

## Council for Cultural Co-operation

Project on "Learning and teaching about  
the history of Europe in the 20th century"

Seminar

"Initial training for history teachers in  
thirteen member states of the Council of Europe"

Vienna, Austria  
19-22 April 1998

## Report

by Dr Julieta Savova  
Associate Professor  
Faculty of Education  
University of Sofia

**The Council of Europe** was founded in 1949 to achieve greater unity between European parliamentary democracies. It is the oldest of the European political institutions and has forty-one member states,<sup>1</sup> including the fifteen members of the European Union. It is the widest intergovernmental and inter-parliamentary grouping in Europe, and has its headquarters in the French city of Strasbourg.

Only questions related to national defence are excluded from the Council of Europe's work, and the Organisation has activities in the following areas: democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms; media and communication; social and economic affairs; education, culture, heritage and sport; youth; health; environment and regional planning; local democracy and legal co-operation.

The **European Cultural Convention** was opened for signature in 1954. This international treaty is also open to European countries that are not members of the Council of Europe, enabling them to take part in the Organisation's Programmes on education, culture, sport and youth. So far, forty-seven states have acceded to the European Cultural Convention: the Council of Europe's forty-one member states plus Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Holy See and Monaco.

The **Council for Cultural Co-operation** (the CDCC) is responsible for the Council of Europe's work on **education** and **culture**. Four specialised committees - the Education Committee, the Higher Education and Research Committee, the Culture Committee and the Cultural Heritage Committee - help the CDCC to carry out its tasks under the European Cultural Convention. There is also a close working relationship between the CDCC and the regular conferences of specialised European ministers responsible for education, for culture and for the cultural heritage.

The CDCC's Programmes are an integral part of the Council of Europe's work and, like the Programmes in other sectors, they contribute to the Organisation's three main policy objectives:

- the protection, reinforcement and promotion of human rights, fundamental freedoms and pluralist democracy;
- the promotion of an awareness of European identity;
- the search for common responses to the great challenges facing European society.

The CDCC's education programme covers school and higher education. At present, there are projects on education for democratic citizenship, history, modern languages, school links and exchanges, educational policies, training for educational staff, the reform of legislation on higher education in central and eastern Europe, the recognition of qualifications, lifelong learning for equity and social cohesion, European studies for democratic citizenship, and the social sciences and the challenge of transition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.



*The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe nor that of the Secretariat.*

*All correspondence concerning this report or the reproduction or translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Director General of Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Environment of the Council of Europe (F – 67075 Strasbourg, Cedex)*

## Contents

I.	Introduction .....	7
II.	The aims of the seminar .....	7
III.	Official opening of the seminar .....	7
IV.	The situation of history teacher training in the countries participating in the seminar .....	9
V.	Overview of the organisational aspects of training for history teachers.....	10
VI.	The relation between academic and practical training: a general description .....	12
VII.	New challenges and new concepts .....	15
VIII.	Conclusions of the working groups .....	16
	Appendix 1: Working groups .....	18
	Appendix 2: Discussion questions for the working groups.....	19
	Appendix 3: History working groups for follow-up to the Vienna seminar .....	20
	Appendix 4: List of participants .....	22



## **I. Introduction**

The seminar on “Initial training for history teachers in thirteen member states of the Council of Europe”, which was the first expert meeting on these issues, took place in Vienna from 19 to 22 April 1998. It was jointly organised by the Council of Europe, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs and the Department of Social and Economic History of the University of Vienna.

If I wish to underline what a fortunate choice Vienna was for this seminar, it is not only because of its well-established traditions. It is true though that Vienna is a historical city which tempts and attracts visitors from all over the world. It was one of major crossroads in European history, and moreover it is a city with a solid tradition of teacher training. This seminar brought together twenty-six participants, representing former teachers, inspectors, teacher trainers, university professors and administrators, from Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Spain and the United Kingdom.

## **II. The aims of the seminar**

The aims of the seminar were to:

- exchange information and experiences on the general structures of initial training for history teachers in the above-mentioned countries;
- to strengthen co-operation between their experts on initial training for history teachers;
- to elaborate on the central problems of initial training;
- to prepare a systematic, comparative study on the aims, curricula, organisation, theoretic concepts and the praxis of initial training;
- to examine how the main topics of the project on “Learning and teaching about the history of Europe in the 20th century in secondary schools” (human rights and pluralistic democracy, women, nationalisms, population movements) could be transmitted to teacher training programmes;
- to develop concrete guidelines for future initial training for history teachers, to be submitted to the Council of Europe.

The realisation of these aims should be completed through the results achieved at the Vienna seminar and those expected from the Prague seminar in 1999.

## **III. Official opening of the seminar**

The Council of Europe has initiated a series of seminars devoted to a thorough examination of teaching history and the training of history teachers for a successful and effective performance of their role. The seminar provided an undeniable and unique contribution to the excellence of their initial training by identifying its key organisational aspects; analysing the relation between academic and practical training; and identifying future challenges, new concepts and innovative approaches to history in the light of the project on “Learning and teaching about the history of Europe in the 20th century”.

There were eleven speakers, who structured their ideas around the above-mentioned areas of training. The combination of the plenary sessions organised as round tables and the meetings of the two working groups stimulated the experts' creative thinking and fostered constructive discussions on the main issues.

The opening session of the seminar was chaired by Dr Alois Ecker, co-ordinator of the comparative study on initial training for history teachers in thirteen Council of Europe member states. He warmly welcomed all the participants and recalled the time when the idea was born, accelerated and assisted by the Council of Europe. He underlined the aims of the seminar which had to be placed in the context of interrelated seminars on this issue — the next to be held in 1999 in Prague.

The Vice-Rector of the University of Vienna — Professor Graisenegger — officially opened this seminar, which was considered as an important follow-up to the Declaration of the First Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe (Vienna, October 1993). He underlined both the political and scientific importance of the seminar, where history and the training of history teachers had to be discussed in a wider context as a powerful means of constructing a peaceful and united Europe, on the one hand, and on the other, of overcoming growing racism, xenophobia and nationalism, through the development of a culture of tolerance and mutual respect.

Ms Monica Goodenough-Hofmann, speaking on behalf of the Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs of Austria, pointed out some of the main Austrian contributions to citizenship education, minority languages and history teaching. Teacher training was viewed as a common concern of all European countries, on the one hand, and on the other, the project on initial training for history teachers was perceived as a unique invitation to other academic groups, such as sociologists, politicians, and so forth. In the background of the significant political changes which had taken place — the end of the division of Europe, the new political climate — history teaching was increasingly becoming a topic of wide discussion. In this respect a great value was attached to training for history teachers.

Dr Carole Reich, as a representative of the Council of Europe, stressed the dominant place and importance given to history by this Organisation. Teaching modern history had become one of the significant dimensions of Council of Europe activities. The launch of the project "Learning and teaching about the history of Europe in the 20th century" was part of the remarkable efforts of the Council of Europe to invent new approaches and promote new concepts in the field of history teaching.

Co-operation with other institutions, such as the Georg Eckert Institute, Euroclio, Unesco, among others, fostered the efforts to develop further initiatives related to education and history teaching.

The opening session provided Dr Marie Homerova with an excellent opportunity to announce officially that Prague would host the next seminar in 1999 and to praise the beauty of this city.

#### **IV. The situation of history teacher training in the countries participating in the seminar**

Following the logic of the key presentations of the two seminar days, I would like to mention the most significant contributions of the main speakers to initial training for history teachers. (These texts have been published separately.)

Dr Alois Ecker (Austria) presented some key questions related to the structure of initial training for history teachers. Teacher training was viewed in the context of accelerated cultural changes, which were affecting both the teaching and the learning processes. He put strong emphasis on the importance of these changes, thus justifying the growing demand for thorough reflection on many aspects — a meta-reflection system on the social structure of learning; reflection on the relationship between theory and practice in university-based teacher education; reflection on the curriculum as well as on training for trainers. His major contribution to the drawing-up and presentation of the ideal profile of a history teacher cannot be neglected. It is based on a combination of academic and didactic competence. Dr Ecker also presented the basic strategies incorporated into the model for teacher education and training used at Vienna University, where a very strong emphasis is put on interdisciplinary teamwork.

Associate Professor Julieta Savova (Bulgaria) highlighted the results of the Lviv seminar, where specific features of history teacher training in the countries in transition were discussed. Similarities in the training systems were reviewed and some of their specific features were presented in the light of the changing role of history teachers. The specifics of teacher education and training at institutional level were presented and the basic structure of the programme models was also included.

Dr Marie Homerova (Czech Republic) discussed the organisation of history teacher initial training in the Czech Republic. Her critical examination of the existing situation, its weak points and the reasons behind them, enhanced our understanding of this situation and presented some of the specific features, from a professional standpoint, of initial training for history teachers in the central and eastern European countries. She described the role assigned to the secondary schools in terms of history teaching and reviewed the type of teacher education provided by the two main faculties – that of philosophy and of education, which have a different status. She raised the issue of young teachers in the Czech Republic.

Ms Anu Raudsepp (Estonia) stressed similar aspects based on Estonian practice. Describing the specifics of teacher training provided by the Tartu University, the Tartu Teachers' Seminary and the Tallinn Pedagogical University, she pointed out the necessity of reorganising the existing training systems with respect to the new national curriculum. Her observations on the drastic drops in the number of students willing to take teacher training courses were very worrying.

Professor Svein Lorentzen (Norway) made an excellent contribution to the problems discussed through his deep insights into the meaning of the key words in current teacher training and by identifying the most significant general challenges facing initial training for history teachers in Norway. He derived the common problems concerning not only history teachers' education but teacher education on the whole, thus widening the perspectives for future co-operation in this field. His presentation on the main challenges of history teacher training in Norway drew a lot of interest.

Ms Gisele Dessieux (France) made highly valuable contributions to the topics discussed, not only as the chair of one of the working groups but also through her presentation on the specifics of teacher training in France and the descriptions of the required teacher competence, which are presented in the next section.

Ms Maria Luisa de Bivar Black (Portugal) spoke on initial training from the standpoint of academic and didactic competence, based on the Portuguese experience. She put considerable emphasis on practical training and teacher assessment, which gave us a deeper understanding of the key aspects of this field.

The joint presentations of school inspector Mark McLaughlin and of Ms Yvonne Sinclair (United Kingdom) were excellent examples of “teamwork in practice”. The general discussions of the teacher training system in England was enriched by very useful specific examples of it as practised by Manchester Metropolitan University. Their descriptions of teaching competence and competence in history fit perfectly into the general framework of the issues covered, thus stimulating further discussion and proposals for positive changes.

Ms Fatmiroshe Xhemali (Albania) presented the Albanian system of history teacher training and highlighted some important examples of international co-operation.

Dr Vladimir Batsin (Russian Federation) made a valuable contribution by emphatically asserting that one of the challenges confronting the Russian system of initial teacher training was how to train history teachers to teach in a multicultural context.

Ms Yoke Van der Leeuw-Roord, president of Euroclio, based her excellent presentation on the results of a survey in which the opinions of history teachers and of students on significant issues related to history teaching were compared, on a national and an international scale. Referring to both the Dutch experience and international trends, she identified such important topics as problems and new challenges for initial training for history teachers in the Netherlands, its standards and what we should expect of it.

## **V. Overview of the organisational aspects of training for history teachers**

Initial training is provided by a variety of institutions, according to factors such as established national traditions and the models incorporated into them and the types of schools where teachers are expected to teach (primary, basic and secondary schools).

The most popular and widely adopted model is that providing initial training for history teachers at university level. Some countries maintain systems where teachers for primary and basic schools are trained at separate institutions, such as colleges, pedagogical institutes and academies, whereas others are developing or retaining systems where teachers for different types of schools are trained at both levels.

Recently a new model has been established in some countries where the school itself has become a key centre for initial teacher training. Thus the diversified institutional network for initial training is responding to the expectations and requirements of the system. In some countries, some initial training institutions are less prestigious than others, which affects the public’s perception and expectations of them.

### **General description**

The main issues covering the diverse aspects of initial teacher training at institutional level that were frequently referred to by the participants at both the plenary and working group sessions were:

- *adaptability and mobility of institutions.* To what extent are and were institutions nominated to provide initial teacher training able to adapt to past and current changes? Taking into consideration the profound political, cultural and economic changes in all European countries, training institutions should be aware of the increasingly ambitious and diversified objectives that they are expected to cope with;
- *inter-institutional co-operation.* The majority of the participants pointed out that relations between institutions involved in teacher training are not maintained on a regular basis. Moreover, some institutions for initial and in-service history teacher training have no contact at all. This has a negative effect on the quality of initial training. As this type of isolation tends to develop stereotypes based upon closed and strongly defended self interests, such institutions create an unfavourable climate in which co-operation and partnership models are totally neglected. This contradicts the mission assigned to modern teachers and to history teacher training institutions, which is to serve the interests of society and to meet the needs of pupils;
- *bilateral and multilateral profiles of inter-institutional co-operation.* Some institutions have student transfer schemes, both nationally and internationally, while others encourage administrative borders and obstacles. No country reported entirely interrupted or non-existent transfer schemes;
- *"competitive environment".* This was discussed as a feature of inter-institutional co-operation. Some participants pointed out the positive effects of competition, which affected the quality of initial training. Although the implementation of the "competition concept" in the field of education is still under discussion — however not as intensively as at the beginning of the 90s — the participants felt that competition was needed to raise the quality of initial training.

### **Main problems in the organisation of initial training for history teachers**

The main problems in the above-mentioned organisational aspects of initial training for history teachers were identified as the following:

- *standards.* The quality maintained by the different training institutions for history teachers is varied. Most of the participants stressed the fact that the institutions were free to set up their own standards. Raising the standards is one of the challenges which has to be met by the countries;
- *the degree of the institutional "openness" to the outside world and to each other.* The issues discussed here were dynamics, permanency, frequency, forms of relations, shared or isolated responsibilities, and so forth. Teacher training institutions are expected to be more open towards the outside environment;
- *regional and broader international co-operation between initial teacher training institutions.* One might find it curious that a number of participants gave good examples of fruitful co-operation and exchanges on an international level rather than on a national level. A need for further co-operation and well-developed information and exchange systems was strongly asserted;

- *specific relations (of whatever nature) between initial training institutions for history teachers.* Universities, colleges, pedagogical institutes and schools were singled out. The quality of these relations was identified as the main problem. It differed greatly from country to country as did the degree of satisfaction obtained from these relations. The most satisfied countries seemed to be those where the model of “the reflective practitioner ” is applied as compared to the countries where the traditional emphasis is mainly on academic training. For the latter, the “training power” of the schools is underestimated and these schools are viewed as unequally presented players on the teacher training scene, which erodes the concept of “partnership”.

### ***New challenges and possible solutions***

The new challenges and possible solutions may be summarised as follows:

- *new institutional culture.* A new institutional culture where the institutions themselves would integrate an “open environment” into the national and international networks responsible for the training of teachers should be developed;
- *dynamics of needs and expectations.* The needs and expectations of the target groups should be studied;
- *partnership.* The concept of partnership and its related models should be adopted and developed further, thus fostering mutual trust and co-operation;
- *democratisation.* Further democratisation of teacher training institutions and conventions should be adopted globally, in order to make them more relevant to both needs and expectations;
- *inter-institutional co-operation.* This would encourage contact between institutions and stimulate co-operation;
- *anticipation of coming changes.* The ability to anticipate future needs and expectations should be developed so as to be better prepared to meet them;
- *globalisation.* The significant trend towards globalisation should be taken into account.

## **VI. The relation between academic and practical training: a general description**

This topic was frequently raised and widely discussed in the plenary sessions and working group meetings — partly because of the key importance attached to it, and partly because the vast majority of the problems were concentrated in this area. Almost all participants recognised the limits and weaknesses of the links between the academic and the practical areas of training for history teachers. Academic training was traditionally highly esteemed and valued at the expense of practical training, which was considered as less important, by reason of sheer inertia. The growing dissatisfaction with the lack of quality links between those two areas of training had resulted in the declining quality of history teacher training. Almost all participants arrived at that conclusion on the basis of their own experience and on the basis of the assessment of current practice. Not only the content but also the length of practical

training should be re-evaluated in order to achieve a better balance between academic and practical training. There was a general consensus on the disparity between the two. The participants agreed on the growing importance of practical training for history teachers.

Reflection on academic and the practical aspects of teacher training allowed the participants to deal in-depth with the so called “key competences” of the history teacher and to draw up his/her ideal profile. This part of the discussion was extremely enriching and its principal arguments were seen from a professional point of view. Although a variety of key competence models were presented, their similarities prevailed. Some of the participants suggested the profile of the ideal history teacher should include two elements — teaching competence and competence in history. Seven groups of criteria were applied in order to measure competence in teaching and twenty history subjects to measure competence in history. These were presented on the basis of the United Kingdom experience. Other participants described the ideal history teacher’s profile as including a combination of: academic competence; ability to implement the curriculum; classroom teaching ability; commitment to school objectives and a willingness to participate in further education (on the basis of the French experience). Portugal and Norway fit into more or less similar schemes. (The history teacher’s ideal profile based on the Austrian experience was presented in the previous section).

Whatever this ideal profile may be, it entails responsibility:

- for the subject taught;
- to the pupils/students;
- to other teachers and parents, as well as to partners;
- to the school itself and to other institutions dealing with education.

### ***Problems already identified in this area***

The problems already identified in this area were the following:

- *number of subjects.* Should training be single-subject training or training based on combined subjects?
- *quality of initial training.* This should be judged not only on the basis of acquired manifest knowledge but on the basis of how this knowledge is applied, as well as on skills and attitudes. It was strongly underlined that training and teaching history is not confined to just training and teaching facts, but entails attitudes, skills, behaviour models, and so forth;
- *flexibility of initial training.* This should be placed in the context of the evolution of the environment. Flexibility should be applied not only to the activities of teacher training institutions but also to the curriculum content and methods of teaching. Changes in the outside world and in the classroom should be taken into account;
- *relevance.* History teacher trainers should not forget that in the classroom there are two learners — teachers and students — who possess different perceptions, attitudes, experiences and expectations. In order to respond to them, we need to develop and deliver more relevant teacher training. Relevance was also seen in a broader social, economic and political context. It was pointed out by a number of participants that cultural and social history, for example, are under-represented while political and military history still dominate to some extent;
- *measurement and assessment.* There are several aspects to this issue, including the measurement and assessment of the quality of teacher training itself

(covering curriculum content; as a functioning system; as outcome; the quality of the history teacher; the quality of history teaching, among others). Several participants held the view that specific measurement criteria should be established and quality assessment should be done on a regular basis. Growing dissatisfaction was expressed by a number of participants with the irregular and sometimes even non-existent evaluation of the results of initial teacher training. There are not many countries in which teacher training programmes and teacher trainers are systematically evaluated and appraised. The same is true for teacher training institutions;

- *entry requirements for teacher training programmes.* Wide variations were observed — from no specific entry requirements to more rigid systems where written exams are required. Moreover, because teaching is not an attractive profession any more and there are no special prerequisites for applicant teachers, excepting the usual first university degree, the best do not apply;
- *systems for tutors and mentors.* These are not well developed at university, college or school level, a situation which is a hindrance to teamwork. This appears to be a problem common to the majority of the countries. The general lack of criteria for the selection and training of tutors and mentors has had repercussions on the quality of teacher training, and takes us back to the clear disparity between academic and practical training;
- *resources.* There is a lack of teaching materials, and so forth, and financial constraints have been frequently reported by a number of countries;
- *lack of training and skill.* These are particularly needed in the field of teaching history in a multicultural environment. There is also a need for more learning-centred training and effective teaching methods.

### ***Coming challenges and possible solutions***

The coming challenges were identified as the following:

- *quality.* From here on out, this will be a high priority issue;
- *flexibility.* A growing demand for flexibility will be reinforced by the growing level of heterogeneity of pupils (with different learning needs, different abilities, interests, etc.);
- *evaluation and appraisal.* There will be increasing pressure for more evaluation and appraisal systems, with an increasing demand for a better balance between internal and external assessment;
- *quality of teacher training programmes.* There will be a growing necessity for permanent updating of teacher training programmes;
- *teamwork.* There will be an increasing demand for teamwork;
- *multiculturalism.* There will be an increasing need for training on how to live and work in a multicultural society;
- *training of specific groups of history teachers.* Training must be ensured for teachers in remote and rural areas.

The possible solutions discussed were:

- *a constant evaluation of initial teacher training*; This will include curriculum evaluation, (from curriculum design to delivery in the classroom), developing teaching methods with an emphasis on active methods, including role plays, simulations, and so forth; development of good teacher-student relationships in order to encourage students to be creative positively; encourage individual training programmes, etc; and permanent teacher appraisal.
- *permanent assessment*; This also applies to learner’s needs and expectations;
- *teamwork approach*; This should be adopted and the necessary skills for it built up;
- *attain a better balance between local, regional, national, European and world history*; Training must go beyond the “white man’s” viewpoint of history; encourage mutual understanding, respect, tolerance; and overcome prejudices, bias, racism and xenophobia.
- *emphasise further the importance of pedagogical knowledge and skills*. This should also include didactic and psychological ones.

## **VII. New challenges and new concepts**

Most of the participants raised a point considered as “vitaly important” — training the trainers. General dissatisfaction was expressed over the lack of specially designed and developed systems and schemes for this purpose. A few countries reported that relevant measures had been taken in that respect.

The specific challenge is the growing presence of new information technologies in the world, including the world of teaching. A consensus was reached on this point. Some of the problems in this field were examined, such as equal access to the new information technologies, a lack of skills, lack of materials and generally speaking a lack of funds to overcome the gaps.

With respect to dissemination of information, some of the main problems identified were: lack of communication at institutional and personal level; a lack of funds to develop and maintain broad scale national and international exchanges; training institutions deprived of the latest publications, including periodicals; and underdeveloped national and international training institution networks.

Some of the solutions to these problems might be to:

- accelerate communication and exchange of information at national and international level;
- increase the funds allocated to these aspects of education activities;
- encourage training institutions to develop national and international networks or to participate more actively in existing ones.

## VIII. Conclusions of the working groups

The two working groups discussed the issues included in Appendix 3, as well as the problems raised at the plenary sessions. Their hard and fruitful work during the sessions produced encouraging results.

The following key issues are worth mentioning:

- *a variety of initial teacher training models.* These included academic and practical training at different levels and school-centred initial teacher training (United Kingdom); two years practising without specialised pedagogical training (Spain); individual, tailored programmes approved by a training agency (United Kingdom), among others;
- *relation between academic and practical training based on countries' experience in the framework of partnership models.* It is important to continue focusing on history, but practical training, necessary to acquire organisational skills and classroom management should be considered as equally important. Presently in most of the countries represented and in most contexts, the importance of forging real links between college and school, between various trainers, between the college tutor and the school teacher has been recognised. Most are currently taking steps to achieve this. Specific cases of well-established partnership models were reported but there are still weaknesses that should be overcome if they are to be effective. The specific role of each institution should be well defined in these models. Clear links should be established between practical training and teaching at school level. A clear need has been expressed for developing effective monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes of partnership models.
- *different models of co-operation.* The different types examined were:
  - conventions, which lay down a legal framework and allowed institutions autonomy within this framework;
  - training schools doing initial training: problems linked to the selection of these schools were mentioned;
  - partnership, seen as a means of co-operation to be developed but above all as a means of facing future challenges, as it is a flexible arrangement that links institutions focusing on specific tasks and work;
  - tutored school practice; how much should be time allotted to it, an effective way of organisation it, how to link it to the main topics of the project on "Learning and teaching about the history of Europe in the 20th century";
- *training of trainers.* This was discussed with respect to their mobility, their understanding of the pupils' standpoint, their perceptions of the changing environment, their awareness of the use and misuse of history;
- *teaching of history at different types of schools, especially less academic ones;*
- *curricula content.* This was discussed in the context of linking curricula development to the point of view of teacher training institutions, on the balance between teaching and learning processes as well as on the balance between academic and practical training;

- *aims and objectives of history teaching.* Who decides what the aims and objective shall be?
- *entrance requirements.* Should there be special entrance requirements or should applicants enter teacher training programmes freely? A variety of practices were reported, from open access to rigid entrance examinations. These practices are determined by autonomous decisions made by universities and teacher training colleges. Some reserves were expressed on the institutions having rigid formal entrance exams; it was feared that history teacher training would be aimed at meeting the entrance examination requirements and not be focused on innovative and non-conventional approaches;
- *models of initial teacher training.* Three years of academic study followed by one year of pedagogical training (training for teaching as a profession) was considered not ideal but still good to be adopted. A good alternative might be a four-year concurrent model, composed of two elements, the study of history as an academic subject and pedagogical training. These elements should be inter-related and of equal importance;
- *academic and practical competence.* Academic and practical competence should have equal status. Practical teaching competence is currently underestimated, a clear need has been defined to accord it more importance. Competencies need to be people-centred, taking into account pupils' real interests and needs. History teachers should be properly prepared to work in an increasingly multicultural environment. History teacher training should be seen as the beginning of teachers' learning and developing competence. Initial training for history teachers should be considered in the light of continuous (lifelong) learning.

## Appendix 1

### Working groups

Working group I — English

Magne **Angvik** (Norway)  
Vladimir **Batsin** (Russian Federation)  
Fred **Burda** (Austria)  
Elka **Drosneva** (Bulgaria)  
Marie **Homerova** (Czech Republic)  
Joke **Van de Leeuw-Rood** (Netherlands)  
Anu **Raudsepp** (Estonia)  
Julieta **Savova** (Bulgaria)  
Yvonne **Sinclair** (United Kingdom)  
Heinz **Strotzka** (Austria)  
Vilmos **Vass** (Hungary)  
Fatmiroshe **Xhemali** (Albania)

Working group II — English and French:

Ludmila **Alexashkina** (Russian Federation)  
Maria Luisa **de Bivar Black** (Portugal)  
Gisele **Dessieux** (France)  
Christa **Donnermair** (Austria)  
Alois **Ecker** (Austria)  
Juan Carlos **Flores** (Spain)  
Gyorgy **Gyarmati** (Hungary)  
Svein **Lorentzen** (Norway)  
Mark **McLalughlin** (United K)  
Petrit **Nathanaili** (Albania)  
Ivana **Ortmannova** (Czech Republic)  
Gregorio Gonzalez **Roldan** (Spain)

## **Appendix 2**

### **Discussion questions for the working groups**

#### ***Organisational aspects of initial training***

- Are there different institutions for teacher training in your country, for example colleges, universities, and so forth?
- What are the links between training institutes/colleges/universities on the one hand and schools on the other?
- Is there a possibility for the students to change from one institution to another?
- What is the degree of co-operation between historians, didacticians/pedagogues and teacher trainers organised in initial training?

#### ***Relation between academic and practical training***

- What are the main competencies students of history teaching are supposed to be trained for?
- Approximately how high is the percentage of practical training courses for trainees compared with academic history courses?
- How is the balance between academic, psychological and pedagogical, methodological and practical training for future teachers of history?
- In which learning environment do the students learn to develop their didactic competencies?

#### ***New challenges and new concepts***

- Does the initial training curriculum provide opportunities to disseminate new concepts and new approaches to history (social, economic history; local research, project work, and so forth)?
- How does initial training deal with the new technologies (CD-ROM, Internet)?
- What are the concepts and/or the possibilities for training the trainers in initial training?
- What could we do to improve the exchange of information and know how on initial training on both international and European level?

## Appendix 3

### *History working groups for follow-up to the Vienna seminar*

1. *Entrance requirements, selection and evaluation of students, models of initial training for teachers*

Gregorio Gonzalez **Roldan** (Spain)  
Petrit **Nathanaili** (Albania)  
Vilmos **Vass** (Hungary)  
Jean **Carpenties** (France)  
Julieta **Savova** (Bulgaria)

2. *Institutional links, partnership models*

Fatmiroshe **Xhemali** (Albania)  
Mark **McLalughlin** (United Kingdom)  
Christa **Donnermair** (Austria)  
Svein **Lorentzen** (Norway)  
Ivana **Ortmannova** (Czech Republic)  
Inere **Veldhuis** (Netherlands)

3. *Initial training in multicultural countries*

Fred **Burda** (Austria)  
Vladimir **Batsin** (Russian Federation)  
Mare Oja (Estonia)  
Joke **Van de Leeuw-Rood** (Netherlands)  
Magne **Angvik** (Norway)

4. *Academic practical competences*

Yvonne **Sinclair** (United Kingdom)  
Ludmila **Alexashkina** (Russian Federation)  
Heinz **Strotzka** (Austria)  
Juan Carlos **Flores** (Spain)  
Elka **Drosneva** (Bulgaria)  
Gyorgy **Gyarmati** (Hungary)

5. *Training for trainers*

Marie **Homerova** (Czech Republic)  
Anu **Raudsepp** (Estonia)  
Maria Luisa de **Bivar Black** (Portugal)  
Alois **Ecker** (Austria)

## **Appendix 4**

### **List of participants**

#### **Albania**

Ms Fatmiroshe Xhemali  
Inspector of History  
Ministry of Education and Sport  
Department for International Relations  
Rruga e Durrës'it 23  
TIRANA  
Tel: 00355 42 22260/26139  
Fax: 00355 42 32002

Dr Petrit Nathanaili  
Str. "Jul Vareboba" Nr. 8  
TIRANA  
Tel/Fax: 00355 42 27370

Address in France:  
39 rue Lafontaine RUA, Bat. G, Apt. 320  
F-92763 ANTONY CEDEX

#### **Austria**

##### *Project co-ordinator*

Mr Alois Ecker  
University of Vienna  
Institute for Economic and Social History  
Dr Karl Lueger Ring 1  
A-1010 Wien  
Tel.: 00431 4277 413 20  
Fax: 00431 4277 94 13  
e-mail: [alois.ecker@univie.ac.at](mailto:alois.ecker@univie.ac.at)

##### *Workshop animator*

Mr Heinz Strotzka  
Pädagogische Akademie des Bundes  
Akademiestraße 23  
A-5020 Salzburg  
Tel: 00431 662 62 95 91 53  
Fax: 00431 662 62 95 91 10  
e-mail: [pa501830@asn-sbg.ac.at](mailto:pa501830@asn-sbg.ac.at)

## **Bulgaria**

*General rapporteur*

Ms Julieta Savova  
Associate Professor  
Ar Druzba 2, Bl. 224, Ent. 2, Ap. 31  
BG-1582 SOFIA  
Tel: 00359 289 45 63  
Fax: 00359 246 40 85

Ms Elka Drosneva  
Université de Sofia  
15, Tzar Osnoboditel bul.  
BG-1504 SOFIA  
Tel: 00359 2 858 322 or 00359 2 876 292  
Fax: 00359 2 463 022

## **Czech Republic**

Ms Marie Homerová  
Revolucní 20  
CZ - 110 00 PRAHA 1  
Tel: 0042 02 35 25 46-8  
Fax: 0042 02 35 25 49

Ms Ivana Ortmannová  
Gym,ázium Pod Vydehradem  
Vratislovova 12  
CZ-140 000 PRAHA 4  
Tel: 0042 02 30 13 76 1

## **Estonia**

Ms Mare Oja  
Curriculum Department  
Stat School Board  
Sakala St. 23  
EE-0100 TALLINN  
Tel: 00372 62 82 304  
Fax: 00372 62 82 350  
*Apologised for absence*

Ms Anu Raudsepp  
Tartu University  
Department of History  
Ulikooli 18  
EE-2400 TARTU  
Tel: 00372 74 65 650  
Fax: 00372 74 65 345

## **France**

Mme Gisèle Dessieux  
Inspection générale de l'Education nationale  
Groupe Histoire et Géographie  
Ministère de L'Education nationale  
143, Bld Raspail  
F-75006 PARIS  
Tel: 00331 49 55 25 68  
Fax: 00331 49 55 25 55

## **Hungary**

Herrn Universitätsdozent György Gyarmati  
Historisches Amt  
Nador u. 4  
H-1051 BUDAPEST  
Tel/Fax: 0036 11 38 31 87

Mr Vilmos Vass  
Teacher, Educational Adviser  
Gesztenye u. 10/a  
H-1164 BUDAPEST  
Tel: 0036 1 400 09 57  
e-mail: [vass@centi.c3.hu](mailto:vass@centi.c3.hu)

## **Netherlands**

Ms. Joke Van der Leeuw-Roord  
President EUROCLIO  
Louise Henriettestraat 16  
NL-2595 TH DEN HAAG  
Tel: 0031 70 385 36 69 and 382 48 72  
Fax: 0031 70 385 36 69  
e-mail: [joke@euroclio.nl](mailto:joke@euroclio.nl)

Ms Ineke Veldhuis-Meester  
Quintuslaan 4  
NL-9722 RV GRONINGEN  
Tel: 0031 50 527 00 99  
Fax: 0031 50 363 59 97  
e-mail: [veldhuis@let.rug.nl](mailto:veldhuis@let.rug.nl)  
*Apologised for absence*

## **Norway**

Mr. Svein Lorentzen  
NTNU, University of Trondheim  
Avdeling for lærerutdanning og skoleutvikling  
N-7055 DRAGVOLL  
Fax: 0047 73 59 10 12  
Tel.: 0047 73 59 19 90  
e-mail: [Svein.Lorentzen@als.ntnu.no](mailto:Svein.Lorentzen@als.ntnu.no)

Mr Magne Angvik  
Bergen College of Higher Education  
Department of Education and Social Science  
Landassvingen 15  
N-5030 LANDAS  
Tel: 0047 55 58 58 64  
Fax: 0047 55 58 58 09  
e-mail: [magnea@lsv.hib.no](mailto:magnea@lsv.hib.no)

### **Portugal**

Ms Maria Luisa De Bivar Black  
Rua Damiao de Gois, 11, 1°Esq.  
Alapraia  
P-2765 S. JOAO DO ESTORIL  
Tel: 00351 14 67 20 50  
Fax: 00351 14 52 24 39  
e-mail: [nop19532@mail.telepac.pt](mailto:nop19532@mail.telepac.pt)

### **Russian Federation**

Mr Vladimir Batsin  
Head of the Department for International Co-operation  
51, ul. Ljusinovskaya  
RF-113 833 MOSCOW  
Fax: 0070 95 230 27 96

Ms Ludmila Alexashkina  
Head of the Laboratory of History  
Russian Academy of Education  
8, Pogodinskaya  
RF-119 908 MOSCOW  
Tel: 0070 95 554 74 11  
Fax: 0070 95 230 27 96

### **Spain**

Mr Gregorio González Roldán  
Technical consultant  
CIDE  
San Agustin, 5  
E-28014-Madrid  
Tel: 0034 13 69 28 50  
Fax: 0034 14 29 94 38  
e-mail: [gregorio.gonzalez@educ.mec.es](mailto:gregorio.gonzalez@educ.mec.es)

Mr Juan Carlos Flores  
CIDE  
General Oráa, 55  
E-28006 MADRID  
Tel: 0034 1 745 94 00  
Fax: 0034 1 563 18 42

## **United Kingdom**

Mr Mark McLaughlin  
25 Lyndale Road  
Northway, Sedgley, Dudley  
West Midlands DY3 3QW  
Tel: 0044 121 455 98 55  
Fax: 0044 121 456 14 20

Ms Yvonne Sinclair  
Senior Lecturer History Education  
School of Education  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
799 Wimslow Road  
Didsbury  
MANCHESTER M20 2RR  
Tel: 0044 161 247 23 97  
Fax: 0044 161 247 63 30

## **Council of Europe**

Dr Carole Reich  
Administrator  
Educational Policies and European dimension  
Council of Europe  
Tel: 33 3 88 41 22 45  
Fax: 33 3 88 41 27 06/27 88  
e-mail: [carole.reich@coe.fr](mailto:carole.reich@coe.fr)

## **Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs**

Mrs Monika Goodenough-Hofmann  
Austrian Federal Ministry of Education  
and Cultural Affairs  
Department for International Relations  
Wipplingerstraße 28  
A-1010 WIEN  
Tel: 00431 53 120 99 47 13  
Fax: 00431 53 120 99 47 13

Mr Fred Burda  
Austrian Federal Ministry of  
Education and Cultural Affairs  
Vocational Education and Training/  
Teacher In-service training  
Minoritenplatz 5  
Tel: 00431 53120 4117  
Fax: 00431 53120 4130  
A-1010 WIEN  
e-mail: [fred.burda@bmuk.gv.at](mailto:fred.burda@bmuk.gv.at)

## **University of Vienna**

Ms Christa Donnermair  
University of Vienna  
Institute for Economic and Social History  
Initial Teacher Training  
Dr. Karl Lueger Ring 1  
A-1010 WIEN  
Tel: 00431 4277 413 01  
Fax: 00431 4277 94 13  
e-mail: [donnermair@compuserve.com](mailto:donnermair@compuserve.com)

## **Interpreters**

M. Benoît Cliquet  
Zweibrückenstraße 15  
D-80331 MÜNCHEN  
Tel.: 0049 89 29 14 45  
Fax: 0049 89 29 34 28

M. Vladimir Olexa  
Domazlicka 373  
CZ-25101 PRAGUE-Ricany  
Tel/Fax: 0042 02 04 63 22 13

## **Seminar secretariat**

Ms Isabel Oliva  
Baumgartenstraße 56/3/4  
A-1140 WIEN  
Tel. 00431 911 19 49

This seminar was sponsored by Kultur kontakt, Austria