

Constructing curricula in teacher education: the national as part of the European framework

Georgios Stamelos¹
University of Patras

Summary

This paper is dealing with teacher education and the development of curricula in this scientific area at different cycles (undergraduate - postgraduate). After an analysis of relevant literature, the paper considers how the findings of the research can help in the construction of a curriculum, specifically at master's level. As a level of specialization what options exist and what negotiations can be done to make the curriculum meet contemporary challenges and needs. Once it has been set up, in a second phase, the satisfaction of the students who choose it is examined. The discussion highlights both the achievements and the challenges that have to do with both the teachers and the students of the program.

Keywords

Teacher Education, Teacher Education Policies, Teacher Education Programs.

¹ Professor, stamelos@upatras.gr.

1. Introduction

Teacher education has been and remains a major stake, especially for those in primary education. The debates and controversies run across all dimensions: a. in which institution; b. what duration; c. what content; d. what the relationship is between teacher education and educational sciences. Perhaps most recently: what the settlements are among the first, second and third cycle of study?

The first question concerns whether primary teacher education should take place within the university or outside, in an institution that may be university or non-university level (sometimes in an institution affiliated with the university but not a university). The stakes, sometimes explicitly stated and sometimes not, have to do with the mission (with or without quotation marks) that the state assigns to the (compulsory) school and its employees. The university guarantees independence in the content of studies, a long duration of studies (3 or 4 years) and, perhaps most importantly, an introduction to research, in other words critical thinking and questioning. Non-university studies ensure that studies (and thus identity formation) are controlled by the state directly or through the mediation of a mandated body (usually the inspectorate). In this case, education in research (i.e. education in the ‘why?’ is not a target or is a peripheral issue. An interesting case of this version is France (Mialaret, 1984; Marmoz, 1988; Charlot, 1995).

The second question is related to the first to the extent that the university ensures concrete cycles of study. Otherwise, non-university studies may be short or very short, either for initial education or for specialization after a first degree in another subject (see again the French case (Charlot, 1995)). In the first case, the university ensures clarity, stability, and the development of a specific scientific and professional identity. In the second case, the functional dimension of the needs of the education system and the state is prioritized (Hudson & Zgaga, 2008)².

The third question is about the content of studies and who determines it. The university, through its autonomy, ensures independence in determining content but also freedom in teaching, learning and assessment. Of course, the university does not operate in a vacuum. Obviously, national profiles (where they exist) or, in recent years,

² It is characteristic that in Greece, the integration of the education of primary school teachers was a political decision, despite the opposition of the universities, which/that considered it non-scientific. (Stamelos G. , 1999).

assessment procedures act as a mechanism for homogenization, delimitation and/or control (QAA, 2019; Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de la Jeunesse, 2024). On the contrary, in the case where studies are not offered at the university, the project is to prepare for integration into the existing school which has specific functions and needs. Consequently, education is mainly practical. The "what" and the "how" take precedence and marginalize the "why" (Stamelos & Gkotsis, 2021).

The fourth question is directly linked to the third question. Usually, the focus on teacher education is more practical. The focus on the educational sciences is to develop a more global understanding of the educational system and its challenges, both inside and outside the school. The first version is accused of being reproducing and short-sighted about a reality that involves many complex and demanding problems (social, psychological, and pedagogical). The second version is accused of failing to prepare the teacher for the real classroom and its needs, rather constructing an educational intellectual (Stamelos, 2012).

Finally, the last question relates to the structure of studies at different levels and the need to identify the differences between them. In fact, it raises the question: if we currently focus on the possession of a first qualification (bachelor, but certainly level 6 of the European Qualification Framework (EQF) and not on the structures, content and procedures for obtaining it (in the logic of Directive 89/48 on the *final product*, as per the Cassis de Dijon case) (European Court, 1979)), how should a second course of study (Master) be structured?

This paper will focus on a curriculum and the rational of its development for teacher education at master level. Furthermore, it will try to highlight the possible contradictions between the intentions of the designers of a master program and the widespread expectations of its participants, teachers, and students (whether they are current teachers or future teachers). Are these three parties (designers, teachers, students) really tuned/satisfied?

2. Literature Review

The history of teacher education has gone through different phases. The different phases mark different social, political and economic needs of each period (Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, & J., 2008). Understanding the formation of relevant teacher education policies based on the previous needs is essential. The first assumption of this paper,

then, is that its focuses on the **policy dimension of teacher education** (Symeonidis, 2020).

The training of teachers in each country, as a strictly national affair, developed in parallel and with rare bridges of -official- communication between states in both the 19th and the first half of the 20th at least. Nevertheless, the transfer of both individual ideas and entire policies (laws) was not rare. However, both during transfer (national filters) and during implementation the environment imposed (reinterpretation) (Stamelos, 1999). Although we are a long way from the time when Durkheim, as the person responsible for the inculcation of *laïcité* in French education, called on schools and teachers to '*uproot*' children from their families (and old values) and '*infuse*' them with the values of citizenship (a citizen with rights and obligations) and democracy (Durkheim, 2022 [1922]), teacher education remains a national priority.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to refer to the different education of primary and secondary school teachers, which led to a different status both in the workplace and in society. In the Greek case, the education of the former was either non-existent (at the beginning of the new Greek state) or - subsequently - integrated into various institutions that were constantly changing as they were criticized for their quality: '*they (the teachers) were recruited from the fields, people who did not thrive in any work [...] as at most ignorant, uneducated, uncouth*'. (Lefas, 1942, p. 256). The secondary school teachers were educated from the outset at the university on the basis of a science that gave them prestige and recognition. As a result, the former (primary school teachers) had the professional status of a municipal employee with an uncertain professional future and salary (depending on whether or not the municipality had money or even how much money it could afford), while the latter (secondary school teachers) were civil servants with a stable and secure salary (but not a permanent position until 1911) (Stamelos, 1999). Thus, although at the beginnings of the Greek state, there was a unified Greek Teachers' Association, in 1889, on the initiative of secondary school teachers, this association was split. The justification for the split: '*the position of the teachers is miserable, they are fighting for existence and not for science [...] it [the association] cannot work in harmony since the purpose of the two sections [primary teachers-secondary teachers] is different and their officials do not have the same education for common cooperation*' (mentioned in Andreou & Papakonstantinou, 1994, pp. 217-218). Although nowadays the two educations take place at the university, the

temporal difference is still mutated: primary teachers derive their scientific identity - mainly- from their teaching practice (pedagogy) while secondary teachers derive their scientific identity from their subject matter. Moreover, primary and secondary teachers, in their initial training, have no points of contact, while in the subsequent (master) education/training they can only coexist in a fragmentary and accidental way. Therefore, there is a communication deficit. This deficit contributes to the - subsequent - professional rivalry between the two trade unions (DOE and OLME, in Greek), which claim more hours in the official program due to the restructuring of the educational programs (especially those of secondary school towards certain subjects in primary school). **Lack of communication and concurrence** is the second assumption in this document.

After the Second World War and its lessons, the role of education has in time been linked to economic development, international mobility and social cohesion. Efforts to increase student flows, first at primary, then at secondary and finally at tertiary level, became a policy objective. The international organizations set up after the Second World War in the Western world played a key role. As a result, the importance of education (and therefore of teachers) increased and international organizations began to influence national policies (Stamelos, 2009). Although the national interest in teacher education remains dominant (at primary level, socialization including identity, at secondary level, preparation for a (national) labor market), the priorities set at the social, political, and economic levels are broader. The demands on the teaching profession are multiplying and, consequently, its training is called upon to become (more) 'scientific' (here we refer to Crandall's scheme) (Crandall, 2000).

The demand for *scientificity* led to the need to reformulate and consolidate a framework of teacher education in two phases (initial/pre-service, continuing/inter-service) to arrive at a concept of a continuum (Buchberger, Campos, Kallos, & Stephenson, 2000; Symeonidis, 2020). The same demand led to the higher education of primary teachers' studies especially from the 1980s onwards. This is a development which, on the one hand, releases the curriculum from the direct control of the state and its agencies, and on the other hand, increases the social prestige of graduates³. The

³ In countries, such as Greece, with periods of political instability and/or diversion, this control could become suffocating. It is characteristic that the two dictatorships that the country experienced in the 20th century (1936-1940, 1967-1974) showed activism on the issue (Stamelos G. , 1999).

increase of autonomy in the curriculum introduced for the first time in the philosophy of the curriculum not only the questions "what" and "how" but also the question "why" (research). **The concept of autonomy** is the third assumption in this paper. This concept can only be based in a university context (research as a building block of university studies).

In the Greek case, the higher education of primary school teachers was completed early (1983). But the beginning was difficult. It was a political decision of the first socialist government and despite the strong opposition of the universities who considered this education as professional and not scientific. In order to overcome these objections, the establishment of the Departments of Teacher Education was combined with simultaneous training in the Educational Sciences. The latter were therefore called upon to ensure *scientificity* and develop a scientific identity in future primary school teachers (Stamelos G. , 1999). Nevertheless, the entrenched identity of the teacher as a 'pedagogue' did not change. On the other hand, secondary school teachers continued to be trained in a discipline with little or no inculcation of the pedagogical dimension of their future profession. This is where the fourth assumption of this paper lies. Secondary school teachers are not familiar with issues of Educational Sciences while primary school teachers, although more familiar, are not sure that they have addressed in their undergraduate studies the issue of "teacher education" as a specialized field of knowledge. The fourth assumption concerns precisely both **the inherent competition between teachers at the two levels and their lack of engagement with the foundations of their autonomy**, the question of the content of their education.

The *universitization* of studies and the increase in demands on teachers have led, on the one hand, to the further specialization of teacher education and, on the other hand, to its professionalization in the last 20-25 years. Therefore, the concept that emerged is the professional identity of teachers. It has been the subject of intensive work both by international organizations (e.g. (OECD, 2022)) as well as by researchers (e.g. (Beijaard, Meijer, & Yerloop, 2004)). The importance of the concept relates to: a. the quality of teaching, b. professional development, and c. its contribution to successful policy development (Rots, Aetterman, Devos, & Vlerich, 2010). The latter is of direct interest to this paper. Indeed, teachers' professional identity not only influences their classroom practices but also how they interpret and implement educational policies. When teachers perceive that their values, identity and experiences are threatened by an

educational policy, they react and resist its implementation. The core of the challenges seems to lie in a contradiction of the professionalization of teachers' studies (and work): on the one hand, the demand for advanced and specialized studies leads to a demand, from teachers, for greater professional autonomy; on the other hand, the administrative version of professionalization leads to stricter and more analytical control measures and attempts to model the profession. Ultimately, the challenges are framed as follows: Is the teacher professionally autonomous or an executor of imposed policy choices (Karousiou, Hajisoteriou, & Angelides, 2019)? The fifth assumption of this paper addresses this stake that ultimately, in its utility, highlights **the need to explore ways to implement educational policy more effectively**. In its starting points, however, it concerns one of the pillars of the constitution of the professional identity of the teacher. Indeed, if the pillars are: a. how to be, b. how to act, and c. how to understand (Sachs, 2005, p. 15), the third pillar concerns the broader understanding beyond the teacher's role and action in the classroom. It concerns broader understandings.

Although the teaching profession (and education) remains a national affair, it is a fact that many international and supranational organizations are now involved in it. As far as the European Union (EU), ex European Economic Community (EEC), and its Member States are concerned, this involvement became official in 1992 with the Maastricht Treaty and has since developed rapidly (Stamelos & Vassilopoulos, 2004; Stamelos & Vassilopoulos, 2013). It is interesting to note that, following the Reyners case (European Court, 1974) and after a series of decisions of the Court of Justice of EU that lasted for about 15 years, the Court, after defining the *exercise of public authority*, defined the sectors of the public area where public authority is exercised (thus falling within the exceptions of Article 48.4 of the Treaty of Rome)⁴ (Official Journal of the EC, 1988). In this decision education was not included in these sectors. Consequently, foreign citizens (citizens of other Member States of the then EEC, now the EU) can join as employees all levels of the education system of a Member State of the Union. In this context, the main component of the teaching profession is understood to be its pedagogical dimension and not the implementation of a government policy (exercise of public authority). Of course, the truth is that this decision, although it opened the way to recruitment (under certain conditions) for all citizens of EEC/EU Member States, did

⁴ Paragraph 4 of Article 48 identified the positions which, because they involved the 'exercise of a public authority', could not be filled by citizens of other Member States of the EEC/EU.

not undo the hierarchical dependence within the education system. Therefore, there remains an ambiguity with significant stakes in the position and role of the teacher in relation to the dictates of the educational administration. After all, education systems remain national.

For school education, the big stake is the activation of the European Education Area in 2025 (<https://education.ec.europa.eu>). This area has been in preparation for fifteen years. However, it is not certain that the average teacher has heard anything about it, although many are already enjoying some of its benefits (primarily thanks to the Erasmus+ program). This area will not do away with national school systems. But it will make them more visible, more permeable, with a view to greater coordination. It is no coincidence that teacher education is one of the six (6) priority themes. The Program Statements recognize, among other things, that *"without involving and committing these professionals, no educational reform will succeed. They play a central role in fostering and implementing innovative curricula and teaching practices that provide learners with the key competences they need to flourish in Europe's sustainable digital economy of the future"*

(<https://education.ec.europa.eu/el/focus-topics/teachers-trainers-and-school-leaders>).

Indeed, the Council Resolution makes teacher education a priority for the EU for the 2021-2030 decade. (European Council, 2021). This engagement establishes an increasingly structured framework in which core competences for teachers are defined (Caena, 2011). At the same time, the existence of both the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (European Union, 2016) and the eight (8) core competences of lifelong learning (European Union, 2018) define a framework for both European schools and European teachers. This is an important development, but it is mainly carried out in closed political offices and small groups of experts. This hides the risks of triggering (again) the defensive reflexes of teachers to the extent that it will be seen as affecting key aspects of their profession. Therefore, on the one hand, **information** and, on the other hand, **the creation of current or future educational experts** on the subject is necessary. This is the sixth assumption of this text. On the other hand, it should be noted that some EU initiatives seem to facilitate the active involvement of teachers through joint projects (primarily through Erasmus+) that create networks and collaborative communities or through joint lifelong training through the Teachers Academies (<https://education.ec.europa.eu/education-levels/school->

education/erasmus-teacher-academies). Therefore, without questioning the national conception of educational systems, a European (Community) perspective is emerging which acts (and will act more strongly in the future) creating a hybridity in which much remains to be settled as regards the position and role of the teacher.

The questions raised by the above analysis are twofold:

- a. how can the previous analysis contribute to the creation of a curriculum, at Master level, that considers contemporary realities?
- b. if this becomes feasible, can it satisfy those who attend, or will it remain an intellectual construct of good intentions?

3. Methodology

First, an attempt will be made to describe the transformation of the theoretical analysis into a proposed curriculum, developed into learning outcomes and offered Modules.

Then, the satisfaction of students following this curriculum will be investigated. Specifically, using a specially constructed questionnaire, students in the academic year 2023-2024 were asked about their satisfaction with the modules offered, both in terms of their content as well as their teaching and pedagogical interest. For the purposes of this document only the general judgements will be used and not a detailed presentation of the individual units of the Modules. The scale used was: a. very interesting - interesting - uninteresting - very uninteresting - don't know/don't answer; b. very informed - informed - a little informed - not informed at all - don't know/don't answer.

4. From literature review to setting up a curriculum

The text up to this point noted six assumptions:

- A. the direct relationship between educational policy and the establishment of teacher education programs (content)
- B. the lack of communication opportunities between primary and secondary school teachers
- C. the central role of the university (the importance of research as a precondition for ensuring autonomy for teachers)

- D. the inherent competition between primary and secondary school teachers and the lack of understanding of the issue of their education content
- E. autonomy because of a broader understanding of reality (global, European, national, local) beyond the classroom
- F. the lack of information and the shortage of current and future educational experts on European policy and teacher education issues.

Firstly, the importance of teacher education is taken for granted and affects their professional identity and their effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2000). From there, if one were to be led to an initial exploration of putting together a postgraduate program based on the assumptions set out earlier in the paper, one would also need to consider the existing offer of postgraduate programs. This investigation, in the context of the Greek-speaking world (e.g. <https://www.eduguide.gr>), showed the offer of a large number of master programs concerning either the first pillar (how to be) or the second pillar (how to act). In fact, the second pillar seems to be in high demand to the extent that many programs are offered in specialized areas (intercultural, integration of immigrants, special education, problems of violence and crises in the school unit, specialized teaching practices/didactics, school leadership, etc.). In contrast, there are not enough programs focusing on the third pillar, especially on teacher education as an educational policy subject. Finally, there are no programs that link the focus on teacher education as an object of educational policy, the central role of the university in teacher education (the role of research and the independence of research that educates (and) in issues of autonomy) and European policies that aim to create a European Education Area.

Therefore, the needs assessment was structured as follows:

- Need for information on existing teacher education policies (national and European)
- Need to understand the challenges in modern teacher education, especially in the negotiation between national and European level
- Need to create a body of teachers who can think and understand the issue of curriculum for teacher education
- The need to establish contact between primary and secondary teachers.

A postgraduate program is not created in a vacuum. It is embedded in a wider European and national (Greek) context. In the European area, two sub-systems coexist in terms of the duration of studies: a. one in the logic of 3-2-3, and b. one in the logic of 4-1-3. Greece is a country in the second system. Therefore, a postgraduate program should be of one (academic) year. It should be a one-year degree program, which should be integrated into level 7 of the Greek and European area and should ensure the following learning outcomes (<https://europass.europa.eu/en/description-eight-efq-levels>):

- Knowledge: Highly specialized knowledge, some of which is at the forefront of knowledge in a field of work or study, as the basis for original thinking and/or research. Critical awareness of knowledge issues in a field and at the interface between different fields
- Skills: Specialised problem-solving skills required in research and/or innovation in order to develop new knowledge from different fields
- Responsibility and autonomy: Manage and transform work or study contexts that are complex, unpredictable and require new strategic performance of teams.

A further issue that would have to be settled is the decision whether such a master degree would be professional or research-based. Based on the assumptions and the needs that have been described, such a master's degree would be research-based. Accordingly, a major would have to be committed to: a. research methodology, and b. the master dissertation (research).

4.1 The application

Within the framework of the Inter-University Interdepartmental Network "Higher Education Policy" of the Universities of Patras, Aegean and Peloponnese (<https://hepnet.upatras.gr>), a Master in Higher Education Policy (<https://mahep-upatras.gr>) has been developed for eight (8) years. From 2022-2023, the program offers two specializations:

- A. Quality assurance and strategic planning, and
- B. Teacher education.

The program of the second specialization is structured as follows:

First semester

Module A : European and Greek Higher Education Framework (9 ECTS)

Module B: Historical Framework and Social Dimension (9 ECTS)

Module C: Teacher Education (9 ECTS)

Colloquium (3 ECTS).

The constitution of the program, follows the main lines presented earlier:

- A. The context (European and national),
- B. The historical and social importance of the university as a context of education, and
- C. The constitution of teacher education.

Finally, the Colloquium exists to publicly present students' ideas for their theses.

Second semester

Module 4 : a. Research methodology (5 ECTS), and b. Dissertation (25 ECTS).

The structure reflects the balance between knowledge and practice.

4.2. Students' satisfaction

In the following we will present the results of the assessment of the students from the Modules of the first semester of the academic year 2023-2024.

Regarding Module A, 58.1% indicate very interested and 41.9% interested (n=31). 48.4% stated that prior to attending the Module they were a little informed, 29% not at all informed, 12.9% informed and 9.7% very informed. After completing the Module, 51.6% stated very informed and 48.4% informed. Finally, 48.4% stated that the Module made it a little difficult, 29% difficult, 19.4% not at all difficult and 3.2% very difficult.

Regarding Module B, 50% stated that they found it very interesting, 45.5% interesting and 4.5% uninteresting (n=22). 54.5% stated that before attending the Module they were a little informed, 22.7% informed, 18.2% not at all informed and 4.6% very informed. After completing the Module, 63.6% reported being informed and

36.4% very informed. Finally, 59.1% stated that the Module made it a little difficult, 39.4% difficult and 4.5% not at all difficult.

Regarding Module C, 63.6% stated that they found it very interesting and 36.4% interesting (n=22). 59.1% stated that before attending the Module they were a little informed, 31.8% informed, 5% not at all informed and another 5% very informed. After completing the Module 54.5% said they were informed and 45.5% very informed. Finally, 59.1% stated that the Module made it a little difficult, 27.3% difficult, 9.1% not at all difficult and 4.5% very difficult.

Based on the responses, it appears that students are satisfied with the course they attended. But the key point is that while before attending they stated a little informed after attending, they stated very informed or informed. This point shows the contribution of the program in developing a body of informed teachers (or future teachers) who have developed the '*how to understand*' pillar that was the objective of the program. Finally, this additional knowledge usually came through an effort of little difficulty in understanding and responding to the content of the Modules.

Finally, note that: a. the sample was dominated by women (about 75%), and b. the wide age range: 23-28 years old, 31.8%; 29-34 years old; 27,3%; 41-46 years old, 13.6%; 47-52 years old, >52 years old, 4.5%.

Conclusions-Discussion

Nowadays, the importance of education is a given. Because of its high importance, teacher education has become a priority. The framework for developing teacher education policies is becoming increasingly complex given the coexistence of national options and the development of a European Education Area. The increasing importance of teacher education has led first to its universalization, then to specializations. This has contributed to the development of a new professional identity which seems to be built around three pillars. One of them aims at better education (of teachers) for a better understanding (and acceptance) of educational policies. This pillar is important insofar as it comes to underline a need arising from a contradiction: teachers, on the one hand, are called upon to become increasingly qualified and therefore professionally developed, and on the other hand, they feel increasingly controlled without a voice on basic issues that concern them. Between professional responsibility and autonomy and the demand for hierarchical adaptation and compliance, a need arises. The need to understand and

participate in the announced changes. This is where the curriculum, at Master level, which has been analyzed, would like to intervene.

Indeed, in this paper we have tried to describe the conception and implementation of a postgraduate program of teacher education aimed at the third pillar. What are we trying to achieve?

Our aim is to train (teachers, current and future) experts in teacher education (policy) who can understand the complex context in which policies affecting them are developed and can claim to express their opinions. Our objective is linked to the third pillar of the construction of teachers' professional identity (Sachs, 2005; Rots, Aetterman, Devos, & Vlerich, 2010) and the reaction to developing educational policies. To do so, we focused on three themes/dimensions: a. understanding European and national policies on higher education (teacher education space), b. the importance of education in the university (right to research, autonomy), and c. an evolutionary analysis of both the constitution of education and the profession of teacher (self-awareness).

The students who attend the program are satisfied. Most importantly, they now consider themselves informed. This awareness has been achieved with some effort on their part, but it is not a dissuasive one.

What does the application so far show? The second specialization (teacher education) is chosen by current and/or future teachers in primary and secondary education. The initial picture has at least two positive aspects: a. the opportunity for primary and secondary school teachers (from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds) to coexist, collaborate (through the student-centered learning activities implemented) and share education in teacher education. On the other hand, there are also at least two challenges. These are: a. the marked age difference of the participants with different needs and boundaries involved (very young future teachers with no other commitments, active teachers with parallel family and work commitments), and b. the omnipresence of initial education which does not ensure a common - minimum - level of knowledge. Since the program is offered at a distance, the distance may bring people together from all four corners of the country, but it does not facilitate efforts to develop interpersonal relationships, networks, and synergies.

Of course, this program has not found the paradise of teacher specialization. Several difficulties call for negotiation despite and beyond the intentions of its creators.

On the part of the teachers there seems to be a variation in understanding and coordination of the approach. It is no coincidence that the lowest, relative, percentage of absolute satisfaction is received by Module B. Its conception had to do with the need to understand the university context of teacher education. This connection does not seem to be fully achieved. Teachers seem to focus more on the university institution itself and not on its importance for teacher education. Thus, trainees do not fully understand the importance of Module B and its place in the curriculum. Finally, at this point a shortcoming seems to emerge: while there are experts on the university institution and experts on teacher education, there seems to be a difficulty in combining the two. Teachers seem to insist on their area of expertise more than the needs of the program.

However, there also seem to be difficulties on the part of the students. The main challenge for the project's responsible is the key motivation of the participants. This is primarily utilitarian. For active teachers, a master degree is essential for a position of responsibility. For future teachers, a master degree adds to their bachelors and improves their position on the lists of substitute teachers (non-tenured staff), which is the main route to future recruitment of new teachers. The basic motivation, combined with the more general circumstances (work, family, etc.) pushes a lot of them to a process-oriented view of their obligations. The challenge for the program's responsible is to stimulate their interest so that they deepen their understanding and start to feel like the 'experts' about teacher education. This feeling, on the one hand, leads to a better understanding of reality and interpretation of policy initiatives (here again, the experience offered by the Erasmus+ programs in terms of cooperation between schools and teachers is invaluable) and, on the other hand, can - under certain conditions - lead to the expression of public opinion on how teachers should be trained. The latter is important as a demonstration of the autonomy of teachers' professional identity.

Referencics

- Andreou, A., & Papakonstantinou, G. (1994). *Power and Organisation-Administration of the Education System*. Athens: Nea Synora-A.A. Livanis (in greek).
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P., & Yerloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2): 107-128.
- Buchberger, F., Campos, B., Kallos, D., & Stephenson, J. (2000). *Green Papaer on Teacher Education in Europe. High Quality Teacher Education for High Quality*

- Education and Training*. Umea: Thematic Network on teacher Education in Europe.
- Caena, F. (2011). *Literature review: Teachers'core competences. Requirements and development*. Brussels: European Commision. Thematic Working Group 'Professional Development of Teachers';
- Charlot, B. (1995). *Les sciences de l'éducation. Un enjeu, un défi*. Paris: ESF éditeur.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., & J., M. (2008). *Handbook of research on teacher education. Enduring questions in changing contexts (3d ed)*. New York & London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Crandall, J. (2000). Language Teacher Education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 34-55.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How Teacher Education Matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3): 166-173.
- Durkheim, E. (2022 [1922]). *Éducation et Sociologie*. Paris: PUF.
- European Council. (2021). *Council Resolution on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training towards the European Education Area and beyond (2021-2030)*. Brussels: Official Journal of the European Union (2021/C 66/01).
- European Court. (1974, 6 21). *Judgment of 21.6.1974 - case 2/74*. Ανάκτηση από <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:61974CJ0002> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:61974CJ0002>
- European Court. (1979, 2 20). *Judgment of 20.2.1979 - case 120/78*. Ανάκτηση από <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:61978CJ0120> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:61978CJ0120>
- European Union. (2016). *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*. Brussels: Official Journal of European Union (2016/ C 202/02).
- European Union. (2018). *Council Recommendation on key competences for lifelong learning*. Brussels: Official Journal of European Union (2018/C 189/01).
- European Union. (2018). *Council Recommendation on key competences for lifelong learning*. Brussels: Official Journal of European Union.
- Hudson, B., & Zgaga, P. (2008). *Teacher education policy in Europe: a voice of hogher education institutions*. Umea: University of Umea-University of Ljubljana.
- Karousiou, C., Hajisoteriou, C., & Angelides, P. (2019). Teachers' professional identoty in super-diverse school settings: Teachers as agents on intercultural education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 25(2): 240-258.
- Lefas, C. (1942). *History of Education*. Athens: OEDB.
- Marmoz, L. (1988). *Les sciences de l'éducation en France*. Issy les Moulineaux: EAP.
- Mialaret, G. (1984). *Les sciences de l'Éducation, 3e ed*. Paris: PUF.
- Ministère de l'Éducation et de la Jeunesse (2024, 4 7). *education.gouv.fr*. Ανάκτηση από <https://www.education.gouv.fr/le-referentiel-de-competences-des-metiers-du-professorat-et-de-l-education-5753>
- OECD. (2022). *Teacher professional identity: How to develop and support it in times of change*. New York: OECD.
- Official Journal of the EC. (1988, 12 21). *Council Directive (89/48/EEC)*. Ανάκτηση από <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31989L0048> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31989L0048>
- Official Journal of the EC. (1988, 3 18). *Official Journal of the EC, C72, v.31*. Ανάκτηση από <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C:1988:072:FULL&from=GA> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C:1988:072:FULL&from=GA>
- QAA. (2019). *Subject benchmark statement: Education studies*. QAA.

- Rots, I., Aetterman, A., Devos, G., & Vlerich, P. (2010). Teacher education and the choice to enter the teaching profession: a prospective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8): 1619-1629.
- Sachs, J. (2005). Teacher professionalism: Why are we still talking about it? *Teachers and Teaching*, 22(4): 413-425.
- Stamelos, G. (1999). *The University Pedagogical Departments. Origins, Present Situation, Prospects*. Athens: Gutenberg (in greek).
- Stamelos, G. (2009). *Educational Policy*. Athens: Dionikos (in greek).
- Stamelos, G. (2012). Formation des maîtres: y-a-t-il un paradis? le cas hellénique. *Cahiers Pédagogiques, hors série numérique*, 27-28.
- Stamelos, G., & Gkotsis, I. (2021). Are educational sciences useful in teacher education? *Academia*, 22: 122-146.
- Stamelos, G., & Vassilopoulos, A. (2004). *European Educational Policy*. Athens: Metahmio (in greek).
- Stamelos, G., & Vassilopoulos, A. (2013). *Lifelong learning Policies in the Context of European Governance*. Athens: Dionikos (in greek).
- Symeonidis, V. (2020). *Europeanisation in Teacher Education. A comparative case study of teacher education policies and practices*. London: Routledge.