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General introduction
The Council of Europe project, “Policies and practices for teaching socio-cultural diversity”: political background

The conceptual framework for the new project, “Policies and practices for teaching socio-cultural diversity”, was developed throughout 2005 by the Secretariat and Bureau of the Steering Committee for Education (CDED) and was adopted at the CDED plenary session in October 2005.

Its development was shaped by a number of events in 2005, some of which occurred at the highest political level in the Council of Europe, while others had to do with intergovernmental co-operation in the education sector. The objectives pursued under the project are in line with the desire expressed by heads of state and government at the 3rd Summit in Warsaw (May 2005) to recognise the need to promote a democratic culture and to foster intercultural and inter-religious dialogue both among European people and between Europe and its neighbouring regions.

Earlier, at the 21st session of the Standing Conference in Athens in November 2003, European education ministers had redefined the objectives of educational co-operation in Europe and recognised the role of intercultural education and the major contribution of the Council of Europe in maintaining and developing the unity and diversity of European societies. They asked the Council of Europe, inter alia, to:

- re-launch conceptual research on intercultural education with a view to adapting terminology and clearly defining the content and context of intercultural education;
- encourage member states to introduce the intercultural dimension in their education policies, in order to enable appropriate consideration of dialogue between cultures;
- devise and promote working methods to facilitate the integration into states’ own initial and in-service training programmes of the principles of non-discrimination, pluralism and equity;
- recognise the potential of ICTs as a tool for promoting intercultural learning in a global context;
- develop educational strategies and working methods to prepare teachers to manage the new situations arising in our schools as a result of discrimination, racism, xenophobia, sexism and marginalisation and to resolve conflicts in a non-violent way.

The Faro Declaration on the Council of Europe’s strategy for developing intercultural dialogue, adopted at the close of the celebrations to mark the 50th anniversary of the European Cultural Convention, mapped out several courses of action with regard to the future priorities of intergovernmental co-operation in the education sector, which echo the concerns expressed by education ministers at the Athens conference. They include:

- respect for cultural rights and the right to education;
– introducing inter-sectorial public policies that encourage cultural diversity and dialogue;
– developing knowledge of history, cultures, arts and religions;
– supporting cultural and artistic activities and exchanges, as a vehicle for dialogue;
– enhancing all opportunities for the training of educators in the fields of education for
democratic citizenship, human rights, history and intercultural education.

Teacher training: focal point of the Council of Europe’s intergovernmental co-operation in the field of education

Against this background, and in response to the political priorities set by ministers, the Council of Europe’s Steering Committee for Education began, in 2006, to step up its teacher training activities in various areas such as education for democratic citizenship, the European dimension of education, the education of Roma children, and history and language teaching. Its training programme for education professionals was bolstered by the gradual introduction, in 2006, of training modules for teacher trainers.

Even though the emphasis has been mainly on developing teaching material based on methodological concepts, principles and approaches and examples of learning activities in various fields (languages, history, citizenship education, etc.), one area of ongoing concern is the development of new skills, and in particular the ways in which these are acquired by teachers, as they face up to the new challenges created by changes in contemporary societies.

It should be emphasised that these new skills remain confined to specific areas depending on the disciplines taught and tend not to spread beyond the context in which they were developed. Consideration could be given to introducing a reference framework that would serve as a common denominator, and incorporate “core” skills of fundamental importance (for the Council of Europe). Were this common denominator to be “education in diversity”, the skills featured in the reference framework, once learnt and applied, would provide teachers and education professionals in general with a valuable tool for dealing with the growing diversity of our societies.

The project and its objectives (2006-09)

Clearly, a key role here falls to pre-service training institutions, and to curricula which have never been the main focus of a Council of Europe project. The project, “Policies and practices for teaching socio-cultural diversity”, accordingly seeks to address some key issues in pre-service teacher training and to introduce common principles for managing diversity at school. It is mainly aimed, therefore, at educational policy-makers and, more specifically, teacher trainers.

The Steering Committee for Education wished to develop the project over three separate phases:
1) First phase, 2006-07: analysis of existing teacher training curricula in a number of states, curricula that are designed to give teachers the skills needed to manage culturally diverse classes;

2) Second phase, 2007-08: drafting of a framework of new teacher competencies on diversity education;

3) Third phase, 2008-09: drafting of guidelines of support for reforms through the organisation of training sessions and awareness-raising activities with stakeholders.

**Methodology**

When it comes to training, the first thing that springs to mind is curricula, but other areas are worth exploring too, such as admissions policies, recruitment policies, professional development of teaching staff, the role of research, the internal organisation of training institutions, community relations, and so on.

All of these issues were the subject of a survey which the ad hoc advisory group (ED-DS), set up by the CDED to run the project, carried out during the initial phase (2006-07) in 16 member states and 26 teacher training institutions.

The survey was conducted in two stages:
- preparation of national reports on in-service teacher training in socio-cultural diversity based on a common questionnaire;
- interviews with the various target groups concerned: teacher trainers, new teachers and administrators in pre-service training institutions.

**First stage: National reports**

The ad hoc group defined the structure of the national reports, and then drew up a questionnaire elaborating on that structure. To make the results easier to understand, it is important for readers to always bear in mind that our study is confined to pre-service training of primary and lower secondary teachers, namely ISCED levels 1 and 2, so that only compulsory education is covered. In the presentation of findings we shall refer to these two levels.

The structure adopted by the group is as follows:

**Part 1: Policies**
**Part 2: Curricula/Programmes**
**Part 3: Teacher qualifications**
**Part 4: Teacher training institutions**

The questionnaire, which is available in both French and English, was distributed to the member states in spring 2006.

---

1. International Standard Classification of Education, UNESCO.
Second stage: Interviews

The second stage is based on semi-guided interviews conducted in teacher training institutions, across three separate groups using three different questionnaires. For each institution, the ad hoc group asked that, as far as possible, the interviews involve:

– an academic manager;
– a few teacher trainers;
– some teachers who had left the institution two or three years earlier.

The participating countries were asked to choose the teacher training institutions where the interviews would be conducted.

To help them choose, the group suggested that they use the following criteria:

– include any geographical areas that are distinctive in terms of social context or diversity;
– include at least one institution that trains both primary and lower secondary teachers (ISCED levels 1 and 2). If there are no such institutions, select one of each kind;
– consider institutions that have specific activities related to diversity;
– take account of the size, status (state-run/private) and location (urban/suburban/rural, central/local);
– to avoid overlap, refrain from choosing two institutions that have similar features in relation to the above criteria;
– choose a maximum of five institutions.

The group met several times in 2006 to compile the questionnaires to be used for preparing the national reports and to arrange interviews, and also to discuss the survey findings and make recommendations.

The present report contains, inter alia, the main findings of the survey and a comparative analysis, while at the same time making a series of recommendations for educational policymakers about teacher training.
Chapter 1

Socio-cultural diversity: content and context
Introduction

Diversity is an issue that has been recognised and politically dealt with on a national level and in international fora. Policies on diversity cut across different policy areas, but this report focuses on education and teacher education and the particular role teacher training plays in preparing teachers for the task to teach and educate new generations of children for a future in which they will increasingly have to appreciate variety and deal with differences.

Diversity as a value implies the notion of an inclusive society, with a vision of providing all inhabitants, regardless of differences, with opportunities to participate and form their lives on an equal footing, within an atmosphere of good relations between groups and communities, and without too much social tension. Thus the notion of celebrating diversity is important, as it appears to present a departure from the categorical thinking that has resulted in marginalisation and hierarchisation of particular groups. Major social and economic differences and structural discrimination based on ethnicity, class, gender, religion and disability are felt to be problems that should be counteracted with active national policies and constitute a major concern for the Council of Europe.

Diversity is in itself a neutral term comprising all kinds of differences between individuals and groups. Diversity may have biological, cultural and structural origins. Socio-cultural diversity implies by definition human differences that are socially or culturally constructed. Hence, from a socio-cultural point of view, diversity is not neutral, but implies problems of discrimination and inequalities that must be dealt with by authorities and individuals, and this fact is the very reason that the current project had to be initiated by the Council of Europe in the first place.

Rather than finding one common definition, we take the concept as it has been used in the Council of Europe’s education activities and initiatives as a point of departure. Key issues involving diversity in this context are access to education and learning activities for all, plurilingualism, respect for minorities, integration of immigrants, education for citizenship, education of Roma children, equal opportunities/equity at school, intercultural teaching/training, the preservation of individual uniqueness while promoting common values and social cohesion, flexible educational provisions as well as specific learning needs and expectations.

Some types of diversity are regarded as “natural” or genetic rather than “cultural”, for example, skin colour, gender, and certain forms of handicap. However, such characteristics may become differentiated in a hierarchical manner and subject to discrimination varying over time, location and circumstances.

But apparently “natural” diversities may also be “cultural” as diversities are embedded in particular political, cultural and relational contexts. Being and/or feeling disabled depends on how society and environments are designed, for example, the extent to which the physical and social environment is constructed for facilitating or hindering participation for individuals and groups.

Socio-cultural aspects of diversity and problems of inequality between groups and individuals are dealt with in several ways: by national legislation and regulations of institutional
practices, political strategies and social practices that are intended to enhance participation and access to social goods for all, for example, education, and counteract marginalisation and exclusion. However, policies and institutional practices may still have unintended consequences. Through legislation and institutions, populations are “structured” both in society at large and in school. Systems of divisions and services intended to help and assist people may have the opposite effect. Special provisions are based on definitions of identity by means of a terminology, implying practices of institutional categorisation and classification that may differentiate between pupils in ways that create or maintain inequalities. Terminology is underpinned by a particular understanding or notion of individuals and groups, which in turn tend to give direction to policies and practices.

In the common grid outlined by the ad hoc advisory group, the following dimensions of socio-cultural diversity have been proposed: immigrants, cultural and linguistic diversity, religious minorities, special needs, gender and other. These dimensions provide a starting point for the country report and questionnaires for our investigation on how teachers’ education deals with diversity. The review indicates that there are differences between the countries in relation to their views on problems and what is emphasised and regarded to be significant enough to call for political strategies and provisions in teacher training programmes.

**Content and context**

Cultural diversity is noted and protected by human rights agreements. Presenting it through educational systems is not only a fundamental issue but also a point of enrichment in knowledge and the dynamics of plural cultural identities.

Most countries are multiethnic and multilingual, although an appreciation of this fact may have evolved quite recently in some countries. National minorities have in most member states gradually become recognised with cultural and linguistic rights.

Immigration to Europe represents a new challenge. Global migration is of course not a new phenomenon. People have travelled and crossed national borders throughout history for a variety of reasons: either by force, necessity or will because of natural disasters, poverty, desire for a better life, new future, desire for adventure, colonialism and refuge from wars. The colonisation of third world countries in the south and east and on the American continent by European countries has had a great impact on Europe as well as the colonised countries, both then and now.

The increasing number of immigrants and refugees to Europe during the last forty years still represents something new in an age of globalisation, respect of human rights and state responsibility. First and foremost, the “new” situation represents a new reality for the education systems, particularly due to increased demands to take diversity into consideration in teaching programmes and enhance the rights of individuals and groups to a much higher extent than in the past.

An education system does not exist in a historical and social vacuum. It functions within the framework of a dominant culture with specific political outlooks, attitudes, values and norms. But these frameworks are not static; they are continuously changing. This becomes evident when looking at recent legislation and reforms in most European countries in education and
teacher education with implications for pupils from cultural and lingual minority backgrounds.

Some countries have a long history of multiculturalism as a multitude of cultures and religions have coexisted for centuries, with periods characterised by peaceful relations and others by antagonism and conflicts, even civil war. Some countries, although comprising a number of minority populations, have in the wake of nation building, been based on a monocultural and mono-lingual orientation based on a notion of a homogeneous population often influenced by a dominant elite. In these cases national unity and commonality is emphasised with assimilation of minority populations as a result. The view of immigration and “the immigrant” is changing over time, from a requirement of adapting to national norms in terms of culture, language, outlooks and general behaviour, to an increasing recognition of rights to be different with emphasis on integration or inclusion in a pluralist society and school.

The schools, to an increasing extent, experience that a number of children who have limited skills in the predominant national language, usually the language on which the teaching is based, fail in school or achieve poorer results than those who have the teaching language as their first language. Language has gradually become an issue seen both as a cultural tool, a mark of identity and belonging, and an instrument of communication. To learn the national language(s) in a particular country is seen as essential to get access to education, be able to succeed in school, and it is a key to getting access to the democratic and social institutions, which is a sign of a successful integration. In social relations a common language is an instrument for social interaction and sharing of experiences and a vehicle for building up social bonds and trust.

In classrooms today, in nearly every country of the world, multilingualism is the rule rather than the exception. The linguistic identity and self-confidence of pupils who represent small minority languages will be strengthened if their language gets a certain space within teaching. For teachers, on the other hand, multilingual classrooms are a big challenge, and in a number of countries legislative and special provisions have been installed to meet the pupils’ needs, both with respect to the learners’ language history and the learners’ need to acquire language skills in order to follow the teaching. This represents great challenges for teacher education programmes. The various countries meet this challenge in different ways.

Many countries have recognised the importance of building upon a child’s first language. Mother tongue education has been recognised as an important basis for identity building, on the one hand, and for second language acquisition, on the other. It is also seen as a necessary tool for those with poor skills in the teaching language to gain access to the subjects. In some countries lingual (and cultural) minorities have their own schools separated from the mainstream.

Foreign language education has also attained new status as crucial for enhancing communication within Europe and internationally in an area of globalisation.

Religious diversity is one of the types of diversity among Council of Europe countries. Some years ago, it became one of the crucial ones. Religion is one of the factors that define the cultural identity of European citizens. Religious diversity is also an issue that has been associated with tensions and provided grounds for conflicts in Europe as well as globally, and in recent years even war motivated by economic, ethnic and religious differences. Some countries have a constitutional bond between church and state, but most European countries
define themselves as secular in terms of considering religion to be a personal matter and an element not necessarily connected to the state or public life. Human rights agreements as well as member states’ constitutions have incorporated universal rights to religious beliefs, banning discrimination on religious grounds.

Yet, religious practice may go beyond faith as a personal matter. In fact, religious societies and communities may interfere in peoples’ lives and claim a right to regulate social existence and behaviour. A dominant religion in a country may claim precedence, and members of all other religions, no matter how numerous, find themselves in the position of minorities. It seems that human rights and minority protection legislation, is the most favourable way of coexistence.

Globalisation brings people closer for better or worse. The number of religions is increasing in Europe, and likewise the number of people who are active members. Respect for differences and equal rights do not seem to be enough to secure peaceful coexistence. Religion as a factor in behaviour and participation in society has become one of the puzzles that European countries are faced with. Recent historical events point out that matters that were previously approached as simply cultural aspects have broader significance and have become more vital and crucial. Understanding of religious factors seems to be one important basis for learning to live together. Knowledge about religions as a matter of democratic citizenship based on religious grounds has become a priority in the field of education.

In recent years, the Council of Europe has been actively involved in dealing with religions and religious issues as well as organised expert conferences and ministerial meetings on the subject. As a result of these works, recommendations on education and religion and a reference book for schools have been created.

In the current project, religion is seen as one dimension of socio-cultural diversity, and in particular the ways in which pre-service teacher training deals with the issue.

There are different approaches to religious diversity education in those countries. At a constitutional level in each of the countries, freedom of religious choice is inviolable. Every religion is protected and equally treated by the states, even if the relationship between states and religions differ.

Gender equality is a high priority in policy documents in many countries. Globally the problem of providing access to education for all is a major concern, and UNESCO has targeted the task of improving access for all, with a special emphasis on girls’ access. In a global perspective, the distribution of educational provisions is highly unbalanced from one region to another and between different countries throughout the world, and the distribution is, seen from a gender perspective, as unfavourable towards girls due to economic, structural and socio-cultural barriers. Gender is one of the socio-cultural diversity dimensions that is part of, and intertwined in, all other diversity dimensions, for example, ethnicity, religions and special needs. Its socio-cultural basis is documented by the different situations of girls and boys and men and women in different countries, localities and cultures and in historical times.

During the past thirty years major international political work has been invested in order to provide education for all (UNESCO). The field of special education has changed and, historically, identification of handicapped pupils has changed from a focus on disability, to a focus on special needs. The flagship for “Education for All”, which is a programme adopted
by most European countries, is intended to secure the rights to educational provisions for all children and young people globally, including those who used to be considered unable to learn and those with special needs. General human rights and international involvement have become stepping stones for changing views on disabilities, the terminology in use and educational practices.

In most European countries legislation has been put in place with the aim of integrating formerly segregated and institutionalised children and young people into ordinary schools or schools close to the children’s homes. Movement towards desegregation and active policies of inclusion have had implications for education and teacher education. Special education and special needs education has become part of most teacher education institutions, not only as a specialisation, but also gradually as part of the general curriculum of pre-service teacher education. The very movement entailed in increasing access for previously institutionalised pupils and the ways in which “special” categories and outlooks on handicapped people have changed to underscore the nature of handicaps and categorisation as “socio-cultural”. The same applies to the differences we find between the various ways in which countries and cultures are viewing and conceptualising handicaps and disability.

Conclusions

The approaches to difference differ across national borders. In fact it seems that there are different ways of dealing with different kinds of socially relevant differences, and there are systematic differences between the countries both in terms of how differences are looked upon and how they are dealt with, in society at large and in school.

While we have to enhance celebration of diversity and enhance tolerance and ways of living together in a pluralist society, it does not mean that all differences should be preserved and maintained. We may recognise diversity and treat all kinds of people with respect and dignity, including the poor, those who live in the streets, people who have committed crimes, but simultaneously make efforts to change peoples’ circumstances by fighting poverty, street life and crime. This is a profiled policy in most member states. In fact, many countries feel that society will gain from diversity in terms of exhausting the total range of human talents and creativity in order to bring about development.

Diversity in social settings implies the building up of trust, respect and recognition. This requires that teachers get knowledge that may form a basis for understanding diversity and skills that prepare them to deal with and manage socio-culturally diverse classrooms. Schools are seen as the ideal public places in which to disseminate democratic ideas and base them in our respective cultures in ways that can enhance or diminish socially created differences.

As all children and young people are part of the school system, this makes school an important arena for cultural and social exchange and learning. The school represents a common ground for sharing experiences in dealing with diversity and enhancing the situation of groups that are discriminated against. Furthermore, education is in most countries taken to be the single most important tool to fight inequalities and improve people’s future and standard of living. In a European perspective more emphasis has been placed on how education can be used as a vehicle for change in social practices both inside and outside schools.
Chapter 2

Summary of the results of the national reports on pre-service teacher training in socio-cultural diversity
1. Methodology

The ad hoc group appointed by the Steering Committee for Education defined the structure of the national reports, and then drew up a questionnaire elaborating on that structure. To make the results easier to understand, it is important for readers to always bear in mind that our study is confined to pre-service training of primary and lower secondary teachers, namely ISCED\(^2\) levels 1 and 2, so that only compulsory education is covered. In the presentation of findings below we shall refer to these two levels.

The structure adopted by the group is as follows:

**Part 1: Policies**

The aim in this part is to detail, for each country, the legislative or constitutional framework in which policy choices are made with regard to socio-cultural diversity in the education system.

**Part 2: Curricula/Programmes**

The aim here is to identify within pre-service teacher training programmes the content and activities deriving from the policies described in Part 1.

**Part 3: Teacher qualifications**

This part deals with how socio-cultural diversity is addressed in recruitment examinations for teachers and in the education system’s explicit expectations with regard to teachers.

**Part 4: Teacher training institutions**

The last part focuses on the institutions responsible for implementing these pre-service teacher training programmes and on teacher educators/trainers, again in terms of preparing future teachers for socio-cultural diversity.

The questionnaire, which is available in both French and English (see Appendix 1), was distributed to the member states in spring 2006.

2. Participating countries

This study is based on 16 reports:

---

2. International Standard Classification of Education, UNESCO.
The country codes are those specified in standard ISO 3166-1.

We do not have a national report for Belgium, only a report by the French Community of Belgium. However, although this is linguistically incorrect, we shall refer in this summary to the “16 participating countries” in order to simplify the drafting of our comments.

We received reports also from Germany, Denmark and Lithuania after the final deadline for submission of reports. They will be taken into consideration in the second, revised, version of this report.

3. Policies

3.1. At what level(s) are public policies on pre-service teacher training defined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISCED level 1</th>
<th>ISCED level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National level only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional level only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level + institutional level</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram showing the distribution of levels for ISCED level 1 and ISCED level 2.](image-url)
We can see that, with the exception of primary education (in two countries only), teacher training policies are always defined at a national level. It is interesting to note, however, that teacher training institutions are involved in defining these policies in over half the participating countries. This finding is no doubt related to the independent status of most higher education institutions, even in countries with a centralised education system.

At ISCED level 2, the national level is a stakeholder in the process in all the participating countries.

### 3.2. What types of diversity – if any – are addressed in public policy on pre-service teacher training?

| Types of diversity | Number of countries addressing them
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and linguistic diversity</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious minorities</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with special needs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtually all the participating countries address these different types of diversity in their education policy, except where the question of immigrants is concerned. This situation is all the more paradoxical in that immigration constitutes a social problem in most of the countries that do not address this type of diversity.

### 3.3. What type of approach is adopted?

This grid covers three ways of addressing diversity: teaching diversity, managing diversity and enhancing diversity. The meaning of these different approaches is explained in the table below.

| Types of approach | Number of countries adopting this approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching diversity</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching diversity implies all provisions that facilitate students to obtain knowledge and have insights of issues concerning diversity (i.e. linguistic diversity in Europe and its consequences for schools, human migration and consequences for multicultural societies, etc.).

---

3. The figures given in this table cover 15 countries because, in 2006, Sweden adopted new legislation on its education system which, at the time of the survey, was in the process of being implemented.

4. The figures given cover 15 countries (see previous footnote).
Managing diversity relates to all the programmes addressing attitudes, methods and skills in dealing with a diverse group of students (i.e. negotiation skills, conflict management, building mutual trust, living together, etc.).

Enhancing diversity means to go beyond knowing about or dealing with diversity; it implies the creation of conditions that value diversity and the development of an inclusive participative atmosphere, towards equal opportunities for all (i.e. affirmative action, empowerment, active citizenship, etc.).

Management of diversity is addressed in virtually all the participating countries. However, there is less of a consensus on the enhancement of diversity, which is understandable given that this aspect goes beyond simply knowing about diversity and is not on the same “practical” plane as the everyday management of diversity. It is interesting to note that, geographically and politically, the four countries concerned⁵ are very diverse.

4. Curricula/programmes

4.1. Who is in charge of defining the curricula/programmes for pre-service teacher training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISCED level 1</th>
<th>ISCED level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National level only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional level only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level + institutional level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community level + institutional level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Cyprus, Estonia, France and Greece.
The institutions involved in drawing up programmes are, depending on the country, either the training institutions themselves, or one or more local universities, or both categories.

Comparing these figures with those obtained in section 3.1 (At what level(s) are public policies on pre-service teacher training defined?), we find a very significant increase in the role of institutions, especially at ISCED level 1, which is understandable given that they are responsible for implementing them. One might also reiterate what was said in section 3.1 about the independence of higher education institutions.

4.2. **Is there a centralised curriculum? If not, are there common elements present in the education of teachers throughout the country? Indicate which ones, if any**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully centralised curriculum</td>
<td>7 + 1 for level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula with common elements</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No centralised curriculum</td>
<td>2 + 1 for level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The great majority of countries exhibit a degree of uniformity in curricula. Countries fall into two blocs: those with a greater tradition of centralisation, with a single curriculum, and the more decentralised countries, lacking a single curriculum.

4.3. **Are there recent changes/reforms that have impacted on pre-service teacher training? If so, describe them briefly**

Apart from one country, all underwent changes or reforms around the start of the new century or are in the process of implementing them.

The adjustment of European education systems to the Bologna Process involves changes in curricula and in the organisation of teaching, or indeed in structures.

4.4. **Socio-cultural diversity in the curriculum/programme for pre-service teacher training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach</th>
<th>Number of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching diversity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing diversity</td>
<td>13 + 1 for level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Based on 15 countries (see section 3.2).
Teaching and managing diversity are included in the curricula of virtually all countries. Enhancing diversity is also very present as this type of approach is addressed in over half the participating countries. These findings are consistent with those of section 3.3.

4.5. Since what year has the current curriculum/programme of pre-service teacher training been used?

Thirteen of the 16 countries use a training programme introduced in the new century. This finding is interesting because this period of change coincides with some major events: changes of political regime, changes in migration patterns and in host countries, recognition of minorities (linguistic, cultural, and religious) and of their place in society.7

4.6. Is any evaluation of the results of its implementation available? If so, what are the main results obtained?

Only three countries say that there is no evaluation and two countries evaluate only one of the two ISCED levels considered here. One might regret that the other countries do not monitor changes in curricula by carrying out evaluations.

In two countries there are results which have a bearing on socio-cultural diversity. In one, the results are positive, particularly as regards the question of pupils with special needs. In the other, at ISCED level 2, teachers are calling for a stepping up of training on managing diversity and support for persons with special needs.

4.7. Is any curriculum/programme being prepared to replace the present one? If so, what are the main predicted changes?

As most of the countries have relatively recent programmes, it is understandable that few changes are expected.

5. Teacher qualification

5.1. Which part of the teacher’s professional qualification deals with diversity issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Curriculum requirements</th>
<th>Practical experience</th>
<th>Specific courses</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. See also Council of Europe conventions.
Apart from credits, all the other categories are extensively mentioned. It will be noted that normative approaches figure prominently.

Estonia has an official standard for the qualification of teachers.

### 5.2. What are the requirements regarding the qualification above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compulsory</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Free&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both ISCED levels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level ISCED 1 only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level ISCED 2 only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two thirds of the participating countries say that these elements of training are compulsory (even more if ISCED level 1 is taken into consideration).

The total is greater than 16 because some countries say that some of these elements are compulsory and others optional and tick both boxes.

### 5.3. In what way is this kind of qualification – dealing with diversity issues – integrated in the current curriculum/programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interdisciplinary modules</th>
<th>Special modules</th>
<th>Within general subjects</th>
<th>Within disciplinary modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both levels ISCED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level ISCED 1 only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level ISCED 2 only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be shown that the proportion of interdisciplinary modules is relatively small. This may be due to the fact that, in universities, few courses are interdisciplinary.

In practice, there are three types of course addressing socio-cultural diversity issues:

---

8. It is conceivable that the term “credits” was not as clear to the drafters of the reports as the other categories and that, given the uncertainty, they preferred not to choose it.

9. The difference between “optional” and “free” should probably have been explained.
– modules which include them in disciplinary content;
– special modules (mono-disciplinary);
– interdisciplinary modules.

More of the last category would be needed because they are the only ones that allow an overview of socio-cultural diversity.

5.4. **In training for diversity, what target profile is established for future teachers with regard to diversity across study disciplines?**

No significant replies.\(^{10}\)

5.5. **How is training for diversity recognised in the official certification of teachers?**

Six countries say that training for diversity is not recognised in the certification of teachers. There are therefore countries which make this training compulsory but which do not take it into account for certification purposes.\(^{11}\)

Of the nine countries which gave a positive reply to this question, five said that recognition is the same as for traditional subjects, while in the other four, recognition takes the form of a mention in the description appended to the diploma.\(^{12}\)

The issue of the recognition of this type of training is important from the point of view of the students and their motivation. Education systems should at least ensure symbolic academic recognition, especially where social recognition is not yet established.

6. **Teacher training institutions**

6.1. **Which institutions are in charge of pre-service teacher training?**

Training is mainly provided in universities (particularly for ISCED level 2) and higher education institutions, even for ISCED level 1. It usually follows the tradition of the particular education system.

---

\(^{10}\) Roughly one report writer out of every two fails to answer this question and the other appears to give it a meaning other than that intended by the authors of the questionnaire. With hindsight, we preferred to cancel this question rather than try and analyse the replies received.

\(^{11}\) In their replies to question 5.2, 11 countries say that this training is compulsory.

\(^{12}\) No doubt following the recommendations of the Bologna Process.
6.2. What curriculum/programme is used in this category of institutions?

Depending on the status of training institutions, the programme used is either the common (national) programme or the programme drawn up within the institution itself, usually in a manner consistent with the rules laid down at national level and the independence of higher education institutions.

6.3. Are any evaluation procedures established for regular assessment of this category of institutions?

Of the 15 countries that answered this question, 12 have an evaluation of this kind and two are preparing one. This evaluation usually forms an integral part of the accreditation renewal procedure.\(^{13}\)

Some evaluations explicitly involve both students and teachers.

6.4. In this category of institutions how are teacher educators/trainers prepared for teaching diversity issues?

Individual research comes top with 13 countries for both ISCED levels, and two countries for one level only. However, we do not have enough information to determine the extent to which this research is supported financially by the institution or the government.

Specialised courses come second with eight countries for both ISCED levels, plus one country for one level only.

Two countries failed to answer this question.

6.5. In this category of institutions is such preparation for teacher educators/trainers to teach diversity issues compulsory or optional?

This preparation is for the most part optional (nine countries for both levels plus one country for level 2) and is compulsory in five countries only (plus one for level 1). One country says that this preparation is “free” and two countries do not answer the question at all.

7. Key findings

– Virtually all the participating countries incorporate socio-cultural diversity issues into their educational policy (at ISCED levels 1 and 2).

– The same pattern is found in teacher training curricula.

\(^{13}\) In the context of the Bologna Process and quality assurance in higher education, such evaluation procedures linked to accreditation are supported in a declaration by the European education ministers (Bergen, 2005).
Teacher training institutions play an important role, in conjunction with government, in defining curricula, but also, more surprisingly, in defining national policies (on teacher training).

The patterns are not as clear when it comes to the requirements for future teachers, evaluation of the relevant competences or recognition of prior learning in the field of socio-cultural diversity.

Trainers responsible for teaching diversity are trained mainly through optional individual research.
Appendices – Detailed results

3. Policies

3.1. At what level(s) are public policies on pre-service teacher training defined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Level 1 = I</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Romania*</td>
<td>N + I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Level 1 = I</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>N + I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = national level, I = institutional level.

* Romania mentions the involvement of the regional level, but this is more an implementation than a policy-making level.

3.2. What types of diversity – if any – are addressed in public policy on pre-service teacher training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of diversity</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and linguistic diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious minorities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with special needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (to be)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Mixed ability" *
3.3. What type of approach is adopted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sweden: According to the Act Prohibiting Discrimination and other Degrading Treatment of Children and School Students (2006:67), issued on 16 February 2006, the purpose of this Act is to promote equal rights for children and school students and to combat discrimination on grounds of sex, ethnic origin, religion or other belief, sexual orientation or disability. This Act also has the purpose of combating other degrading treatment. This Act is applicable to education and other activities and referred to in the Education Act (1985:1100). The institutions should develop various courses that correspond to the intentions of the reform as expressed in the Higher Education Ordinance and travaux préliminaires. Therefore it is not possible to give one answer to what is actually taught.

4. Curricula/programmes

4.1. Who is in charge of defining the curricula/programmes for pre-service teacher training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Level 1:</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Level 1:</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>N + I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Level 2:</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (French Community)</td>
<td>C* + I</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>N + I</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C = community level.
4.2. Is there a centralised curriculum? If not, are there common elements present in the education of teachers throughout the country? Indicate which ones, if any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>No common curriculum but a reference framework</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No common curriculum but co-ordination between the different bodies responsible for curricula and their implementation, to promote common attitudes and “pillars” between the 2 levels</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Level 1: yes Level 2: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (French Community)</td>
<td>Level 1: 120 hrs at the discretion of training institutions – remainder common Level 2: 30% institutions – 70% common</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>No centralised curriculum but common themes (such as school practice or subject didactics)</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Level 1: Common subjects (e.g. in pedagogics and psychology) Level 2: common framework only</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Yes, in the form of national specifications for pre-service teacher training common to primary, secondary and vocational education. New national specifications are expected for late 2006</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>No common curriculum but common elements with similar</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Yes, like all university programmes</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Nothing centralised, but content must guarantee the acquisition of professional, Ukraine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3 Are there recent changes/reforms that have impacted on pre-service teacher training? If so, describe them briefly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2000 and 2003</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2004 report recommending pre-service teacher training at university</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2005/06 reform of pre-service training for primary teachers</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2005-06 new curriculum for pre-service teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Re-organisation of training to bring it into line with the Bologna Process</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2003 New curricula for compulsory training</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Re-organisation of training to bring it into line with the Bologna Process</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Reform in progress since 2002 linked with the Bologna Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Socio-cultural diversity in the curriculum/programme for pre-service teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sweden: According to the Act Prohibiting Discrimination and other Degrading Treatment of Children and School Students (2006:67), issued on 16 February 2006, the purpose of this Act is to promote equal rights for children and school students and to combat discrimination on grounds of sex, ethnic origin, religion or other belief, sexual orientation or disability. This Act also has the purpose of combating other degrading treatment. This Act is applicable to Education and other activities and referred to in the Education Act (1985:1100). The institutions should develop various courses that correspond to the intentions of the reform as expressed in the Higher Education Ordinance and travaux préliminaires. Therefore it is not possible to give one answer to what is actually taught.

4.5. Since what year has the current curriculum of pre-service teacher training been used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Greece: there is no national curriculum and no information is available because each university can modify its curriculum without state supervision.
4.6.  Is any evaluation of the results of its implementation available? If so, what are the main results obtained?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Evaluation available in some places. Positive results for teacher training on the question of pupils with special needs and the modularisation of practical studies</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Level 1: evaluation conducted in 2000 conclusion: programme of a high standard, but some areas over-emphasised Level 2: no official evaluation, but survey among teachers (2002-04) Conclusion: moderate satisfaction – need for more emphasis on managing diversity and on supporting persons with special needs</td>
<td>Luxembourgh</td>
<td>Level 1: no evaluation; reform too recent Level 2: unpublished internal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (French Communit y)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Since 2005 evaluation of the competences of newly qualified teachers in relation to the “Teacher Professional Standard”</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Audit report in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Yes, but mainly on the acquisition of knowledge</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Regular evaluations in each teacher training institute, but no national overview</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Evaluation report to be published shortly. Interim report in 2005 with no result on diversity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Evaluation by students started, but no public results</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>No, but accreditation granted for limited time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Audit report in 2005</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted in 2005 but reform too recent to obtain reliable results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Regular evaluations in each teacher training institute, but no national overview</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>Evaluation report to be published shortly. Interim report in 2005 with no result on diversity issues</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>No evaluation results. Many new departments and faculties. Still many crucial problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>No, but accreditation granted for limited time</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted by the Ministry of Education and Science in 2006. Result: the communicative approach to language teaching has had a positive effect on students’ abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7. Is any curriculum/programme being prepared in order to replace the present one? If so, what are the main predicted changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Level 1 = no</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Level 1 = no, Level 2 = permanent working party</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Reform in progress in most institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2 = reform recently carried out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (French Community)</td>
<td>Responsibility of each institution</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Ongoing process of improvement</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>No information available</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Expected late 2006</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>New programmes in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>No, but changes linked to social and professional needs</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Teacher qualification

5.1. Which part of the teacher’s professional qualification deals with diversity issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical experience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Greece:** Universities offer courses dealing with diversity, however they do not form a compulsory element. This means that only some qualified teachers have studied diversity at university.

**Sweden:** The institutions should develop various courses that correspond to the intentions of the reform as expressed in the Higher Education Ordinance and travaux préliminaires. All students, both primary and secondary level, study the general education areas as a start in the teacher training programme.

### 5.2. What are the requirements regarding the qualification above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Le vel 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* France: These elements may be compulsory or optional, depending on the particular case.
** Greece: At present the issue of diversity does not form a compulsory element of pre-service teacher training.

### 5.3. In what way is this kind of qualification – dealing with diversity issues – integrated into the current curriculum/programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>G R</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary modules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special modules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within general subjects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within disciplinary modules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Le vel 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Greece: no reply.
** Sweden: The institutions should develop various courses that correspond to the intentions of the reform as expressed in the Higher Education Ordinance and travaux préliminaires. All students, both primary and secondary level, study the general education areas as a start in the teacher training programme. There are 29 institutions over the country that organise teacher training programmes and they choose how to teach about diversities, either interdisciplinary, or in special modules.
5.4. **In training for diversity, what target profile is established for future teachers concerning diversity across study disciplines?**

No significant replies.

5.5. **How is training for diversity recognised in the official certification of teachers?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Yes, in the wording of the supplement to the diploma</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Yes, in the wording of the supplement to the diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (French Community)</td>
<td>Yes, because it is a compulsory subject</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Yes, because this forms part of the professional standard</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Yes, in the wording of the supplement to the diploma</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Yes, mentioned in the annex to the diploma</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Yes, in subject content, in management of diverse school populations and in certifications relating to pupils with special needs</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Yes, because it is a subject in its own right (&quot;Socio-cultural diversity&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Teacher training institutions

6.1. Which institutions are in charge of pre-service teacher training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Level 1: Colleges of education/regional teacher training colleges/Low 2: Colleges of education/regional teacher training colleges/universities</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Level 1: Department of Education of the University of Cyprus/Level 2: Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus (Ministry of Education and Culture)</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>University of Luxembourg and universities in other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (French Community)</td>
<td>Hautes Ecoles (pedagogical sections)</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>In six universities and Tallinn Pedagogical Seminary</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Faculty of Education of the University of Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Higher schools, universities</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>In the 31 university teacher training institutes (IUFM)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Universities and university colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Level 1: Academies, higher schools/Level 2: Universities (pedagogy faculties in particular)</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Level 1: colleges and university faculties/Level 2: Teacher training departments</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. What curriculum/programme is used in this category of institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Curriculum/Programme</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Curriculum/Programme</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Curriculum/Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Programmes published by boards of education</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>See detailed programme</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Programme specific to the University of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.3. Are any evaluation procedures established for regular assessment of this category of institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular evaluation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Y = Yes, N = No.
** CR: No, but in preparation.
** TU: in progress.

### 6.4. In this category of institutions, how are teacher educators/trainers prepared for teaching diversity issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>G R</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>N O</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>R O</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Le vel 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Le vel 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Le vel 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5. In this category of institutions is such preparation for teacher educators/trainers to teach diversity issues compulsory or optional?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Le vel 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

Summary of the results of the interviews on pre-service teacher training in socio-cultural diversity
1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to illustrate, through real examples, the reality of the situation with regard to teacher training in socio-cultural diversity, as it appears from examination of the national reports. The examples of “good practice” may also provide ideas for further recommendations.

The study is based on semi-guided interviews conducted in teacher training institutions, across three separate groups using three different questionnaires. For each institution, we asked that, as far as possible, the interviews involve:

– an academic manager;
– a few teacher trainers;
– some teachers who had left the institution two or three years earlier.

2. Participating institutions

The participating countries were asked to choose the teacher training institutions where the interviews would be conducted.

To help them choose, we suggested that they use the following criteria:

– include any geographical areas that are distinctive in terms of social context or diversity;
– include at least one institution that trains both primary and lower secondary teachers (ISCED levels 1 and 2). If there are no such institutions, select one of each kind;
– consider institutions that have specific activities related to diversity;
– take account of the size, status (state-run/private) and location (urban/suburban/rural, central/local);
– to avoid overlap, refrain from choosing two institutions that have similar features in relation to the above criteria;
– choose a maximum of five institutions.

We asked the participating countries to explain their choice.14

The following table contains a list of the 26 institutions concerned.

14. This information can be found in the appendix together with all the completed questionnaires. In the case of Malta, teacher training is provided by a single institution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Pädagogische Akademie des Bundes (Carinthie)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bulgaria  | Plovdiv University “Paisii Hilendarski”  
Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen  
Sofia University “St. Kl. Ohridski”  
South-West University “Neofit Rilski” |
| Croatia   | Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Zagreb  
Teacher Faculty in Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Zagreb  
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Rijeka, Pula |
| Cyprus    | Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus  
University of Cyprus, Department of Education |
| Estonia   | University of Tartu, Department of Education  
Teacher Training College of University of Tartu  
Tallinn Pedagogical University  
Tartu University Narva College |
| Lithuania | Vilnius Pedagogical University  
Klaipėda University  
Šiauliai University |
| Malta     | University of Malta, Faculty of Education |
| Norway    | Oslo University College, Faculty of Education  
Telemark University College, Faculty of Teacher Education, Notodden |
| Romania   | West University of Timisoara  
Petroleum-Gas University, Ploiesti  
National School of Political and Administrative Studies in Bucharest |
| Turkey    | Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education in Ankara  
Marmara University, Ataturk Faculty of Education in Istanbul  
Ataturk University, Education Faculty of Kazım Karabekir in Erzurum |

### 3. Breakdown of interviews

The present summary is based on the questionnaires, distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Academic managers</th>
<th>Teacher trainers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romania  1  6  6  
Turkey   1  2  3  
Ukraine  0  0  0  
Total    22  61  59  

4. Interviews with academic managers

Of the 22 academic managers interviewed, two thirds were directors of education or deans and the rest were heads of department or equivalent.

Half of the institutions had no formal policy on socio-cultural diversity. The respondents did nevertheless give several examples of practical decisions connected with the subject. For instance:

– The UOM is committed to provide free tertiary education for those who have the required qualifications. This certainty is an advantage for students who cannot afford to pay, however free students’ access to university courses is limited to those having a Maltese nationality. (MT)

– Recruitment of students and staff with a variety of backgrounds. (NO)

Among those which profit from such policy, some concrete examples are presented:

– Because of the bilingual situation in Carinthia, our college has a special focus on training bilingual teachers and team teachers working in bilingual (Slovene-German) classes. (AT)

– In the Faculty of Pedagogics and the Faculty of Philology, there are students of different ethnic minorities, and they are educated via special strategies. Recently, the university has been the host of three big conferences related to socio-cultural diversity. (BG)

– The university has a special policy towards the students from different minority group backgrounds. For example, in the recent past years a centre for advanced research of multiethnic relations was established. … In addition, for the academic 2002-03 entrance exam campaign, a new project under the title “Equal access to higher education” has been launched to meet the goals of the university’s policy. The aim of this project is to give opportunities to young people of Roma origin to continue their studies in a higher education institution. (BG)

– In our university there is a centre for intercultural dialogue and integration…. its main aim(s): to work for the mutual knowledge of cultures and development of the intercultural dialogue on the Balkans, Europe and worldwide in the spheres of science, education, culture and arts. (BG)
Describing their institution’s student recruitment policy in relation to socio-cultural diversity, the academic managers gave practical examples, relating to several types of diversity:

– In their admission to the university disabled people are assigned to a special list. Free pre-examination courses are organised for orphans and Roma children. (BG)

– There is also a supporting programme (scholarships and single money assistance) for disabled students and students with insufficient incomes. (BG)

– (HR)

– Students with limited (Estonian) language skills can obtain special training in their language of instruction (one year) which is financed by university. There are special scholarships for students with rural backgrounds (directed funds “Arno Tali”) and also study allowance for low-income students. There are specific grants for foreign students (Finno-Ugric nationalities) in order to support their studies at the University of Tartu. For local ethnic minorities there is a special teacher training college in Narva (Narva College of the University of Tartu) where the language of instruction is Russian. (EE)

– Special recruitment programmes targeting male applicants, especially to early childhood education. (NO)

– As a measure for positive discrimination, we offer each year a number of free tax places for Roma students. (RO)

Almost none of the institutions had a specific recruitment policy for teacher trainers in relation to socio-cultural diversity. One exception was Norway:

– According to the central recruitment policy regarding teacher education, persons with ethnic and/or linguistic minority backgrounds are encouraged to apply. (NO)

The managers did, however, provide information about their staff:

– The bilingual situation in the province of Carinthia is also reflected in the teacher trainer population of our college; as mentioned above, however, the difference is purely a linguistic and not really a socio-cultural one. (AT)

– About 10% of the lecturers are of different ethnical belonging. There are Turkish, Roma, Armenians, Russians, Ukrainians, Moldavians. (BG)

– Faculty staff reflects some basic characteristics of the country’s population in terms of cultural diversity, although there has been no policy in that regard. (HR)

– Dominantly ethnic Norwegians with a few exceptions. (NO)

– Generally, there is an equitable report between the cultural diversity of the country and our staff, except for the fact that Roma citizens are not represented. (RO)

Socio-cultural diversity skills are not, in fact, a consideration in the recruitment process.
A common feature of all the institutions, without exception, is that the teacher trainers are not assessed in relation to socio-cultural diversity.

All the institutions, except one, have teacher trainers who specialise in socio-cultural diversity. For example:

– Some ten of our teacher trainers have been involved in UNICEF’s projects aimed at improvement of human rights, tolerance and coexistence. (HR)

– There is a working group of three people who are dealing with diversity issues (language minorities and models of minority education, intercultural communication, and teachers’ attitudes towards teaching in multicultural classrooms). They teach the relevant courses/topics and carry out research in this field. (EE)

– Two professionals specialising in cultural theory plus educational theory. One senior lecturer specialising in gender issues. One lecturer specialising in feminist philosophy. Two senior lecturers in psychology specialising in inclusive education. Three senior lecturers specialising in language plus diversity issues. (MT)

– A specialist in Norwegian as a second language is involved in teacher education with emphasis on minority language and multicultural groups. One of the teacher trainers giving courses in pedagogy has specialised in multicultural issues by devoting his research to such issues. (NO)

In almost all the institutions, the trainers who teach diversity issues undergo preparation for this purpose.

When it comes to monitoring alumni, the situation varies. A few institutions have specific arrangements in this area, the rest leave it up to individual students and/or teacher trainers.

– Students’ council supports a club for alumni, who can also visit a special forum on the university website. (BG)

– Neither the educational institutions nor alumni themselves are obliged to stay in mutual contact. Many alumni stay in contact with the faculty. Furthermore, quite a few even actively participate in in-service seminars, workshops and similar activities. Some of the alumni serve as mentors in their schools to the current students. (HR)

– Not formally, by keeping contact with their tutors or by participating in the seminars the institute offers in the afternoons – the teachers can participate on a voluntary basis. (CY)

– The newly qualified teachers are tutored by mentors who are at the same time partners of university. (EE)

– After becoming teachers, our ex-students return to the department to prepare themselves for these exams that the teaching carrier implies (…). They also follow the continuing education of teacher trainers that our department organises. Attendance at continuing education programmes every five years is compulsory. (RO)
5. Interviews with teacher trainers

The 61 respondents are mainly experienced trainers with an average of nine years’ service. Most teach languages, literature or linguistics. Others teach pedagogy or didactics while a few teach psychology or art subjects.

Almost all the respondents said they incorporated socio-cultural diversity in their courses and that they had undergone preparation for this purpose. Such preparation was optional and mainly took the form of individual research or specialised courses.

These teacher trainers address diversity issues according to the three approaches suggested in the questionnaire – teaching, managing, enhancing – in descending order, mainly within disciplinary modules, but sometimes in other ways as well: within general subjects, in special courses or interdisciplinary courses.

In response to the question “Do you think such training meets the students’ needs in their teaching profession?” half of the respondents said they thought it did. The rest were divided, more or less 50/50, between those who thought it met some of the needs and those who thought it met them to an insufficient degree or not at all.

Most of the respondents thought that their institutions did not have specific provisions on socio-cultural diversity for pre-service teacher training. Others, however, gave examples of such provisions:

– Our lesson plans were well designed, and they have sufficient numbers of classes for practicum and observations in multicultural schools and schools with children from various social groups. (BG)

– Supplies and information databases are very important: ready access to book stock and Internet; specialised schools and kindergartens where there are children from different cultures, school for children with special needs, the house of children with disabilities, day care centre for children with disabilities – where students go to observation classes, current practicum, summer schools, practicum for the state examinations; a training logopedic office. (BG)

– Improving physical facilities and learning infrastructure (web Braille letters) for disabled students. (HR)

– Multicultural teaching is of high priority and is part of the strategic plan of the university college. (NO)

As far as monitoring alumni is concerned, the teacher trainers believed this was done on an individual basis – mainly by the students themselves – rather than under some specific arrangement. There were, however, some examples of successful formal monitoring of this kind:

– Meetings are held on a regular basis during observation and training practice at educational institutions. (BG)
The institution has a particular programme that provides new teachers with a follow-up/school counselling. It has now been running for three years, and has been evaluated with a very positive outcome. (NO)

Regarding teacher trainers’ needs in relation to socio-cultural diversity, some examples follow:

– Firstly, we need various training and administration support at all levels; secondly, there is a need for separate financial support for training improvement; and thirdly, continuous work on research and scientific projects in the field of diversity and tolerance. (BG)

– There is a serious need for more specialised learning (on cultural diversity) for development of pedagogical problem-solving skills in such a type situation. Currently, training here is “superficial”, so to speak. It is vital for teachers to become susceptible to cross-cultural education and put it into practice. Now – we are going to extremes (nothing’s being done – we’re doing the best we can). (BG)

– I think that we have a need for teacher co-operation since scientific research is mostly individual and teachers should be trained through teamwork. Another option is to build links through electronic conferences and virtual seminars in co-operation with other and foreign universities. There is an idea for a postgraduate studies centre for academic teachers. (BG)

– (HR)

– What could be done from the management, is to actively encourage and support research on diversity issues. (HR)

6. Interviews with teachers

The following findings are based on replies from 34 teachers who received training in socio-cultural diversity as part of their pre-service training.

Half of them left the training institution 3 years ago. The average is 2.5 years.

Two thirds are level 1 (ISCED) teachers.

Regarding the different approaches to diversity encountered during their training, “teaching diversity” comes first (32), followed by “managing diversity” (22) and “enhancing diversity” (17).

Two thirds of the respondents said they were assessed on this content.

When asked to rate the training received in relation to their work as teachers, giving it marks between 0 and 5, where 0 = “useless” and 5 = “very useful”, they expressed moderate satisfaction with “teaching diversity”, which scored 3.6 on average, but gave lower average marks for “managing” (3.0) and “enhancing” (3.1).
In their work as teachers, almost everyone said they had encountered at least one situation related to socio-cultural diversity. For example:

- In the last class I had to teach there were 12 children with Serbian/Bosnian/Croatian parents. There were in total more children with Serbian/Bosnian/Croatian parents than children with parents from Austria or other countries, so it was kind of normal, they were so to say the leaders of the class. But the other children seemed not to care about that, it was okay. (AT)

- I remember a Roma girl to whom the rest of the children had initial prejudices, however they changed to her when time passed. I also have some students from Turkish ethnical belonging who are extremely hardworking, they are very modest and have excellent marks, the rest of the children accept them very well. However there is a major problem: because many Roma children speak in their mother tongue the result is that not only students but teachers too cannot understand them. (BG)

- I teach both Christian and Muslim children, children belonging to three ethnical groups – Bulgarians, Turkish and Roma. The majority of my students are Roma and the major difficulties I have with them are that they cannot read or write, thus they cannot assimilate their lessons and they don’t make any effort to cope with these problems. (BG)

- Students belonging to religious and ethnic minorities (Muslim, Orthodox and Roma), and students with special needs in education. (HR)

- Mostly I encounter children with some degree of mentally retarded, dysfunctional behaviour and Down’s syndrome. (HR)

- Problematic situations in my classroom: adaptation of students from a rural background, students from poor families (low SES status), students with a native tongue other than Estonian, students from religious families. (EE)

- I had children from irregular immigrants with different cultures, religions, languages. (MT)

- I am working in a school where 30% of the children come from a linguistic minority background, some of them were born in Norway, and others are newly arrived in Norway. This means that I encounter such situations every day, all the time. (NO)

Two thirds of the respondents had observed situations that indicated problems between students (or between students and staff). For example:

- I observed a boy trying to hurt another guy, by telling him, he shall go back to Africa, where his father is from and that it is shit there. (AT)

- The Roma children lack motivation for studying and the only reason they attend school is for their parents to receive financial support from the government. (BG)
- Unfortunately the majority of students/pupils tend to isolate Roma ones, and the latter tend to stand aside. (HR)

- We had once two sisters from Russia who could not get used to the way of life and school life in Cyprus. They were political refugees and felt that they received hate. They hit the teachers, they did not participate in the class, neither did they or their parents speak the language and they had feelings of inferiority. (CY)

- I have however observed situations that indicate problems between students. There’s a group of four girls (all native Russian speakers) in our eighth grade who have excluded themselves from the rest of the class. They don’t communicate with any of their Estonian (i.e. monolingual Estonians) classmates. These girls are also known for bullying their non-Russian classmates. (EE)

- Children with a different colour find it difficult to integrate with Maltese children. (MT)

- I have observed situations where a teacher has been physically attacked by a pupil. (NO)

- Somali children have been subjected to bullying. An ethnic Norwegian girl was not accepted by her classmates of other origin that live in the same neighbourhoud during her free time. (NO)

When these teachers were asked whether their pre-service training had helped them to deal with situations of the kind mentioned above, giving marks between 0 and 5, where 0 = “It did not help me at all” and 5 = “It helped me a lot”, the average was 2.6, and the comments suggest that the practical training received was inadequate.

All the teachers, except one, said they received help in their institution, from colleagues, educationalists, psychologists, language specialists, social workers, nurses, managerial staff, and so on. They also received help from their former pre-service training institutions.

When asked whether they were aware of existing legislation on socio-cultural diversity in their country, more than half of the teachers replied “yes, but not enough” and one third “yes, enough”.

7. Proposed changes to pre-service teacher training in socio-cultural diversity

In terms of curricula (content and skills):

- My suggestion is that there are more obligated courses for the students. We just had to follow for one semester one course of two hours per week and that is not enough. (AT)

- Part of the school experience should be in schools that deal with socio-cultural diversity. Besides examples of good practice policies on managing and enhancing diversity should be included in the programme of study and there should be a continuation when our trainees are appointed to a job. There should be close co-operation with schools to
“coach” novice teachers and keep in touch with and extend their training on a “solution-oriented” programme. (CY)

– (...) the need to implement the policy of socio-cultural education in Lithuania’s education policy which could acknowledge the needs of national minorities, i.e. preserve the essential elements of ethno-cultural identity such as language, cultural heritage, customs and religion; social exclusion and social risk groups could also be identified more easily. (LT)

– .CY

– We have a content-based and not a skill-based diversity in educational programmes. (CY)

– The intercultural/multicultural dimension should be one of the components in every subject didactics course (for example how to teach science for religious pupils/for boys and girls, etc). (EE)

– More consistency and connection between theory and practice in the field, with more direct contact between the university college and schools. (NO)

– New specific subjects (RO):
  (a) civic attitude within affirmative discriminations;
  (b) central and eastern European borders and cultural co-operation process;
  (c) intercultural governance;
  (d) corporative citizenship in multicultural societies
  (e) more practical workshops dealing with diversities. (HR)

– The training programme at the pedagogical institute could have an interdisciplinary character… (CY)

– At university, apart from the theoretical background, we should have also had “practical” issues and sessions or talks with experts (e.g. doctors dealing with special needs) to obtain more knowledge on how to deal with different cases. Moreover, as regards psychology and methodology of teaching sessions – there should be teaching on how you approach “diversity” and how to teach diverse people. (CY)

– Students need more hands-on experience in their training. (MT)

– There is a need for really implementing a multicultural perspective in all subjects and courses, and for enhancing bilingualism/plurilingualism and valuing diversity in general. Managing diversity (practical training, techniques) should be given more emphasis. (NO)

– To bridge the gap between theory and practice I suggest one year of guided practical training, as a compulsory part of teacher education. (NO)

– Because the number of Roma pupils is increasing, it will be useful, in my opinion to teach the future teachers how to approach and how to solve the problems that may appear. (RO)
In terms of how teacher training institutions operate:

– Improving recruitment policy recruiting teacher trainers to reflect socio-cultural spectrum. (MT)

– I would like to have training the moment I get in the school and I face the problems and the different issues of diversity. (...) At university you see things from a theoretical point of view… it is very difficult to understand at the time what real life in school is… (CY)

– It would be good to visit schools with diverse student bodies or gain practice (supervision and teaching) in those classrooms/schools. Also study tours to foreign countries and exchange of experiences would be useful. (EE)

In terms of exchanges and mobility:

– International exchange of teacher trainers and intercultural training. (HR)

In terms of support and advice:

– It would be good to have a centre for multicultural counselling where teacher trainers, school leaders, teachers, students and parents are consulted by university specialists in this field. (EE)
Chapter 4

Conclusions and recommendations
In this fourth chapter we may find some statements, recommendations and implications for action that emerge from the data analysis on phase 1. The data collected allow us to identify four fields for decision-making and action on teacher training:

- Declarations, recommendations and other legal texts on education, cultural diversity and teacher training by international organisations;
- National and regional teacher training policies;
- Teacher training institutions;
- Main agents: trainers and pre-service teacher training students.

The data collected allow us to identify three dynamics of relation among these fields and their elements:

- Link to “influence”: Some elements of a higher level have a direct impact on some elements of a lower level.
- Link to “tension”: Some elements within a level become closely related to some other elements as the modification of one may directly affect the modification of others.
- Link to “opposition”: Some elements within a level are directly opposite to some other elements.

The content of this chapter is organised around these four fields and the dynamics they set up among them. First of all, we introduce a section with some conclusions that we identify throughout the data analysis. Secondly, we provide a section with some recommendations related to these conclusions, and some implications for action that can be developed from a national perspective in a short-term period of three years.

Both conclusions and recommendations have been structured in order ranging from the more global to the more local and then personal issues. This can become helpful in setting up a framework of coherence and creating a strategy. The main aim remains to promote decisions and actions to change the negative aspects and reinforce the positive ones that were found in Chapters 2 and 3, in order to move closer to the framework defined in Chapter 1.
Conclusions

International level – legal framework

The legal literature on education, cultural diversity and teacher education is clear about the relationship among these three elements. Directly or indirectly, all international organisations share the need to provide high quality education for all students, focusing especially on target groups that run the risk of exclusion (e.g. ethnic minorities), spreading the value of cultural diversity in a global world and recognising the relevant status of teachers and the importance of excellence in teacher training to achieve both goals.

We propose to summarise the key contents on education, cultural diversity and teacher education that have been stated by the Council of Europe, the European Union and UNESCO during recent years.

Council of Europe

The Council of Europe links education with cultural diversity and teacher training in two main declarations. The first one, on cultural diversity, adopted in December 2000, declares that “Education, training of professionals and users of new services, and reinforcement of cultural and audiovisual production are notable factors in the promotion of cultural diversity”. Despite the fact that it is mainly inspired by the needs in the cultural industry, there is a clear intention of relating education, cultural diversity and teacher training.

However, the most important document approved by this organisation is the declaration outlined by the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, entitled...
“Intercultural education: managing diversity, strengthening democracy” (Athens, November 2003). In this declaration, the Council of Europe is called “to focus its work programme on enhancing the quality of education as a response to the challenges posed by the diversity of our societies by making democracy, learning and intercultural education key components of educational reform”. To achieve this challenge and others, this standing conference requests, among other recommendations, to:

– set up efforts in the area of content of learning methods and teaching aids, in order to provide the member states with examples of educational tools making it possible to take the intercultural dimension of curricula into account;

– encourage the member states to introduce the intercultural dimension in their education policies, in order to enable appropriate consideration of dialogue between cultures;

– strengthen intercultural education and management of diversity within its programme of in-service training for education staff and encourage member states to contribute to that programme by organising seminars on topics directly linked to the aims of this declaration;

– devise and promote work methodologies that are suitable to integrate into states’ own initial and in-service training programmes the principles of non-discrimination, pluralism and equity;

– develop educational strategies and working methods to prepare teachers to manage new situations arising in our schools as a result of discrimination, racism, xenophobia, sexism and marginalisation and to resolve conflicts in a non-violent way;

– encourage the development of professional competencies for the teaching profession, taking account of skills existing within a team linked to the roles of learning facilitator, mediator, counsellor, partner and human resources manager.

**European Union**

The European Union is also an international institution which has demonstrated a wide and deep interest in fostering education, cultural diversity and teacher training. The Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 18 December 2006, on key competences for lifelong learning recommends that Member States ensure that “appropriate provision is made for those young people who, due to educational disadvantages caused by personal, social, cultural or economic circumstances, need special support to fulfil their educational potential” and that the “appropriate infrastructure for continuing the education and training of adults including teachers and trainers is in place”.

The recommendation also deserves, in relation to teacher training, a mention of some key competences closely related to cultural diversity such as key competence 2 (communication in foreign languages), key competence 6 (social and civic competences) and key competence 8 (cultural awareness and expression). For key competence 2 it is said that all citizens should be competent in “appreciating cultural diversity, and an interest and curiosity in languages and intercultural communication”. According to key competence 6, lifelong learning should
include “understanding the multi-cultural and socio-economic dimensions of European societies and how national cultural identity interacts with the European identity is essential” as well as “full respect for human rights including equality as a basis for democracy, appreciation and understanding of differences between value systems or different religious or ethnic groups”. Finally, in key competence 8 it is considered that all citizens have to learn that “it is essential to understand the cultural and linguistic diversity in Europe and other regions of the world, the need to preserve it and the importance of aesthetic factors in daily life”. This learning must not mean a cultural relativism as “a solid understanding of one’s culture and a sense of identity can be the basis for an open teacher training attitude towards and respect for diversity of cultural expression”.

On the subject of teacher training the European Commission also mentions education, cultural diversity and training through the work programme “Education and Training 2010”. In the progress report dated September 2004 by the working group on “Improving the education of teachers and trainers”, it states that “in the vast majority of European countries initial teacher training education takes place within higher education institutions. Higher education also plays a role in teachers’ continuous professional development sometimes delivering courses which award second or third cycle degrees. Therefore, in drawing up the common European framework for teachers’ and trainers’ competences and qualifications, it is necessary to give greater consideration to the place of their education within the European higher education area and the Bologna Process. The enhancement of quality and the promotion of European mobility are common goals of the Bologna Process and of the European framework for teachers and trainers”. Therefore, any kind of European, national or regional policy which tends to improve teacher training must take place within the Bologna framework as an opportunity and not as an obstacle.

**UNESCO**

The references to education, cultural diversity and teacher training can be found in recent UNESCO documents. One of the most relevant is the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (November 2001), where the member states declare in article 2 that “in our increasingly diverse societies, it is essential to ensure harmonious interaction among people and groups with plural, varied and dynamic cultural identities as well as their willingness to live together. Policies for the inclusion and participation of all citizens are guarantees of social cohesion, the vitality of civil society and peace. Thus defined, cultural pluralism gives policy expression to the reality of cultural diversity. Intrinsic to a democratic framework, cultural pluralism is conducive to cultural exchange and to the flourishing of the creative capacities that sustain public life”. For all these reasons, it is stated in the action plan that national authorities should “promote through education an awareness of the positive value of cultural diversity and to this end improve both curriculum design and teacher education”.

The other reference is included in the text adopted by the World Education Forum at Dakar last April 2000, the so-called UNESCO “Education for All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments”. The second goal (of six) is that “by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality” and states that a key strategy to achieve these goals should aim to “enhance the status, morale and professionalism of teachers”.

The previous Regional Framework for Action for Europe and North America, adopted by the Conference on Education for All in Europe and North America (Warsaw, February 2000) had already been clear on that requirement as it addresses as a particular issue “to identify a specific set of problem issues and develop strategies to address them. The experience of the past decade in this region suggests that these might include identifying children excluded from basic education (rural children, disabled children, girls, street children, ethnic minorities and children affected by conflict or HIV/AIDS), and implementing flexible and creative programmes to restore their right to basic education”. All partners agree that member states should provide “more opportunities for teachers’ initiative, creativity and decision-making”. In this sense, the participants at the regional meeting consider that:

– The main objective is to instil in the institutions and the personnel that are responsible for education, the will that is needed in order to achieve teacher training with the goal of educational success for each pupil and to develop the practices that are required for this purpose. It implies, in particular, training and retraining teachers, assessing schools and teachers, co-ordinating their action, and training teachers and social interveners on how to have dialogue with excluded families and with the parents of pupils in difficulty.

– It should be emphasised that the nature of the teaching profession is related to decision-making and planning, and to identifying and solving problems, rather than to transmitting teacher training knowledge and following rules. The recognition of this fact has consequences for the goals and style of in-service teacher-education programmes. Teachers must have the opportunity within their organisations to participate in the process of formulating educational policies.

– The essential role of universities and other institutions of higher education should also be emphasised both in educational research and in pre-service teacher education.

Most of the respondents in the national report enquiry acknowledge the importance of this legal framework, and a link to influence between this process and national teacher training policies can be reported. Therefore, it seems that international declarations and recommendations can become an opportunity to improve teacher training on socio-cultural diversity at national and regional levels, as this international dimension can introduce powerful inputs to improve national teacher training policies. To sum up, a global overview gives us input which enables us to give some basic conclusions that will lead us to identify some recommendations and implications for action.

– **Aim of teacher training and curriculum.** It seems clear that all international documents referred to in national reports are in accordance with a teacher training model based on the profession and not on the occupation. The main consequence is that national teacher training policies as well as teacher training institutions are requested to make a transition from a curriculum inspired by conceptual contents to new curricula inspired by competences.

– **Socio-cultural experiences in teacher training.** International documents directly influence national teacher training policies in terms of socio-cultural diversity in at least three dimensions closely related to a training rich in socio-cultural experiences: the promotion of students’ mobility, the promotion of an integrated European labour market, the promotion of a strategy of life-long learning.
Teacher training curriculum: structure and methodology. International documents request a teacher training which follows a structure based on Bachelor, Master and Doctorate careers. In this sense, it seems sensible to define which competences and learning experiences on socio-cultural diversity are suitable for each different teacher training level. A major and vast importance of interdisciplinary modules is requested.

National level – the voice of policy-makers, managers, trainers and teachers

National teacher training policies and curriculum

In accordance with the analysed data from national reports, and managers’, trainers’ and teachers’ questionnaires, we observe that there is a system of interplay formed by three elements: the national background of every country (recent historical events, implicit cultural assumptions of population, shared values), national teacher training policies and the national teacher training curriculum. When we modify one, the other two become directly affected.

In this sense, we clearly see that the national background interplays with national teacher training policies and national teacher training curriculum.

– From one side, national background influences national teacher training policies and national teacher training curricula. For instance, those countries which belong to the so-called “second generation immigration countries” (small population western European countries which started to receive immigrants from all over the world during the 1970s and the 1980s) do no include specific references to immigration when dealing with diversity issues in their national teacher training policies or curricula. Some countries which are living the experience of an emerging new democracy do not include socio-cultural diversity aspects or gender issues in their national policies or curricula yet. Religion does feature in national teacher training policies or curricula in those countries with deep roots in “laicism” as a social model.

– From another perspective, and according to what we have said about international legal literature, national teacher training policies and national teacher training curricula want to influence national background in terms of interculturality. Therefore, teacher training is seen as a powerful tool for transforming teaching in schools.

Finally, in national reports “managing diversity” appears as the theme which is given most consideration in both national teacher training policies and national teacher training curricula in all countries. However, some countries do not consider “enhancing diversity” to be a basic prerequisite for all. Therefore, it seems that “managing diversity” could be seen as the common key theme for all countries and “enhancing diversity” could become the basic challenge to be achieved in the short term.
Teacher training institutions

The relationship between national teacher training policies and teacher training institutions depends on some context factors. There is a tendency to define national teacher training and curricula exclusively at a national level – rather than regional – in smaller population countries. In these countries, once the policy is defined, the teacher training institutions are involved in defining the teacher training curriculum. However, it is particularly interesting to see that there is a tendency to define national teacher training policy and curricula at both national and institutional level in countries with larger populations.

The data collected also show a tension between teacher training policy and teacher training institutions in defining the teacher training curriculum. It is imperative to explore the reasons for this misunderstanding in order to clarify co-operation systems in the definition of this curriculum for pre-service as well as for in-service training.

Another relevant issue is the link to opposition between the administration and teacher training institutions that has been found through the data analysis. We have identified some key factors which help us to understand the dynamics of this opposition.

– One factor is the relationship between the status of socio-cultural diversity within the teacher training curriculum and the curriculum assessment. In most of the countries, the nature of socio-cultural diversity contents is compulsory. However, the curriculum implementation is not assessed. Therefore, it is not possible to know if there are changes in teacher training after the integration of socio-cultural diversity in the teacher training curriculum.

– Another factor is the relationship between discussion and practice. Two countries have assessed the impact of the teacher training curriculum in relation to socio-cultural diversity on teachers, and despite this content being compulsory in both national curricula, the teachers consulted asked for more training on special needs children.

– A third factor is the relationship between the nature of the contents on socio-cultural diversity in teacher training curricula and its accreditation. Although these contents are compulsory, there is no official accreditation of them.

There is a strong tendency to set up teacher training institutions within universities. This means that these wider training institutions play a key role in the definition of teacher training conditions as well as the bridges that may be implemented towards non-education curricula which are closely related to socio-cultural diversity (e.g. humanities studies). The university dimension also provides a wider framework when implementing Master and Doctorate degrees in education.

Concerning the institutional development on cultural diversity within teacher training schools and faculties, the data analysis proves it is low. According to the data obtained from managers and pre-service teachers, no formal policies on this issue have been established. However, we may identify some real actions which could be considered on the way to making the institution really “inter-cultural”. These actions concern student recruitment as well as
teachers’ selections. From a perspective of Banks\textsuperscript{15} concerning the developmental stages of educational institutions regarding multiculturalism, the data analysis leads us to think that they could be on a “contributions” stage (the lowest one): no institutional policy but some single experiences and practices relating to

Managers emphasise the lack of alumni monitoring. The absence of a relationship between teacher training institutions and alumni reflects a loss of knowledge and opportunities for mentoring new pre-service teachers, and making pre-service training relevant to the reality of teaching in a school.

**Trainers and teachers**

There is a link to opposition between trainers and teacher training institutions in relation to socio-cultural diversity. Trainers are supposed to be trained on socio-cultural diversity by their institutions as they may give lectures or organise teaching on this issue. However, all the countries agree on the need to identify the origin of the trainers’ background in socio-cultural diversity through research activities. What seems to be positive is the fact that all the institutions count on experts who specialise in socio-cultural diversity.

According to the nature of the content of socio-cultural training of trainers within teacher training institutions, both national co-ordinators and managers agree to state that there is no link to influence between these institutions and trainers. The main reason is that this training of trainers is not compulsory. There is also a lack of assessment with respect to trainers’ competence in socio-cultural diversity.

Trainers and teachers value “teaching diversity” as the most common stage for all practitioners. Secondly, “managing diversity” is taken into consideration. “Enhancing diversity” is the lowest priority for both. We may suppose a link to influence between trainers and teachers at this point.

Finally, in-service teachers claim there is a lack of practical orientation in training at teacher training institutions. The absence of a relationship between teacher training tuition and real practical problems at school can be identified. To solve this inadequate professional competence, in-service teachers have requested help from other professionals who work at school; counsellors, psychologists, social workers, and so on. There is no reference to who, how and where these professionals are currently trained.

Recommendations and implications for action

Recommendations

Taking an international perspective into account, member states are recommended to:

1. Promote national policies on teacher training which include actions to develop a specific status for teacher training on socio-cultural diversity according to UNESCO, Council of Europe and European Union declarations and recommendations on education, teacher training and socio-cultural diversity.

2. Define a teacher training curriculum for both pre-service and in-service teachers which emphasises professional competences on managing and enhancing socio-cultural diversity in conjunction with Bachelor, Master and Doctorate degrees by using an interdisciplinary approach.

Taking a national/regional perspective into account, member states are recommended to:

3. Involve national educational authorities in the search for an international partnership for the promotion of exchanges and the development of joint programmes on teacher training and socio-cultural diversity.

4. Introduce an approach of socio-cultural diversity which comprises equality and inclusion as core contents within teacher training curricula and programmes (UNESCO Education for approach).

5. “Managing diversity” should be considered to be the lowest priority in national teacher training policies and curricula. “Enhancing diversity” should become a real challenge to be achieved by trainers as well as teachers.

Taking a teacher training institution’s perspective into account, member states are recommended to:

6. Ensure quality of teacher training on socio-cultural diversity throughout their country. Teacher training policy and curricula should have a common framework at a national level and a specific implementation at an institutional level as the best way to respect the different regional situations in relation to diversity within every country.

7. Define a teacher training curriculum on socio-cultural diversity by both teacher training policy decision-makers and teacher training institution representatives in a collaborative framework.

8. Develop a specific assessment of the implementation of socio-cultural diversity in teacher training curricula as well as the impact of this implementation in teachers’ professional development.
9. Develop an accreditation system on socio-cultural diversity competences according to the several higher education degrees.

10. Be aware of the role of universities in promoting frameworks and actions between teacher training institutions and other faculties or departments which are not directly involved in education.

11. Be aware of affirmative actions when defining student and trainer recruitment policies for teacher training institutions, and encourage alumni to create a self-managed system of activities and training on socio-cultural issues.

Taking a trainer’s and teacher’s perspective into account, member states are recommended to:

12. Include support programmes for teacher training institutions for the organisation of training of trainers on socio-cultural diversity. Participate and finance international initiatives to promote the training of trainers: Seminars, courses and networks on teacher training and socio-cultural diversity.

13. Participate in the creation of a research network on training of trainers on socio-cultural diversity.

14. Acknowledge experts on socio-cultural diversity within their institutions in order to ask them to act as multipliers and promoters of this subject.

15. Consider the initial and in-service training of other professionals who work on socio-cultural issues in school and other educational fields.

Implications for action

All these recommendations may be implemented following an integral action plan in the short to mid term at a national level. For those countries with a larger population, this strategy may be developed at a regional level. In any case, this action plan needs to be carried out in a period of no less than three years, and must count on the active participation of all the agents involved: policy-makers, teacher training managers, trainers, teachers and pre-service teaching students. In order to facilitate the description of the different contents of this action plan, we suggest organising the information according to various phases.

Phase 1: The current situation of the national teacher training curriculum and socio-cultural diversity – Where we are

The aim of this phase is to analyse the current situation of the national teacher training system and identify the agents who are going to be involved in the curricular development. This analysis is valid for both pre-service and in-service teacher training programmes and activities. The outputs from this phase should be documented in:
– A report which explains the current situation in pre-service teacher training.
– A report which explains the situation in in-service teacher training.

Both reports should include information on the following elements:

– A map of teacher training institutions involved in introducing socio-cultural diversity in their pre-service or in-service curricula, taking into consideration the themes “teaching diversity”, “managing diversity” and “enhancing diversity”.
– A directory which includes individual teacher trainers and teacher training teams who are engaged in curricular development based on socio-cultural diversity.
– A list of potential school teachers with expertise in dealing with socio-cultural diversity and interested in collaborating with teacher training from a practitioner perspective.
– A collection of good practices on teacher training and socio-cultural diversity, covering both theoretical and practical dimensions.

**Phase 2: Definition of a national/regional teacher training curriculum based on socio-cultural diversity – What we want**

The aim of this phase is to create a proposal for a national/regional teacher training curriculum for both pre-service and in-service teacher training. This may be implemented through a participatory process which involves policy-makers, teacher training managers, teacher training trainers, teachers and pre-service teachers. The outputs of this phase should be documented in:

– A national/regional teacher training curriculum as a framework for teacher training institutions (an articulated pre-service and in-service teacher training curriculum).

This national/regional curriculum should include information on the following elements:

– A list of core competences that all school teachers must learn for managing and enhancing diversity (especially socio-cultural diversity). Contributions from experts and researchers should be welcomed. These core competences should be organised according to a system which responds to four main questions:

  • What competences require training?
  • How can effective training be delivered in these competences?
  • Who must be responsible for training in these competences?
  • What sequence of training in these competences has to be followed?

– A curriculum framework for pre-service teacher training. This framework should include a proposal based on core competences in managing and enhancing socio-
cultural diversity in a Bachelor degree. This framework should provide several models of curricular management that may be adopted by teacher training institutions.

- A curriculum framework for in-service teacher training. This framework should include a proposal based on core competences in managing and enhancing socio-cultural diversity in a Master and Doctorate degree. This framework should provide several models for curricular management that may be adopted by teacher training institutions and research institutes.

- A network of schools and active teachers engaged in providing practical experience to teacher training institutions, in giving feedback on teacher needs in relation to socio-cultural diversity, in offering their institutions for research activities on teacher training and socio-cultural diversity and in mentoring pre-service teachers during their Bachelor degrees.

**Phase 3: Provision of a support system for the implementation of a national/regional teacher training curriculum based on socio-cultural diversity – How we implement it**

The aim of this third phase is to implement a support system which permits an effective and efficient implementation of the designed curriculum. Policy-makers should be aware of this system as it is crucial for the correct development of the national/regional curriculum within teacher training institutions. This system must be related to international networks and resources which may operate as facilitators at a national level. The outputs of this phase should be included in:

- A support programme for implementing a renewed national/regional teacher training curriculum at both pre-service and in-service teacher training levels.

This support system should include information on the following elements:

- A national system of accreditation and assessment of trainers and teachers on their competence in socio-cultural diversity during Bachelor, Master and Doctorate degrees. This accreditation and assessment should be integrated within the ordinary accreditation and assessment systems. This accreditation should acknowledge the core competences for each degree.

- A programme of mobility for trainers, pre-service teachers and in-service teachers on a regional, national and international scale. This mobility should be integrated as a part of their training and some concrete output for innovation should be expected from the training. These training experiences should be orientated towards personal development on issues related to socio-cultural diversity.

- An agreement of participation in international networks of trainers and teachers, and international events to promote and improve trainers’ and teachers’ competences on socio-cultural diversity.
- A specific system for the training of trainers in accordance with international organisations and institutions.