

Governing European Teacher Education: How great expectations in Brussels are ‘glocalised’ within Germany

Hans-Georg Kotthoff* & Vasileios Symeonidis** ■

ABSTRACT

After years of integration and efforts to converge European education, the EU has visibly gained influence on various aspects of national education systems, including teacher education. This paper explores whether, and to what extent, European expectations and policy initiatives, focusing particularly on the Bologna process, have an influence on national teacher education systems. Taking the German teacher education system as an example, the paper argues that despite the harmonising influence of the Bologna process, systems of teacher education within Europe retain a strong national and even regional character, being far from uniform. Findings reveal that the diversity of teacher education within Germany has grown and that teacher education institutions within Germany are still primarily regulated by national or even regional bodies, which effectively resist increasing pressures to converge European teacher education systems.

1. Introduction

Those readers who are interested in issues of implementation of political reforms might be aware of the fact that the rather strange title of this article derives from the famous North American implementation study by Pressmann and Wildavsky (1973). Back in 1973, the two authors titled

* Hans-Georg Kotthoff is Professor of School Pedagogy and Comparative Education at the University of Education Freiburg, Germany. Email: kotthoff@ph-freiburg.de

** Vasileios Symeonidis is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Education Research and Teacher Education, University of Graz. Email: vasileios.symeonidis@uni-graz.at

their rather influential study provocatively, "Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oklahoma; or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all". Thus, Pressmann and Wildawsky indicated already in their subtitle that very strong and influential regional or even local interests, which effectively resist or even 'dash' great expectations from Washington, counterbalance federal programs in the US.

Considering these well-established implementation problems of federal political reforms in the US and elsewhere, it seems rather likely that the impact of recent European initiatives and attempts to establish a more integrated or even standardised 'European Teacher Education' (ETE) system will suffer from similar problems as the North American federal programs back in the 1970s. In her comparative study on ETE in four countries, Caena (2014) has described the 'translation' process of global/European developments into local/national contexts as 'glocalisation'. According to Caena (2014), the mediation between contrasting influences and diverse education cultures is not only a challenging process, but also bears an innovative potential in the sense that global influences provide opportunities for local innovations.

Based on these observations, the present paper on ETE is putting forward the following two arguments. *First*, if we take account of the specific function(s) of teacher education (TE) for the state (e.g. transmitting national belonging and identity; cp. Kotthoff & Denk, 2007) and the necessity of 're-contextualising' European educational reforms on a national and regional level, it is highly likely that the implementation of an integrated and harmonised ETE-system will meet local resistance and therefore not necessarily meet the high expectations raised by the EU. *Second*, there is empirical evidence, which suggests that the European initiatives and policies to harmonise ETE through the 'Bologna process', are finding it difficult to gain influence on national systems of TE and that in some cases (e.g. in Germany) the European Bologna process in HE has even increased the diversity of TE within national systems of HE (e.g. Bauer et al., 2012).

To support these two arguments, this paper aims at analysing the discrepancies between the expectations that are attached to ETE-initiatives on the one hand and the empirically verifiable impact of these initiatives on the other. By using the term 'European', we refer predominantly to policies and initiatives developed at the level of the European Union (EU), also considering initiatives developed by European countries and

supported by the EU, such as the Bologna process. To this end, the article is structured according to six consecutive steps. Following this introduction (1), the second section is dedicated to briefly outlining the main features and concepts of educational governance research which provides the theoretical background and analytical framework for this study (2). In the subsequent two sections, we will look at the expectations that are attached to a supra-national European TE system by analysing relevant EU policy documents and initiatives (3) and describe the strategies and mechanisms of Europeanisation in TE (4). In the fifth section we will study the available empirical evidence on the impact of ETE initiatives (e.g. the Bologna reform) on national TE systems with particular reference to Germany (5). The final section of this paper will discuss the findings using the analytic 'tools' provided by governance research and conclude with a brief assessment of the generalisability of our findings (6).

2. Theoretical background and analytical framework

The theoretical background of this study derives from the 'Educational Governance' perspective which studies all kinds of 'coordination problems' among interdependent actors (de Boer et al., 2007). Following Altrichter (2010), who is one of the main protagonists of educational governance research in the German-speaking countries, the underlying assumption of this perspective is that "the regulation of systems and the production of system performance are conceived as arising from the *coordination of the independent actions of social actors*" (op. cit.: 147). However, governance research does not stop there, but wants to understand what exactly is happening when we perceive social processes such as the establishment of a 'European Teacher Education Area' as being 'steered' or 'governed'. In their 'Handbook' on new governance in school education, Altrichter and Maag Merki (2016) summarize that the analytical framework of governance studies is based on the general assumption that decisions in complex systems are not taken by individual actors in isolation, but that there are multiple actors and interdependencies. Thus, the main analytical concepts are the following (cp. Altrichter & Maag Merki, 2016: 8-12; Altrichter, 2010: 148-151).

Multitude of actors in 'actor constellations': Governance research aims to steer away from the notion that development and reform in educa-

tional systems are unilaterally shaped by a single dominant actor (e.g. the government, ministries of education). Conversely, many actors are involved in the transformation of an educational system and in analysing transformation processes in education. It is thus not helpful to differentiate between 'subjects' and 'objects' of a reform process, as actors are mutually dependent and not always act in simple hierarchical or top-down directions. Governance researchers therefore maintain that actors act in constellations, or as Kussau and Brüsemeister (2007) point out very succinctly: "*the constellation acts, not the actor*" (op. cit.: 26; author translation; AT¹). Although many actors are involved in these constellations, they are not necessarily equally influential; rather, the actors involved have different rights of disposal (see below) and therefore have differing chances of participation and influence.

Coordination of action: In governance research, the term 'coordination of action' is used to describe and analyse the way and modes in which different actors are cooperating without assuming who is 'steering' (subject) and who is being 'steered' (object). Lange and Schimank (2004) have distinguished three different types of 'governance mechanisms' on a micro-level which help to analyse modes of coordination. Firstly, in 'constellations of observation', coordination is achieved through unilateral or mutual adaptation to what has been observed of the other's action. Secondly, in 'constellations of influence', coordination of action is achieved by the targeted use of potentially influential means such as money, power, knowledge, or moral authority. Thirdly, in 'constellations of negotiation', coordination is based on bilaterally elaborating binding arrangements without necessarily exercising power.

Rights of disposal and regulation structures: Governance researchers take a particular interest in the analysis of structured and structuring actions, e.g. actions that are not accidental, but appear to be planned or 'steered'. Agency and structure are considered as related and are analysed in their relationship. In this sense, all action is based on 'structural elements' and 'regulation structures' which organise rights and competences of disposal in a way which is specific for a particular social context. Therefore, governance analyses search for and examine rules and resources, which, as Altrichter points out, "are already existent in a system, and also for those which are additionally provided by the promoters of a reform and which are to be taken up by other actors in order to push forward, transform or hinder the reform policy taking root in a system" (Altrichter, 2010: 150).

Multi-level systems: In the governance perspective, complex social systems (e.g. schools, university systems) are considered as multi-level phenomena, which means that governance analyses should include all relevant actors, who might be acting on different levels of the social system under consideration. Not all actors interact with all other actors in the same way, but there are typical actor constellations (e.g. teachers, headteachers) with typical principles of action which might be very different from the logic of action on another level (e.g. school administration). Regarding social systems as multi-level phenomena draws our attention to questions of cross-border coordination between system levels, which is of crucial importance for system development. Thus, governance analyses must necessarily analyse processes and effects on different levels: Each educational reform will meet a number of interface problems which arise from the different logics, principles, values and priorities of each level.

Intentional action and partially transintentional results: Although social systems can be regarded as the product of an 'intentional struggle' of different actors, many important results of struggles are 'transintentional' because actions produce unforeseen and unintended effects. Educational reforms initiated by a given ministry of education, for example, are not implemented identically in each school, but will meet resistance, acceptance and adaptations as they pass through the various levels of the system. Thus, reforms and innovations in education need to be 're-contextualised' (Fend, 2006). They need to be adapted to the local context which means that they will change shape and produce unintended side-effects which had not been anticipated by the initiators of the reform.

All of these concepts used by governance researchers provide a valuable analytical framework for studying the way European reforms and initiatives in TE are implemented and transformed on national or regional levels. However, before we demonstrate the usefulness of these concepts with reference to the 'translation' of the 'Bologna process' into German TE, we need to establish the expectations attached to the envisaged integration of ETE, and focus on processes and mechanisms of Europeanisation with which the EU attempts to bring TE systems in Europe closer together.

3. European Teacher Education: What are the expectations?

In a previous publication, Symeonidis (2020) already achieved to categorise the development of EU policy cooperation in TE, differentiating this development in two distinctive historical periods from 1957 to 2000, when policy cooperation among Member States focused predominantly on economic issues, and from 2000 to 2018, when the broader area of education became officially part of EU policy cooperation. These different periods indicate radically different competences for the EU in education and training, although it should be acknowledged that the legal competence of the EU on education continues to be weak, since EU education policy is governed by the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, meaning that the EU can only intervene in a complementary way:

The Union shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity. ("The Lisbon Treaty – Article 165", 2006)

Through the term "quality", the EU has yet discovered "an entrance to the education sector" (Alexiadou, 2007: 106), allowing the Commission to intervene in areas that are generally considered to be of national concern. Since 2000, the wider integration process promoted through the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), a form of intergovernmental policymaking, has intensified and formalised, resulting in the emergence of a distinctive European model of education in general and of TE in particular (Alexiadou, 2014; Dale, 2009; Symeonidis, 2020). Mainly through the OMC, several working groups focused on teacher related and TE policies creating useful materials, including policy handbooks, reports of peer learning activities, literature reviews, and virtual toolkits that informed EU policy documents and initiatives.

Over the years, international mobility and the European dimension in TE have consistently been some of the main expectations on the EU agenda. Specifically, the 1988 resolution of education ministers documented the commitment of Member States to give greater emphasis to

the European dimension in initial and in-service TE by developing joint programmes providing student and teacher mobility among TE institutions (Council of the European Communities, 1988: 6). The specific resolution triggered various non-governmental initiatives on teacher-training links, some of them supported through the Erasmus programme (Sayer, 2006). Mobility is also the key and central concept of the Bologna process (Zgaga, 2008), which will be further detailed later on in this article. The European dimension of teaching, a rather vague concept, has been reinvigorated following the terrorist attacks and the outbreak of the refugee crisis in 2015, promoting the ideas of social cohesion, active citizenship, intercultural dialogue, and inclusion, as well as the internationalisation of TE curricula (e.g. Council of the European Union, 2015; European Commission, 2017, 2018).

Under the umbrella of lifelong learning, which became the flagship of the European Commission in the area of education and training since the Lisbon Strategy in 2000, the education and professional development of teachers is perceived as a lifelong learning task, too. EU policy documents specify “a seamless continuum of provision embracing initial teacher education, induction into the profession, and career-long continuing professional development that includes formal, informal and non-formal learning opportunities” (European Commission, 2007: 12). The continuum of TE appears a main topic and conceptual framework for most other teacher policy areas dealt with in OMC peer learning activities and working groups. The different TE phases are interlinked in a coherent approach so that every phase gives feedback to the previous phase, and is influencing the following phase, in order to enhance quality (European Commission, 2015).

Also often connected to the continuum of TE is the development of teacher competence frameworks. By agreeing on a shared framework of teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes connected to student learning outcomes, the EU argues that countries can guide and assess the effectiveness of TE, introduce criteria for teacher recruitment and selection, and assess teachers’ professional development needs and the provision of professional learning opportunities throughout teachers’ professional development (European Commission, 2013a). The design of teacher competence frameworks has been inextricably linked to the creation of National Qualification Frameworks (NQFs) which European countries established to improve the comparability and understanding of profes-

sional qualifications among them. NQFs in Europe are developed on the basis of the European Qualification Framework (EQF) for lifelong learning with different reference levels defined as learning outcomes in order to align qualifications across different countries and systems. Since the launch of the EQF in 2008, the notion of competence has been linked to the learning outcomes approach, meaning that competences are often articulated as “statements of what a learner knows, understands and is able to do on completion of a learning process” (Cedefop, 2014: 165). Competences, formulated as learning outcomes, have found widespread applications among European countries in the design and delivery of initial TE programmes, although progress has been uneven (Halász, 2017).

If TE is to be seen as a continuum, then student teachers and teachers need adequate support at every stage of their professional practice. Thus, the relevance of teacher educators increased in the European policy agenda, particularly following the intensive policy work within the Commission between 2010 and 2013. The 2009 Council Conclusions recognised for the first time that teacher educators “should themselves have attained a high academic standard and possess solid practical experience of teaching, as well as the competences which good teaching requires” (p. 8). A working definition of teacher educators adopted by the Commission defined the specific profession as including “all those who actively facilitate the (formal) learning of student teachers and teachers” (European Commission, 2013b: 8). This definition is important because it extends the traditional view of teacher educators to include not only the ones based in TE institutions responsible for initial TE, but also school mentors and all actors involved in the continuing professional development of teachers. Two key actions suggested to Member States regarding teacher educators include the definition of their relevant competences and the need to reinforce professional collaboration among teacher educators working in different university- or school-based settings (European Commission, 2012: 64).

Considering the above mentioned ambitious expectations, e.g. enhancing student and staff mobility, promoting the European dimension in teaching, establishing a continuum of TE, developing teacher competence frameworks, and better supporting teacher educators, the question that remains open is how these expectations are achieved? Through which strategies does the EU attempt to converge TE in Europe?

4. Strategies and Mechanisms of Europeanisation in the 'European Teacher Education Area'

In a previous publication, Symeonidis (2018) has argued about the emergence of a 'European Teacher Education Area' governed by mechanisms, processes and key agents of Europeanisation that are internal or external to the functioning of the EU: policy coordination, evidence-based management, cross-sectoral instruments, educational programmes, stakeholder pressure, and the Bologna process. By means of reciprocal interaction, the specific mechanisms produce significant effects on policy formation and implementation, transforming the strict nation-bound conception of TE and resulting in common trends across Europe, such as the ones described above.

For example, policy coordination refers to the OMC working groups related to teachers' professional development, as well as policy texts and presidencies of the European Council. Since the Lisbon agenda in 2000, the EU has been employing the OMC as a means of governing education developments through setting commonly agreed objectives, and through peer and informal pressures on Member States to perform (Alexiadou, 2007). The work of the OMC working groups has mainly focused on the initial preparation and continuing professional development of teachers, producing influential reports for policymakers (e.g. European Commission, 2010, 2013a,b). Presidencies allow Member States to bring to the attention of EU policymakers challenges and good policy examples, with most of the TE related objectives aiming at improving the quality of TE (Stéger, 2014). Since the launch of the OMC, evidence-based policymaking in education has been a flagship of the Commission (cf. European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017), while several European networks and agencies, such as Eurydice and Cedefop, as well as Europe-wide associations, produce evidence and diffuse them in the European education space.

Policy instruments of other sectors than education also play an influential role in the transfer of policies, particularly because they allow the Commission to launch initiatives in sectors where Member States are most receptive for them, considering that the sector of education is governed by the subsidiarity principle. In TE, relevant cross-sectoral instruments are the EQF, European structural and research funds, and the European semester. Often intentionally, these instruments are operat-

ing within the employment sector. Moreover, educational programmes such as Erasmus+, contributing to the goals of mobility and the promotion of the European dimension, are widely recognised as having an impact on teachers' professional development (Zgaga, 2008, 2013). Stakeholder groups, such as the European social partners, international organisations and TE networks, exerting pressure on the EU to consider their positions, claim another influential role.

Last but not least, an important instrument contributing to the convergence of TE systems across Europe is the so-called 'Bologna process' which started back in 1999, but is still evident until the present day. In 1999, Ministers of Education from 29 European countries signed the Bologna Declaration which aimed at creating a related and coherent European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010. Although the Bologna process was intergovernmental in nature and was initiated outside the EU context, it cannot be understood independently of the EU higher education policy (Pépin, 2007). The fact that it was developed outside the EU framework is judged to be a reason for the huge support it received, meaning that it was inclusive for non-EU countries and less bureaucratic. Eventually, it became more dependent from the European Commission, both in terms of financial support and policy advice (Corbett, 2011).

The main objectives of the Bologna process relevant to TE can be outlined as follows:

- 1) adopt a system of easily readable and comparable degrees
- 2) adopt a system based on two main cycles (undergraduate/graduate)
- 3) establish a system of credits (ECTS)
- 4) promote mobility by overcoming legal recognition and administrative obstacles
- 5) promote European co-operation in quality assurance
- 6) promote a European dimension in higher education (Bologna Declaration, 1999)

While changes with regard to the first three objectives, which are more structural and/or administrative in nature, are rather visible in the field of TE, progress with regard to objectives 4 and 6, which also require a curricular harmonisation and convergence, is much less visible. What is the 'empirical evidence' with regard to these two objectives in the field of TE? To which extent are EU regulations and policy initiatives gaining influence on national systems of TE? How mobile are TE students as a

result of the envisaged alleviated legal recognition of studies abroad? In the following section, we provide some empirical evidence for these questions, with particular reference to TE in Germany.

5. Empirical evidence on the impact of the Bologna reforms on TE in Germany

Although the financial and political support for the 'Bologna process' and the establishment of a 'European Teacher Education Area' have been quite considerable in the last two decades, and although there are numerous studies which are identifying general European trends in TE (e.g. Hudson & Zgaga, 2008; Hudson 2017; Gassner, Kerger & Schratz, 2010), the empirical evidence on the impact of the Bologna process on ETE is still rather scarce.² On the national level, however, there are several studies that focus on the impact of the Bologna reforms on TE systems (e.g. Schubarth, Mauermeister & Seidel, 2017³). Amongst these, the German TE system is a particularly interesting case, because, due to its federal constitution, it grants each of the 16 states/*Länder* a high degree of autonomy in the organisation of its TE system. Thus, we can expect a variety of different regional 'translations' of the Bologna process and subsequently, of different systems of TE within Germany.

As argued in an earlier paper by Kotthoff & Terhart (2013), there is a wide-spread view in Germany that the Bologna process, which was intended to increase the transparency of study requirements and to support the flexibility and mobility of the students, has, particularly in the field of TE, failed to reach its aims (Arnold & Reh, 2005; Tillmann, 2007). While most of the early observations of an ever-increasing diversity in German TE were based on case studies of single universities or regions (e.g. Ricken, 2010; Winter, 2008), there was already empirical evidence based on systematic comparisons across different sites (e.g. Terhart, 2010) and states/*Länder* (e.g. Bellenberg, 2009) strongly supporting this notion of diversification. An increasing curricular and structural diversity of TE following the implementation of the Bologna reforms in Germany have also been confirmed in later studies, which will be shown with reference to two exemplary studies.

In a first study by Bauer et al. (2012), which analyses the heterogeneity of TE study programmes in twelve German universities preparing stu-

dents for teaching in the grammar school (academic track), the authors summarize their results in the following way:

The results corroborate the hypothesis that the study structures of current teacher education programs are largely heterogeneous. Particularly, we found that programs differ regarding their focus on academic subjects versus profession-oriented studies and their ranges of required studies in subject education (6-25 CP) and internships (6-38 CP) (Bauer et al., 2012: 102).

The impression of increasing curricular diversity in German TE is even strengthened when looking underneath the highly heterogeneous surface of the university-based study programs, and at the structure of the different TE models which have been established in the 16 Länder since the ratification of the Bologna treaty in 1999. According to the authors of the same study, the following different structural variants can be found in Germany (op. cit.: 105-106):

The 'state exam' in its traditional form can be found only at very few universities, in particular at 'universities of education' [Pädagogische Hochschulen]. However, those states/Länder that have kept the state exam (at least partly), have introduced a modularized version of the state exam course or are in the process of introducing it (in particular Baden-Wuerttemberg, Bavaria, Hesse, Mecklenburg-Hither Pomerania, Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt, Thuringia) (AT). (op. cit.: 105)

By now, most states/Länder have changed to a consecutive model of TE consisting of BA and MA courses. In this model, the BA represents the first academic exam, but it does not give access to the teaching profession. Irrespective of the school type (e.g. primary or grammar school), access is only granted on the basis of a Master of Education (M.Ed.). However, below this seemingly homogenous structure, there is a large heterogeneity with regards to the relative shares of individual study components. According to Bauer et al. (2012), student teachers who want to become teachers for the academic school track (*Gymnasium*) devote on average 58,2% of their studies to their academic subjects, 9,3% to subject didactics, 12,4% to educational studies, and 6,7% to practical studies (e.g. internships). However, the spectrum of these individual study

components varies considerably between different universities and states/*Länder*: the number of credit points (CP) attributed to the study of academic subjects varies between 128 to 222 CP, the number of CP attributed to the study of subject didactics ranges from 12 to 50 CP and the number of CP attributed to practical studies varies between 6 to 38 CP. Thus, as Bauer et al. (2012) conclude, “students who study at the university with the highest share of studies in subject didactics have to acquire 4.2 times more CP than their fellow students who study at a university with the lowest share of studies in subject didactics” (AT) (op. cit.: 115).

In a second empirical study by Hohenstein et al. (2014), the large diversity of TE curricula in initial teacher training in Germany is further confirmed. During the Bologna reforms, the ‘Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs’ (abbr.: KMK) formulated so-called ‘education standards’ for higher education teacher training programmes (KMK, 2004) in four areas: teaching, educating, assessment and evaluation, and innovation. These four areas of study were defined by 11 competences, which in their turn were specified and concretised through curricular content. In their study, Hohenstein et al. (2014) analyse to which extent these ‘education standards’ are reflected in the teacher training curricula at universities by analysing course regulations, module handbooks, and exam regulations for teacher training at 16 different universities (one university per state/*Land*). Through document analyses, Hohenstein et al. (2014) show convincingly that a large proportion of the education standards and the corresponding curricular content introduced by the KMK (2004) are not reflected in the curricula of many universities:

The curricula of the different university sites differ considerably with regard to the implementation of curricular content in education, which indicates that teaching in initial teacher training varies severely and that the mobility of students, for example when changing universities, is exacerbated. On no account it can be assumed that there is a uniform knowledge base or comparable competences at the end of initial teacher training. (AT) (Hohenstein et al., 2014: 505)

On the basis of these and other empirical studies on the implementation of the Bologna reforms in the field of TE, it does not come as a surprise that Schubarth (2017) argues in his analysis of the impact of the Bologna

reforms on TE in Germany that in hindsight the adjustment of TE to the Bachelor-Master structure has been 'counterproductive':

Teacher education became more fragmented and the 'patchwork' has become even more confusing. Also in this respect federalism has proved to be a barrier to progress rather than a chance. Dozens of different teacher education systems at different sites, which prepare for 16 different school systems, give an idea about the excesses of federalism. The heterogeneity in teacher education with regard to designations, subjects and combinations of subjects, contents, proportion of practical work in schools, organisational forms etc. has become so large that the necessary clarity, transparence and comparability are not given. The consequences are, amongst others, problems with the recognition of academic achievements, a reduced mobility or a limited transition into employment in the different federal states. (AT) (Schubarth, 2017: 129-30)

The mixture of diverse models and developments and increasing curricular diversity in TE has caused severe criticism in Germany before (e.g. Keller, 2010; Keuffer, 2010) and by now has led to a situation, in which the curricular and structural differences between TE models in the 16 federal states of Germany are probably bigger than before the start of the Bologna process in 1999 (e.g. Hohenstein et al., 2014; Schubarth, 2017).

If we look at student mobility in TE, which should also have been positively affected through the 'Bologna process' (see above), the first observation is that data to assess student mobility in TE programs accurately and accross Europe is rather difficult to obtain and has limitations (e.g. ususally TE is covered by the Unesco ISCED-97 subject area 'education and teacher training' (Edu/TE), which is broader and not exclusively restricted to TE). However, even if the empirical data have their limitations, the available studies show unanimously that mobility rates are low and underproportionate in some areas of TE and that the problematic recognition of credits acquired abroad is one of the major barriers that prevents student teachers to study abroad. According to Wernisch (2016), the review of data and studies regarding students' mobility rates in ETE suggests that calls to increase mobility in TE programmes have their legitimation:

All data and studies reviewed point into the same direction, indicating that the subject area education (and thus also the subfield teacher education) is underproportionally represented in mobility schemes (such as Erasmus), and that it is one of the subject areas with below-average TSM levels (as measured by the most important forms of TSM) in higher education in Europe. (Wernisch, 2016: 134-35)

If we take a closer look at the outward mobility rates of TE students in Germany, we can rely on the mobility studies of the 'German Academic Exchange Service' (DAAD) and the 'German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies' (DZHW), who regularly monitor and analyse the mobility of German students every two years (e.g. Heublein et al., 2015; Woisch & Willige, 2015). According to Kercher and Schifferings (2018), who analysed the most recent study of the DAAD/DZHW and additional data on graduate surveys, the outward mobility rates of the TE graduates of the year 2015 reached 24%, which equals the mobility rates of all students in that year. There are, however, marked differences in the mobility rates between different school types and subjects:

Graduates who are aiming for a teaching position in the grammar school [academic track] are by far the most mobile students. More than a third (34%) of these graduates spent a study-related period of residence abroad during their course of study. In comparison to these, the mobility rates of graduates, who are aiming for a teaching position in primary, lower secondary ['Hauptschule'] and special needs schools (17%), lower secondary technical schools ['Realschule'] (18%) or vocational schools (14%), are considerably lower. Thus, considering the proportion of these groups in the overall number of TE students in Germany, we can conclude: during their course of study, about half of the TE students show outward mobility rates, which are well above average, while the other half shows outward mobility rates, which are well below average (AT) (op. cit.: 239).

If we ask for the reasons for the low mobility rates of primary, lower secondary and vocational school student teachers, the latest DAAD/DZHW mobility study also provides useful data. According to Kercher and Schifferings (2018), the DAAD/DZHW study shows that for 54% of the mobile TE students 'loss of time' is a relevant problem (compared to only

36% of the mobile students in general), when putting their outward mobility plans into practice:

Apparently, TE students are finding it far more difficult to integrate studies abroad into their courses of study at their home university, so that they are experiencing delays in their course of studies more frequently than other students. An important reason for this finding could be the relatively large national differences in TE, which hamper a smooth integration of academic credits acquired abroad into the studies at home (AT) (op. cit.: 244-45).

The assumption that large differences between national curricula in TE are one of the main mobility barriers for TE student is confirmed when we look at the answers that German TE students give to the question, which factors motivate them most to put their mobility plans into practice. By far the most frequent answer is the 'unproblematic recognition of credits acquired abroad', which was mentioned by 59% of the TE students (compared to 47% of the overall student population) (op. cit.: 247).

If we try to sum up the available empirical evidence on curricular convergence and student mobility in Germany initiated through the Bologna reforms, we have to first of all point out that the 'Europeanisation' of TE in Germany is still a rather under-researched field of study and that the available empirical evidence is relatively weak. However, the evidence available shows two trends clearly: *Firstly*, there is increasing empirical evidence on curricular and structural diversity in German TE below the national level, which has been instigated by the 'translation' and implementation of the Bologna reforms (e.g. Bauer et al., 2012; Hohenstein et al., 2014). *Secondly*, mobility rates are particularly low amongst German TE students for those types of schools (e.g. primary, lower secondary and vocational schools), who could particularly benefit from internationalisation through increased cultural sensitivity, intercultural competence and language awareness, because in future they will be dealing with the most culturally diverse classrooms (e.g. Kercher and Schifferings, 2018). Thus, it is probably fair to say that the overall integrating impact of the Bologna reforms on TE in Germany has been, and still is, rather moderate, although the international pressures to adapt have been high. Why is this the case and how can we understand and explain this phenomenon? The analytic categories used in educational

governance research that have been introduced earlier (cp. section 2), can provide helpful analytic ‘tools’ to understand and explain these developments, as we will show in the final section of this paper.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

As outlined in the introduction, this paper aims to check two assumptions. *Firstly*, we argue that European initiatives and policies to establish a more integrated and coherent system of TE in Europe will meet national, regional and local particularities and resistance and will therefore find it difficult to gain pervasive influence on national systems of TE. *Secondly*, we aim to check the assumption that processes of ‘glocalisation’ and local ‘translations’ of the Bologna process increase the probability of diversity *within* national systems of TE rather than decrease it. To check these assumptions, we analysed the expectations that are attached to a supra-national European system of TE (section 3) and described the mechanisms and instruments of Europeanisation in TE (section 4). We then focused on the case of Germany in order to assess the influence of ETE initiatives on an exemplary national system of TE based on available empirical evidence (section 5). The final section of this paper will discuss the findings presented above using the analytic ‘tools’ provided by governance research (cp. section 2) and will finish with a short concluding remark on the generalisability of our findings.

ETE is shaped by a multitude of actors exchanging policies by means of reciprocal interaction from the European to the national level and vice versa. In this context, the EU has claimed a strategic role by enabling a close cooperation among Member States, providing financial incentives and supporting intergovernmental initiatives, such as the Bologna process. Rather than merely an actor, the EU itself consists a constellation of actors influencing ETE policies according to sectoral priorities and Member States’ needs. Similarly, European networks and international organisations dealing with TE can complement or compete each other in shaping policies of the specific field. Either by producing new evidence or exerting pressure, these actor constellations can inform and influence EU policy recommendations, as well as decisions taking place at national, regional or local levels. Some of the ETE actors are also moving across these different levels, acting as key agents of ‘Europeanisation’ that ne-

gotiate the policy translation process and employ EU instruments to promote their own institutional interests. With reference to TE in Germany, we can identify several examples that show how local actors employed the 'Bologna process' according to their own needs to push forward their own interests. For example, the adaptation of the Bachelor-Master structure (3+2 years) in TE, initiated by the Bologna reforms, has been very useful for those actors in German TE, who had criticised the different length of degree courses for primary (4 years) and secondary teachers (5 years) for many years and who had had the temporal equalisation of the different degree courses in TE high on their reform agenda.

The main way that the ETE actors coordinate their action is the OMC, a horizontal procedure of policy transfer suggesting a mutual adaptation between the European and domestic levels. Specifically, peer pressure often takes place when actors participating in OMC working groups, observe each other's action and learn about best practices and policies implemented in other countries. 'Constellations of influence' can then occur by means of EU structural or research funds, as well as through cross-sectoral instruments and evidence-based management. The Bologna process is another way of coordinating action and can be interpreted as 'constellation of negotiation', whereby Member States elaborate binding arrangements without necessarily imposing them. Germany, a signatory country of the 1998 Sorbonne Declaration, was among the main negotiators of the Bologna process, but as we can see from the analysis above, the adaptation of Bologna in the German TE landscape is rather diverse.

Resistance to the 'Europeanisation' of TE in Germany through the 'Bologna process' is strong and highly effective, because it can rely on existing 'rights of disposal and regulation structures', which effectively protect German TE from external influences. For example, the prohibition of harmonisation ('*Harmonisierungsverbot*') enshrined into the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht (Art. 126) 'clipped the wings' of the EC by defining clear limits against EC interventions into sensitive policy fields, such as education. In the German case, European interventions into TE are also particularly difficult, because TE in Germany is largely regulated by powerful regional bodies (e.g. ministries of education and/or science) which can effectively resist harmonizing pressures on 'their' schools and TE system. While the curtailment or re-definition of these 'rights of disposal' of the 16 states/*Länder* is next to impossible due to their constitutionally guaranteed right of sovereignty in the field of education, it is still pos-

sible to push forward desired educational reforms by providing additional resources or to introduce new rules into the system. For example, although the EU is still not allowed issuing directives in education, Directive 2013/55/EU constitutes an intervention in German TE by regulating the recognition of teacher qualifications and recognizing the rights of teachers for free movement in the single market. Thus, it becomes obvious that the EU can indirectly intervene into the field of education, if the intervention overlaps with other sectors, such as employment.

ETE is also a multi-level system that spans from European to national to regional and to local levels, with different actor constellations at each level influencing the policy enactment process. In Germany, we observe that the national level represented by the KMK is more receptive of European recommendations regarding Bologna, while regional governments (*Länder*) and local institutions are often reluctant to converge their TE requirements even within the same country. Despite the existence of overarching education standards, TE institutions in Germany adopt them in their curricula in differing ways, thus hindering mobility of students across countries and across institutions.

Finally, the establishment of a more integrated system of ETE described in this paper clearly shows that intentional action can produce 'partially transintentional results', as suggested by governance research. Amongst the numerous unintended side-effects that had not been anticipated by the initiators of the reforms, we can point to the uneven translations of the 'Bologna process' in the Member States making the outward mobility of TE students still rather cumbersome compared to student mobility in other subjects. Further unintentional side-effects can be observed on a sub-national level as demonstrated by the case of Germany, where the translation of the Bologna reforms has exacerbated already existing tensions between the 16 states/*Länder*. As a result, the mobility of German TE students who want to change from one state/*Land* to another or even from one university to another within the same state/*Land* has partially become more difficult. However, there are also positive 'side-effects' of the Bologna reforms, which had not been anticipated by the reformers, but became a reality in course of the reform process. Again, with reference to the German case, we can, for example, observe that the 'Bologna process' has accelerated innovative curriculum reforms in TE, such as an increased focus on inclusion and heterogeneity, the diagnostic competences of teachers, a profession-oriented

teacher training, and coherence and lifelong-learning, which had long been 'in the pipeline'.

By means of conclusion, we argue that our assumptions have been confirmed. Although there is an increasing significance attached to TE at the European level, teaching continues to be regarded as national profession; TE is framed nationally and even regionally in the case of Germany. The Bologna process has certainly influenced the structure and delivery of TE in Europe, but its implementation in Germany has revealed substantial diversity due to differing national and regional translations. Local actors tend to adapt the Bologna process based on their institutional needs and own interests, resisting effectively national and European pressures. Our analysis of the German case of TE shows that 'glocalising' Bologna can exacerbate existing tensions within a country, but that it also bears the potential to accelerate innovations and bring about change. However, whether these results are specific for TE in Germany or can be generalised for TE in Europe is difficult to gauge at present. Further analyses require more empirical evidence with regard to the impact of the Bologna process on different national TE systems in order to enable comparisons and extract broader conclusions about ETE governance.

References

- Alexiadou, N. (2007). "The Europeanisation of Education Policy: Researching Changing Governance and 'New' Modes of Coordination", *Research in Comparative and International Education*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 102-116.
- Alexiadou, N. (2014). "Policy Learning and Europeanisation in Education: The Governance of a Field and the Transfer of Knowledge", in Nordin A. & Sundberg D. (eds.), *Transnational Policy Flows in European Education: The Making and Governing of Knowledge in the Education Policy Field*, Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 123-140.
- Altrichter, H. & Maag Merki, M. (Hrsg.) (2016). *Handbuch Neue Steuerung im Schulsystem*, Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Altrichter, H. (2010). "Theory and Evidence on Governance: Conceptual and Empirical Strategies of Research on Governance in Education", *European Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 147-158.
- Arnold, E. & Reh, S. (2005). "Bachelor-und Master-Studiengänge für die Lehrerbildung. Neue Studienstrukturen als Professionalisierungschance?", *Die Hochschule*. Heft 1, pp. 143-156.

- Bauer, J., Diercks, U., Rösler, L., Möller, J. & Prenzel, M. (2012). "Lehramtsstudium in Deutschland: Wie Groß ist Die Strukturelle Vielfalt?", *Unterrichtswissenschaft*, 40, H. 2, pp. 101-120.
- Bellenberg, G. (2009). "Bachelor und Masterstudiengänge in der LehrerInnenbildung im Jahr 2008", in Keller A. & Rödde U. (Hg.). *Endstation Bologna? Die Reformdebatte zur LehrerInnenbildung in den Ländern, im Bund und in Europa*, Frankfurt/Main: GEW, pp. 15-29.
- Bologna Declaration (1999). *Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education Convened in Bologna on June 19, 1999*. https://www.eurashe.eu/library/modernising-phe/Bologna_1999_Bologna-Declaration.pdf
- Caena, F. (2014). "Comparative Glocal Perspectives on European Teacher Education", *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 106-122.
- Cedefop (2014). *Terminology of European Education and Training Policy: A Selection of 130 Terms (2nd ed.)*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Corbett, A. (2011). "Ping Pong: Competing Leadership for Reform in EU Higher Education 1998-2006", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 36-53.
- Council of the European Communities (1988). *Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education Meeting within the Council on the European Dimension in Education of 24 May 1988*. Retrieved from [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/ALL/?uri=CELEX:41988X0706\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/ALL/?uri=CELEX:41988X0706(01))
- Council of the European Union (2009). *Council Conclusions on the Professional Development of Teachers and School Leaders*. Retrieved from [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52009XG1212\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52009XG1212(01))
- Council of the European Union (2015). *Declaration on Promoting Citizenship and the Common Values of Freedom, Tolerance and Non-discrimination through Education*. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/epale/en/resource-centre/content/declaration-promoting-citizenship-and-common-values-freedom-tolerance-and-0>
- Dale, R. (2009). "Contexts, Constraints and Resources in the Development of European Education Space and European Education Policy", in Dale R. & Robertson S. (eds.), *Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education*, Oxford: Symposium Books.
- De Boer, H., Enders, J. & Schimank, U. (2007). "On the Way towards New Public Management? The Governance of University Systems in England, the Netherlands, Austria, and Germany", in Jansen, D. (ed.), *New Forms of Governance in Research Organisations*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 137-152.
- European Commission (2007). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Improving the Quality of Teacher Education*. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A52007DC0392>

- European Commission (2010). *Developing Coherent and System-wide Induction Programmes for Beginning Teachers: A handbook for Policymakers*. European Commission Staff Working Document SEC (2010) 538 final. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/education/policy/school/doc/handbook0410_en.pdf
- European Commission (2012). *Supporting the Teaching Professions for Better Learning Outcomes. Accompanying Document to the Rethinking Education: Investing in Skills for Better Socio-economic Outcomes*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/policy/school/doc/teachercomp_en.pdf
- European Commission (2013a). *Supporting Teacher Competence Development for Better Learning Outcomes*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2013b). *Supporting Teacher Educators for Better Learning Outcomes*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2015). *Shaping Career-long Perspectives on Teaching: A guide on Policies to Improve Initial Teacher Education*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2017). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Strengthening European Identity through Education and Culture. The European Commission's Contribution to the Leaders' Meeting in Gothenburg, 17 November 2017*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/communication-strengthening-european-identity-education-culture_en.pdf
- European Commission (2018). *Proposal for a Council Recommendation on Promoting Common Values, Inclusive Education, and the European Dimension of Teaching*. Retrieved from <https://www.eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j9vvik7m-1c3gyxp/vkl3ija5eszw>
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015). *The European Higher Education Area in 2015: Bologna Process Implementation Report*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2017). *Support Mechanisms for Evidence-based Policy-making in Education. Eurydice Report*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2018). *The European Higher Education Area in 2018: Bologna Process Implementation Report*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fend, H. (2006). *Neue Theorie der Schule*, Wiesbaden: VS.
- Gassner, O., Kerger, L. & Schratz, M. (eds.) (2010). *The First Ten Years after Bologna*, Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

- Halász, G. (2017). "The Spread of the Learning Outcomes Approaches across Countries, Sub-systems and Levels: A Special Focus on Teacher Education", *European Journal of Education*, 52, pp. 80-91.
- Heublein, U., Ebert, J., Hutzsch, C., Richter, J., & Schreiber, J. (2015). *Internationale Mobilität im Studium 2013. Ergebnisse der vierten Befragung deutscher Studierender zu studienbezogenen Auslandsaufenthalten*, Hannover: DZHW.
- Hohenstein, F., Zimmermann, F., Kleickmann, T., Köller, O. & Möller, J. (2014). "Sind die Bildungswissenschaftlichen Standards für die Lehramtsausbildung in den Curricula der Hochschulen Angekommen?", *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 17, pp. 497-507.
- Hudson, B. (eds.), (2017). *Overcoming Fragmentation in Teacher Education Policy and Practice*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, B., & Zgaga, P. (eds.), (2008). *Teacher Education Policy in Europe: A Voice of Higher Education Institutions*, Umeå: University of Umeå.
- Keller, A. (2010). "Gleichermaßen Hochwertig und Einheitlich Lang: Gewerkschaftliche Anforderungen an die Reform der Lehrerbildung im Bologna-Prozess", *Erziehungswissenschaft*, 21, pp. 99-107.
- Kercher, J. & Schiffering, M. (2018). "Auslandsmobilität von Lehramtsstudierenden in Deutschland: Ein Überblick zur Datenlage und zu Praktischen Umsetzungsbeispielen", in Falkenhagen, C., Grimm, N., Volkmann, L. (Hg.), *Internationalisierung des Lehramtsstudiums. Modelle, Konzepte, Erfahrungen*, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, pp. 235-261.
- Keuffer, J. (2010). "Reform der Lehrerbildung und kein Ende? Eine Standortbestimmung", *Erziehungswissenschaft*, 21, Heft 40, pp. 51-68.
- KMK (Kultusministerkonferenz) (2004). *Standards für die Lehrerbildung Bildungswissenschaften. Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 16.12.2004*, http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2004/2004_12_16-Standards-Lehrerbildung.pdf.
- Kotthoff, H.-G. Denk, R. (2007). "Last Past the Post? Teacher Education and the European Higher Education Area", in Kotthoff, H.-G. & Moutsios, S. (eds.), *Education Policies in Europe. Economy, Citizenship, Diversity*, Münster: Waxmann, pp. 115-127.
- Kotthoff, H.-G. & Terhart, E. (2013). " 'New' Solutions to 'Old' Problems? Recent Reforms in Teacher Education in Germany", *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, 22, pp. 73-92.
- Kussau, J. & Brüsemeister, T. (2007). "Educational Governance: Zur Analyse der Handlungskoordination im Mehrebenensystem der Schule", in Altrichter, H., Brüsemeister, T. & Wissinger, J. (Hrsg.), *Educational Governance: Handlungskoordination und Steuerung im Bildungssystem*, Wiesbaden: VS, pp. 15-53.
- Lange, S. & Schimank, U. (2004). "Governance und Gesellschaftliche Integration",

- in Lange S. & Schimank, U. (eds), *Governance und Gesellschaftliche Integration*, Wiesbaden: VS, pp. 9-44.
- Pépin, L. (2007). "The History of EU Cooperation in the Field of Education and Training: How Lifelong Learning Became a Strategic Objective", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 121-132.
- Pressmann, J.L. & Wildavsky, A. (1973). *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ricken, N. (2010). "Von Bremen über Bologna nach Bremen. Zur Neustrukturierung der LehrerInnenbildung an der Universität Bremen", *Erziehungswissenschaft*, 21, pp. 109-123.
- Sayer, J. (2006). "European Perspectives of Teacher Education and Training", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 63-75.
- Schubarth, W., Mauermeister, S. & Seidel, A. (Hrsg.) (2017). *Studium nach Bologna. Befunde und Positionen*, Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Stéger, C. (2014). "Review and Analysis of the EU Teacher-related Policies and Activities", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 332-347.
- Symeonidis, V. (2018). "Revisiting the European Teacher Education Area: The Transformation of Teacher Education Policies and Practices in Europe" *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 13-34.
- Symeonidis, V. (2020). "Tracing the Value of Teacher Education in EU Teacher-related Policies", in Smith, K. (ed.), *Validity and Value of Teacher Education Research*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, pp. 291-311.
- The Lisbon Treaty - Article 165. (2006). Retrieved May 25, 2018, from <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-the-functioning-of-the-european-union-and-comments/part-3-union-policies-and-internal-actions/title-xii-education-vocational-training-youth-and-sport/453-article-165.html>
- Tillmann, K.-J. (2007). "Erziehungswissenschaft in der BA/MA-Struktur: Die Lehrerbildung", *Erziehungswissenschaft*, Heft 35, 18, pp. 17-24.
- Wernisch, D.V. (2016). *Internationalization and Student Mobility in Teacher Education: Internationalization Models, Diffusion Barriers and Recommendations for Policy and Higher Education Institutions* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Education Freiburg, Germany). Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:debsz:frei129-opus4-6512>.
- Willige, J., Grützmaker, J. & Sudheimer, S. (o.J.). *Internationale Mobilität im Studium 2017. Ergebnisse der Sechsten Befragung Deutscher Studierender zur Studienbezogenen Auslandsmobilität*, Unveröffentlichter Abschlussbericht.
- Winter, M. (2008). "Studienstrukturreform in der Universitären Lehrerbildung. Zum Stand der Umstrukturierung des Lehrerstudiums und zum Studiengangmodell Sachsen-Anhalts", *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung*, 30, pp. 82-111.

- Woisch, A. & Willige, J. (2015). *Internationale Mobilität im Studium 2015. Ergebnisse der Fünften Befragung Deutscher Studierender zur Studienbezogenen Auslandsmobilität*. Hannover: DZHW.
- Zgaga, P. (2008). "Mobility and the European Dimension in Teacher Education", in Hudson B. & Zgaga, P. (eds.), *Teacher Education Policy in Europe: A Voice of Higher Education Institutions*, Umeå: University of Umeå, pp. 17-41.
- Zgaga, P. (2013). "The Future of European Teacher Education in the Heavy Seas of Higher Education", *Teacher Development*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 347-361.

Notes:

1. Translations from German into English are provided by the authors and are marked with the abbreviation: (AT).
2. The Bologna implementation reports (e.g. European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015, 2018) monitor changes in higher education instigated by the Bologna process on a regular basis. However, these reports do not focus on individual subjects or subject groups (e.g. TE).
3. Schubarth, Mauermeister & Seidel (2017) provide an informative overview of the post-Bologna developments of TE in Germany, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Czech Republic and Russia.

Διακυβέρνηση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Εκπαίδευση Εκπαιδευτικών: Η υλοποίηση των μεγάλων προσδοκιών των Βρυξελλών στη Γερμανία

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Ακολουθώντας το όραμα της ευρωπαϊκής ολοκλήρωσης και τις προσπάθειες σύγκλισης των Ευρωπαϊκών συστημάτων εκπαίδευσης, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει εμφανώς επεκτείνει την επιρροή της σε διάφορους τομείς των εθνικών συστημάτων εκπαίδευσης, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του τομέα της εκπαίδευσης εκπαιδευτικών. Το παρόν άρθρο διερευνά εάν και σε ποιο βαθμό οι Ευρωπαϊκές προσδοκίες και πολιτικές πρωτοβουλίες επηρεάζουν τα εθνικά συστήματα εκπαίδευσης εκπαιδευτικών, επικεντρώνοντας την ανάλυση στη διαδικασία της Μπολόνια. Με βάση το παράδειγμα του συστήματος εκπαίδευσης εκπαιδευτικών στη Γερμανία, το άρθρο υποστηρίζει πως παρά την επιρροή εναρμόνισης που επιδιώκει η διαδικασία της Μπολόνια, η εκπαίδευση των εκπαιδευτικών στην Ευρώπη διατηρεί έναν ισχυρό εθνικό και τοπικιστικό χαρακτήρα. Συγκεκριμένα, η ανάλυση αναδεικνύει πως η εκπαίδευση εκπαιδευτικών εντός της Γερμανίας έχει διαφοροποιηθεί σε μεγαλύτερο βαθμό απ' ό,τι έχει ομογενοποιηθεί, ενώ η διακυβέρνηση των ιδρυμάτων εκπαίδευσης εκπαιδευτικών συνεχίζει να καθορίζεται από εθνικούς και τοπικούς φορείς, οι οποίοι αντιστέκονται αποτελεσματικά στις αυξανόμενες πιέσεις για σύγκλιση των ευρωπαϊκών συστημάτων εκπαίδευσης εκπαιδευτικών.