher) education within a university (+1.22); only respondents from Switzerland (0.00) and the Netherlands (-0.10) do not see this option as possible. Those who see this option as (very) possible make up three-quarters (75.8%) of all respondents. If we compare this figure with the fact that somewhat fewer of them (69.5%) actually come from faculties of (teacher) education we may conclude that the trend toward this organisational form might strengthen in the upcoming years.

Indeed, the mean scores for the other options are close to 0.00: option 1 – i.e., other faculties of a university – still had a positive score (+0.04) while option 2 – a faculty of (teacher) education within a university of applied sciences – is perceived negatively (-0.19). However, variations among the countries are large: the respondents from Albania, Croatia, France, Ireland, Norway, Poland and Portugal allow some possibility (between +0.10 and +0.50) also for option 2, while the respondents from the Czech Republic, Greece, Denmark, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Turkey, Serbia and Switzerland find this option more realistic (between +0.57 and +1.25). On the other hand, option 1 attracted the highest scores (between +1.25 and +0.54) in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Greece and Denmark. A traditional independent college outside university does not seem an option (-0.84) while teacher training courses outside universities or independent colleges achieved a surprisingly high score (+0.54); mainly from respondents from Turkey, Estonia, the UK, Macedonia, Poland and Albania.

When we asked about the degrees they expect to be awarded at their institution in the future they almost unanimously respond (+1.00) that *degrees after all three cycles of studies* (Bachelor, Master and PhD) will be awarded. The two options – only a Bachelor or only a Bachelor and Master – are negative (-0.92 and -0.30). There are not many variations across countries; only respondents from Denmark find the ‘Bachelor only’ option possible (+0.58) and the ‘BA+MA+PhD’ option not possible (-0.38). Generally speaking, European teacher education has obviously left the stage of marginalised colleges awarding ‘associate degrees’. This trend has started to affect Denmark as well (Rasmussen, 2008).

Regarding their *curricula*, the respondents had a choice of three options: teacher education will be dominated by: (1) subject knowledge (disciplines); (2) education sciences; and (3) well-balanced subject knowledge and education sciences (interdisciplinary focus). All options are rated positively. As the most possible option (+0.88), the respondents marked option 3 but the other two are not far below: option 1 at +0.53 and option 2 at +0.49. There are again many

variations among the countries, but in this limited space we cannot go into the details. It seems that the respondents estimate that both extreme options have some potential to prevail in one environment or another but they expect an “interdisciplinary solution” to the traditional opposition between the Subject and Pedagogy, between the ‘academic discipline’ and the ‘profession’.

Finally, the respondents outlined some further features of teacher education in the future. In general, they do not expect substantial changes; the situation is mainly expected to remain the same. Yet they indicate cautious optimism: they believe the number of applicants will only slightly increase (+0.23), candidates will be slightly better academically prepared (+0.28) and their motivation will be slightly higher (+0.27). Four-fifths expect their graduates to find a job mainly in education and slightly more easily (+0.20) than graduates from other fields.

In contrast, they expect that in terms of academic suitability the competition for vacant positions at their institution will be higher (+0.58), that their research output will be higher (+0.71) and that their academic status and reputation will improve (+0.49). However, they are quite pessimistic about their overall financial situation (mean score -0.27) in the future. The respondents mostly expect that public financial sources will make up one-half of their budget or more, although more than one-quarter remains neutral (‘I can’t say’) regarding this particular question. The possibility that students will pay fees – or higher fees than today – seems quite realistic (+0.62) in most countries except the Nordic ones, Germany, France and Greece.

Therefore, *whither schools of education in Europe?*

Teacher education has been ‘universitised’ and has also been largely institutionalised in specialised ‘faculties’ (a term which in Europe is more popular than ‘school’). However, it has been integrated into the academic environment differently than other professional faculties. Goodlad’s note that undergraduate teacher education is ‘preservice’ and not ‘precurricular’ as with other professional schools is also valid in Europe. Once teacher education entered the university, in a certain sense it became less autonomous. This creates several constraints. Last but not least, teacher education can be treated as a ‘cash cow’ within a university (Darling Hammond 2010, 39) and many torments are needed to promote and implement ‘the all university concept of teacher education’ (Zeichner 2009, 335). This is the foremost challenge for the next decade, also in Europe.

European Teacher Education is now almost completely at universities – but universities are being tossed about by a restless sea of deep reforms, changed social circumstances and financial cuts. There are no signs of an imminent improvement in the weather. The Bologna Process was a success – but it was far from a ‘perfect plan’, in particular its implementation. The enthusiasm for a re-united Europe at the start of the 1990s has disappeared and the *Grande Idée* of ‘the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world’ (Council... 2000) has recently been replaced by fears about the euro and the future of the European Union. Protectionism and other freaks of the past which Europe seemed to send to museums can again be encountered across the continent.

This is a macro trend; yet not without consequences for higher education and teacher education. The financial crisis has strongly affected Europe’s education systems; its pressure is not only about money but also about *concepts*. In one sense, in many countries the recent

reforms go the opposite way to a decade ago. Universities are being challenged by the neoliberal vision: an entrepreneurial university, a managerial university, a university reduced to a lever of economic recovery etc. Education has been instrumentalised. This is not simply a pressure on universities generally; this is also another direct challenge to teacher education:

Teacher education institutions of high quality have normally included a highly challenging subject curriculum (including subject didactics) alongside their theoretical professional-knowledge base content area (Educational Science). But in balance! Current policies are tipping this balance. (Beach and Bagley 2010, 29)

The ‘universitisation’ of teacher education should not be understood as an irreversible process, a ‘happy end’. In fact, there have been two trends in the past period: on one hand, further integration within the logic of higher education and research and, on the other hand, there have also been, as in the case of the UK, ‘policies designed to reduce the role of universities in teacher education’ (Young, 1998, 57). One has been more pronounced with the (‘traditional’) academic community, the other with (‘neoliberal’) governments. On one side, teacher education needs to follow the logic of higher education and research; on the other governments are regulating the teaching profession. As a result, the boat may be rocking dangerously. No good results can be expected from this ‘experimentation’.

While we are on this restless sea, there is not much time for dilemmas: teacher education must find a way in the years to come to maintain its course. Any ‘re-traditionalisation’ would be a horrible mistake. Unfortunately, various kinds of ‘re-traditionalisation’ have been advocated in several countries due to a lack of teachers or lack of ‘practical skills’ etc. A university environment resistant to instrumentalisation can significantly help teacher education maintain its course. Conversely, new productive ways to connect the university and society should be found: this is necessary not only for teacher education but also for other professions as well as for the university of the twenty-first century as a whole. Teacher education needs to strengthen its research-based character and the ‘liberating influence of the university’ (as we heard above) but it should also strengthen its ‘caring and understanding’ for the ‘distressed men and women’, girls and boys. This is the third – not the last, however – challenge to which European teacher educators should respond in the coming years.

Notes

ⁱ See http://ec.europa.eu/education/focus/focus479_en.htm and http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/general_framework/ef0016_en.htm

ⁱⁱ Nuland, S.B. 1999. The uncertain art: The medical school medical school and the university. *The American Scholar* 68, no. 1: 121-124.

ⁱⁱⁱ Within the EU, under the OMC “governments learn from each other by sharing information and comparing initiatives. This enables them to adopt best practice and coordinate their national policies”. See http://ec.europa.eu/youth/focus/open-method-of-coordination_en.htm. – All websites referred to in this paper were last accessed on 15/03/2013.

^{iv} The Eurydice Network provides information on and analyses of European education systems and policies. See <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/>

^v See http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/teacher-educator_en.htm. Also see Biesta 2010, 10-12.

^{vi} The European Commission declares Erasmus “the most successful student exchange programme in the world”. See http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/erasmus_en.htm

^{vii} Beside *Erasmus*, the European Commission runs several programmes which enable the exchange of students and teachers: e.g. *Comenius* for teacher education institutions or *Tempus* for countries which are not EU member states.

viii See <http://www.pef.uni-lj.si/index.php?id=482>

ix See <http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/home.html>

References

- Beach, D. 2011. "New Threats in Advanced Knowledge-based Economies to the Old Problem of Developing and Sustaining Quality Teacher Education." In *Developing Quality Cultures in Teacher Education: Expanding Horizons in Relation to Quality Assurance*, ed. Eisenschmidt, E. and E. Löfström, 15-33. The TEPE Network. Tallinn: Tallinn University.
- Biesta, G. 2012. "The Future of Teacher Education: Evidence, Competence or Wisdom?" *Rose* 3, no. 1: 8-21.
- Bologna Declaration. 1999. "The European Higher Education Area." Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Convened in Bologna on June 19.
- Budapest-Vienna Declaration. 2010. "Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area." March 12.
- CEPS 2012. *Differentiation, Equity, Productivity: The social and economic consequences of expanded and differentiated higher education systems – internationalisation aspects. First results*. Internal material. University of Ljubljana, Centre for Educational Policy Studies.
- Clark, B.R. 1999. "Constraint and Opportunity in Teacher Education: Reflections on John Goodlad's Whither Schools of Education?" *Journal of Teacher Education* 50: 352-357.
- Council of the European Union 2000. "Presidency Conclusions". Council of European Union, Lisbon, 23-24 March 2000.
- Crosier, D., Purser, L. and Smidt, H. 2007. *Trends V: Universities shaping the European Higher Education Area*. Brussels: EUA.
- Darling Hammond, L. 2010. "Teacher Education and the American Future." *Journal of Teacher Education* 61, no. 1-2: 35-47
- European Commission 2005. "Common European Principles for Teacher Competences and Qualifications." European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture. Brussels, 20-21 June 2005.
- European Commission 2007. "Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Improving the Quality of Teacher Education." Brussels, 3.8.2007 COM(2007) 392 final.
- The EHEA in 2012. 2012. *Bologna Process Implementation Report*. April 2012. Brussels: EACEA P9 Eurydice.
- Eurydice 2012. *Key Data on Education in Europe 2012*. Brussels: EACEA P9 Eurydice.
- Gibbons, M. et al. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Goodlad, J.I. 1999. "Whither Schools of Education?" *Journal of Teacher Education* 50: 325-338.
- The Maastricht Treaty. 1992. "Provisions Amending the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community with a View to Establishing the European Community." Maastricht, February 7.
- Pantić, N. 2012. "Teacher Education Reforms between Higher Education and General Education Transformations in South-eastern Europe." *CEPS Journal* 2, no. 4: 71-90.
- Rasmussen, J. 2008. "Nordic Teacher Education Programmes in a Period of Transition: The End of a Well-established and Long Tradition of 'Seminarium'-based Education?" In *Teacher Education Policy in Europe: A Voice of Higher Education Institutions*, ed. Hudson, B. and P. Zgaga, 325-343. The TEPE Network. Umeå: University of Umeå.
- Reichert, S., Tauch, Ch. 2005. *Trends IV: European Universities Implementing Bologna*. Brussels: EUA.

The Sorbonne Declaration. 1998. "Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System by the Four Ministers in Charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom." Paris, the Sorbonne, May 25.

Sursock, A. and Smidt, H. 2010. *Trends 2010: A Decade of Change in European Higher Education*. Brussels: EUA.

Teichler, U., Ferencz, I. and Wächter, B. 2011. *Mapping Mobility in European Higher Education. Volume I: Overview and Trends*. A study produced for the DG EAC of the European Commission. Brussels, June 2011.

Tuning. 2005. *Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degree Programmes in Education*. Bilbao and Groningen: University of Deusto and University of Groningen.

Young, M. 1998. "Rethinking Teacher Education for a Global Future: Lessons from the English." *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy* 24, no. 1: 51-62.

Zeichner, K.M. 2009. *Teacher Education and the Struggle for Social Justice*. New York and London: Routledge.

Zgaga, P. 2003. "Teacher Education and the Bologna Process. A Survey on Trends in Learning Structures at Institutions of Teacher Education." In *Education Policy Analysis in a Comparative Perspective*, ed. Buchberger, F. and S. Berghammer, 183-221. Linz: Trauner.

Zgaga, P. 2010. "Between National Higher Education Systems and Internationalisation: The Case of Teacher Education in Europe." In *Education, Language, and Economics: Growing National and Global Dilemmas*, eds. Maclean A.G., S. Majhanovich, 167-179. Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense.