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This story begins in 1999 with the Bologna Declaration issued by the European Ministers of Education. The declaration proposed the creation of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) with free student mobility using national qualifications in one country as recognized entry requirements for further study in another. The principal aims were stated thus:

Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees. Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries. (Bologna Declaration, 1999)

The content of the Bologna Declaration and its implications and effects, commonly termed the Bologna process has been adapted and implemented, at least to some degree, in most countries within the EHEA. Less well-known, however, is the fact that much of the basic work to make the Bologna process implementable was conducted by the project ‘Tuning Educational Structures in Europe’.

The Tuning project was financed by the EU and started in 2000 under the dual leadership of the Universities of Groningen in the Netherlands and Deusto in Bilbao, Spain. Initially universities from twelve countries in five subject areas, including history, were represented in the project. The participating institutions were chosen by their respective national governments. More countries and more subject areas were added later in the course of the process. Over the
following years the national representatives for the different Subject Area Groups (SAG) met regularly in locations across Europe for lively discussions about teaching, learning, comparability and convergence in their respective disciplines. Between meetings academics in each country were consulted about the issues raised in these SAGs. The History SAG, for instance, utilized the Erasmus Thematic Network for History (CLioH) in order to reach as many academics as possible (CLioH Ourstory, 2014). Although all decisions were made by the small SAGs they were based on input from hundreds of academics. The most important outcomes of the SAG’s work have been the definition of the overall learning outcomes for the different subjects and the provision of a method to attach appropriate learning and teaching approaches to them. The results can be found on the Tuning website www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/.

The success of the Tuning process meant that it was soon adopted by other regions: Latin America, the US, Canada, Russia, Africa, Central Asia, and recently China, Japan and India. The now worldwide process enables us to compare the results of these different Tunings and arguably to formulate both wider and more precise definitions of the subject areas. In what follows I am using for comparison the outcomes of Tuning Europe and Tuning Latin America, together with some aspects of Tuning Central Asia and Tuning US.

A ‘Tuner’s’ perspective

The question ‘The same history for all?’ was posed by one sceptical member of the history SAG at the beginning of the Tuning Project. The question was valid, or rather would have been, if the ambition had been to harmonize higher education, or, even worse, to make academics conform to a political agenda fabricated by some anonymous EU bureaucrat. We needed to be assured that Tuning did not constitute an attack on academic freedom. But, as it turned out, these apprehensions were mostly unfounded. The decision to create an EHEA was political but the work to facilitate it was left to us academics ourselves. In addition, the work was not done by
officers in Universities’ Central Administrations, but by us, the teachers: this in itself was reassuring.

The main working programme for Tuning can be formulated as follows. In order to achieve convergence in higher education across the subject area, we were to map the different countries’ educational structures, find a ‘common language’ and agree upon commonly accepted professional and learning outcomes. The results expected were transparency of the different educational structures and systems; comparability of degrees; and transferability of degrees and learning outcomes between educational systems. During the work, in order to reach the aims mentioned above, Tuning was expected to develop a methodology for analysing common elements and areas of specificity and diversity and find a way to tune them; to deliver best practices and good example; and to develop a model curriculum structure. In practice, whilst the mapping proved to be relatively easy, finding a common language and reference points in teaching and learning history was more difficult. For reasons of space, I will leave aside some important aspects of Tuning such as the European Credit and Accumulation Transfer System (ECTS), the exploration of approaches to learning, and teaching and assessment and their alignment with the required competences. However, it is worth stating that the initial Tuning process has now developed to include an elaborate method to construct, assess and ensure the quality of educational programs. It has become a highly useful tool for academic teachers (for history, see Cliohworld Guide II, 2011).

In this article I focus on the work to find common denominators and reference points in teaching and learning history. To begin with a common vocabulary had to be constructed in order to enable productive discussions. This work proved to be surprisingly intricate. History is, as a rule, based on national traditions with origins in various historiographical outlooks and is taught in a multitude of ways in diverging educational structures. This created an initial communication problem in the SAG. For instance: diachronic divisions were different, the importance and content of historical methods and theories varied, the terminology for historical aspects and phenomena was often national, and
understanding of various teaching and learning methods was dissimilar. There were, for example, many ways to translate the concept of a ‘seminar’. In the end we did, however, reach consensus on a working baseline vocabulary for our efforts.

The next step was to define the ‘core’ of history as a discipline. Again there were difficult issues to confront. National and thematic interests led to, sometimes fierce, discussions about what should be included. The situation was not initially encouraging, especially when the group consisted of academics all with extensive education in critical thinking and used to putting their opinions forward. What we could in the beginning agree upon was therefore only a very general definition of what history as a subject ‘is’: broadly, to study the past by critically analysing appropriate source materials with applicable methods. However, the Tuning project supplied us with a methodology that did strongly emphasize the student perspective. The point was not what we as academic teachers were providing, but what the students received. Behind this was the realization that after completing his/her education the student possesses a variety of qualifications (knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes) that are formed in the learning process. Tuning aimed at finding a way to describe all these attributes by categorising them in different types of overall learning results: learning outcomes, subject specific competencies, and generic competencies.²

A history student is much more knowledgeable and competent than we educators tend to think. Besides the obvious, knowledge of history and the historians’ craft, the student has actually accrued much more during his/her years conducting academic studies. Some of these competencies are general, like the ability to meet dead-lines, to organize one’s work, ability to communicate in one or more languages, evaluate and maintain the quality of work produced, work in team, etc. Some are subject-specific, provided by learning specifically history: for instance, the abilities to find and analyse relationships between current events and processes and the past; to analyse critically historical facts, phenomena and processes; and, to present the results in a scientifically acceptable form. The history SAG’s view was also that recognising these different levels in a
student’s academic development would help to demonstrate the social value of studying subjects like humanities that have traditionally been considered ‘useless’ from a strict utilitarian point of view. The realization that there is a difference between the learning outcomes that teachers decide and the competencies that the student develops and can apply and use, for instance, in a future workplace, provided a solid starting point for constructing the history core.

The core of history: a competencies approach

Learning outcomes are defined as ‘statements of what a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completion of a process of learning’ (Gonzáles & Wagenaar, 2005: 383). Diverse educational systems and historiographical outlooks result in different learning outcomes as a result of the need to cover national history and national historiographies. An Italian student has to know classical Latin in order to be able to study Roman history properly, while a Swedish student might need to understand the runic alphabet to understand Nordic medieval times. However, as long as learning outcomes are clearly and transparently linked to subject specific (and generic) competencies, the knowledge base can reflect national variation without changing the common agreement of history’s core. The same competencies can be formed with different learning outcomes.

The Tuning Project defines competencies in terms of ‘a dynamic representation of demonstrated knowledge, understanding/ insight/comprehension, (subject specific and generic) intellectual, practical and interpersonal skills and (ethical) values’ (Wagenaar, 2004: 294; cf. Beneitone & Bartolomé, 2014). The competencies cover a wide range of abilities formed during the process of learning, some of which are general and can be formed in virtually any program within higher education. This definition of competencies has not been without criticism, and the choice of terminology has certainly generated some misunderstandings (Wagenaar, 2014; Sánchez & Ruiz, 2008). Particularly confusing is the fact that the concept could be understood as the traditional Competence-Based Approach to Education
and Training (CBET) (Kerka, 1998). Not surprisingly, theoretical and pedagogical discussion about the definitions and use of competencies has continued both inside and outside the Tuning Community (Wagenaar, 2014: 295 f.). The generic competencies, although also formed in history education, are a part of the overall academic education, and while interesting as such, do not form an essential part of the training to be a historian. For this reason, as we are here considering history specifically, I focus upon those ‘subject-specific competencies’ that a student develops through studying history as a subject.

The list of subject specific competencies was elaborated through long discussions with colleagues in the history SAG. The situation was further complicated for historians as history is often taught in many other subject areas as a part of the program of study (Gonzáles & Wagenaar, 2003: 151–155). I therefore restrict myself here to discussing programs where the students receive a history degree, and it is worth pointing out that the following lists must not be seen as absolute rulebooks of what an education in history or what history as a subject is. Rather the function of the lists is twofold: to show what professional historians recognise as central subject specific competencies and to function as a guideline for educators when constructing program curricula.

In the table below the Tuning ‘canon’ is displayed both for Tuning EU and Tuning Latin America (cf. Beneitone & Bartolomé, 2014). The competencies are placed in random order and not categorized according to their relative importance.

**Table 1. Subject Competencies: Tuning EU and Tuning Latin America**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuning EU</th>
<th>Tuning Latin America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Specific Skills and Competences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific competences in the Area of History</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A critical awareness of the relationship between current events and processes and the past.</td>
<td>1. Awareness of the social function of the historian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Awareness of the differences in historiographical outlooks in various periods and contexts.</td>
<td>2. Awareness that historical debate and research are constantly under construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Awareness of and respect for points of view deriving from other national or cultural backgrounds.

4. Awareness of the on-going nature of historical research and debate.

5. Knowledge of the general diachronic framework of the past.

6. Awareness of the issues and themes of present day historiographical debate.

7. Detailed knowledge of one or more specific periods of the human past.

8. Ability to communicate orally in one's own language using the terminology and techniques accepted in the historiographical profession.

9. Ability to communicate orally in foreign languages using the terminology and techniques accepted in the historiographical profession.

10. Ability to read historiographical texts or original documents in one's own language; to summarize or transcribe and catalogue information as appropriate.

11. Ability to read historiographical texts or original documents in other languages; to summarize or transcribe and catalogue information as appropriate.

12. Ability to write in one's own language using correctly the various types of historiographical writing.

13. Ability to write in other languages using correctly the various types of historiographical writing.

3. Ability to use the specific techniques necessary to study documents from given periods, such as paleography and epigraphy.

4. Knowledge of national history.

5. Ability to design, organize and develop projects of historical research.

6. Critical knowledge of the relationship between current and past events and processes.

7. Ability to use information and communication technology to compile historical data or facts related to history (for example, statistical and cartographical methods, databases etc.).

8. Ability to read historiographical texts and documents in other languages.

9. Knowledge of the methods and problems posed by the different branches of historical research: economic, social, political, gender studies, etc.

10. Knowledge of local and regional history.

11. Ability to take part in interdisciplinary research work.

12. Ability to know about, contribute to and participate in sociocultural activities in the community.

13. Ability to use tools for information storage such as bibliographic catalogues, archival inventories and electronic references.
14. Knowledge of and ability to use information retrieval tools, such as bibliographical repertoires, archival inventories, e-references.

15. Knowledge of and ability to use the specific tools necessary to study documents of particular periods (e.g. paleography, epigraphy).

16. Ability to use computer and internet resources and techniques elaborating historical or related data (using statistical, cartographic methods, or creating databases, etc.)

17. Knowledge of and respect for points of view derived from diverse cultural, national and other records.

18. Critical knowledge of the general diachronic framework of the past.

19. Knowledge of and ability to study documents of particular periods (e.g. paleography, epigraphy).

20. Knowledge of indigenous languages, where relevant.

21. Knowledge of and ability to use the theories, methods and techniques of other social sciences and humanities.

22. Knowledge of local history.

23. Knowledge of one's own national history.

24. Knowledge of and ability to use the theories, methods and techniques of other social sciences and humanities.

25. Knowledge of and ability to use the theories, methods and techniques of other social sciences and humanities.


27. Knowledge of and ability to use the theories, methods and techniques of other social sciences and humanities.

28. Knowledge of universal or world history.

29. Critical knowledge of differing historiographical perspectives in different periods and contexts, including those currently under debate.

30. Knowledge of universal or world history.

31. Knowledge of local history.

32. Knowledge of one's own national history.

33. Knowledge of and ability to use the theories, methods and techniques of other social sciences and humanities.

34. Knowledge of European history in a comparative perspective.

35. Ability to communicate and present an argument in both oral and written form in one's own language, in accordance with the standard terminology and techniques of the profession.

36. Knowledge of European integration.

37. Knowledge of world history.

38. Ability to apply the techniques and methods of the teaching of history.

39. Awareness of and ability to use tools of other human sciences (e.g., literary criticism, and history of language, art history, archaeology, anthropology, law, sociology, philosophy etc.).

40. Awareness of methods and issues of different branches of historical research (economic, social, political, gender related, etc.).
25. Ability to define research topics suitable to contribute to historiographical knowledge and debate.
26. Ability to identify and utilize appropriately sources of information (bibliography, documents, oral testimony etc.) for research project.
27. Ability to organize complex historical information in coherent form.
28. Ability to give narrative form to research results according to the canons of the discipline.
29. Ability to comment, annotate or edit texts and documents correctly according to the critical canons of the discipline.
30. Knowledge of didactics of history


The European list contains three competencies more than the Latin American. But on the whole there is a convergence between how academic historians in Europe and in Latin America define the subject. Altogether, twenty-three competencies are the same or very similar. There are two interesting types of competencies that Latin America has added into the list but are lacking in the European one. The first category deals with the ethics or the moral responsibilities of the historian (SSC LA 1 and 12). Even if the need for an ethical dimension was clearly stated in the European SAGs work, in the final formulation of subject specific competencies the social role of the historian was overlooked. The second category deals with students’ research abilities: the Latin Americans expect the students to take an active role in research (SSC LA 5, and 11). The European competencies that have not found their way into the Latin American list are in a sense very European (SSC EU 9, 17 and 21). In addition Tuning Europe seems to have been keen on fostering students’ abilities to do presentations in other languages and to write in a variety of forms (SSC EU 13 and 28), competencies lacking in the Latin American list.
One of the reasons for these small discrepancies is probably that while Tuning Europe did the basic work in the beginning when definitions and terms still were ambiguous, Latin America could use this work to enhance and refine it. This provides a good example of the iterative nature of the Tuning process.

In general it can be noted that among scholars in these two regions there is a good agreement of what is regarded as history and what students should be able to do. This is reinforced when results from additional regions are added into the analysis. Table 2 shows the competencies that academics in four regions have considered the most important. This does not mean that other competencies are less important; the table simply gives an indication of how academics ranked the subject specific competencies relative to each other. One could call these competencies ‘the core of the core’. While Latin America and Central Asia did use the European list as a starting point, Tuning US redefined and rewrote the competencies in order better to adjust them to institutional and structural conditions in the US, however the working order was the same (Tuning USA, 2012).

**Table 2.** The most important subject specific competencies in history according to academics in four Tuning processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A critical understanding of the relationship between current events and processes and the past</td>
<td>A critical awareness of the relationship between current events and the past</td>
<td>Critical knowledge of the relationship between current and past events and processes</td>
<td>Practice historical thinking as central to engaged citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of national history, as part of world history</td>
<td>Knowledge of one’s own national history</td>
<td>Knowledge of national history</td>
<td>Practice historical empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand the</td>
<td>Awareness of the issues and themes</td>
<td>Understanding of the fact that</td>
<td>Generate significant, open-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges issues of national historiography</td>
<td>in current historiographical debates</td>
<td>historical debate and research is permanently developing</td>
<td>ended questions about the past and devise research strategies to answer them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to acquire new knowledge, using modern information and communication technologies</td>
<td>Ability to identify and utilize appropriate sources of information</td>
<td>Ability to identify and utilize appropriate sources of information for historical research</td>
<td>Understand the complex nature of the historical record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of skills and abilities for research activity</td>
<td>Ability to communicate orally and in writing using correct terminology</td>
<td>Ability to communicate and argue orally and in written form, in the native language of the relevant country, in accordance with usual terminology and techniques of the profession</td>
<td>Engage in historical inquiry, research, and analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES:** The project Towards a Central Asian Higher Education Area is currently working (October 2014); these competencies should only be seen as an indicator of the final ones. Tuning History EU SAG never published the most important subject specific competencies. These results are from my private notes and working papers and should be cited with caution. Beneitone et al., 2007: 196; Beneitone & Bartolomé, 2014; American Historical Association, 2014.

A comparison of the most important competencies in these four Tuning regions reveal convergence but also interesting differences,
with the US competencies diverging most from the three others. The common core of the core seems to consist of ‘critical awareness or knowledge of the relationship between current events and the past (processes); knowledge of national history and historiography; and ability to find and use sources’. Here we are back to the overall general definition of history that the European SAG started out with. There are, however, some interesting differences. Research activity is underlined in Tuning Central Asia (development of skills and abilities for research activities) and in Tuning US (engage in historical inquiry, research and analyses). Central Asia also pinpoints the necessity to use IT for information gathering, yet, as shown in Table 3, academics in other regions considered this competence as one of the least important. The difference in the value attributed to IT mirrors the ten-year time gap between the consultations and a new survey in Europe and Latin America would without doubt place this competence among the most important. The vast amount of sources and articles now available on-line as well as the growing methodological discussions about using IT in teaching and research, has made this competence indispensable (e.g. Noiret, 2009). The great importance of IT in history in central Asia could also reflect Central Asian national, institutional and structural preconditions. In these relatively new states access to printed materials is still complicated: libraries need to restock, and much of the international research and sources are only accessible on-line. A further interesting difference is the US accent on historians’ ethical/moral commitments. Two of the six competencies have an ethical content. The European History SAG entirely lacked such a dimension, and although Latin America did have competencies with this content they are not among the most important. In general the US list emphasizes the historian’s skills and attitudes rather than concrete historical knowledge. In the other Tuning regions the competencies answer the question: ‘What should a student know, be able to do and relate to?’ In the US the list accentuates the importance of ethics and attitudes linked to the historians’ craft.

In a recent article Pablo Beneitone and Edurne Bartolomé have studied similarities and differences in generic competencies in four
regions. In their analysis they emphasise that cultural contexts and educational traditions must be taken into account in order to understand the dissimilarities. They also note that identical competencies can express different things in different regions (Beneitone & Bartolomé, 2014). This is also the case in regard to subject specific competencies in history. The differences in Table 2 demonstrate clearly that although a common understanding of ‘the core of the core’ in history is widespread, each region has its own views and perspectives. A summary of the subject specific competencies suggests, for instance, the following conclusions. In Europe and Latin America the emphasis is upon ‘to know, identify, use and present; in Central Asia, ‘to know, identify, use and research’, and in Tuning US ‘to understand, create, research, and present with a social consciousness’.

What then were the competencies that history academics found least important (that ranked lowest in the list of competencies)? Here we can compare Tuning Europe to Tuning Latin America. The comparison reveals some obvious similarities: languages and auxiliary sciences of history are not considered important. One of the functions of the ranking was to unveil competencies that were potentially important but that tended to be discarded. The combination of high esteem for knowledge of national history and low esteem for languages shows clearly how inward-looking history as a subject can be. The low ranking of ancient languages is perhaps understandable as the study of antiquity does receive increasingly less attention in Europe. Perhaps more surprising is that the Latin America list contains native languages. Together with the low ranking of the ‘ability to recognize, contribute and participate in socio-cultural community activities’ and ‘knowledge of local and regional history’, this presents a problematic picture of historians not really being interested in the life and past of common people. Also worrying is the low ranking given to IT. Ten years ago IT was the talk of the town for the enlightened, but historians as educators seem on the whole to prefer to continue to walk in the dark, or rather the past. In this case, as in those mentioned above, the list offers a wakeup call.
### TABLE 3. Least important subject specific competencies according to academics in Europe and Latin America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuning EU Subject Specific Skills and Competences</th>
<th>Tuning Latin America Specific competences in the Area of History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Ability to write in other languages using correctly the various types of historical writing</td>
<td>8. Ability to read historiographical texts and documents in other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ability to use specific techniques for the study of documents from particular periods (calligraphy, epigraphy etc.)</td>
<td>10. Knowledge of local and regional history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Knowledge of Ancient Languages</td>
<td>3. Ability to use the specific techniques necessary to study documents from given periods, such as paleography and epigraphy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ability to communicate in foreign languages using terminology and the profession</td>
<td>4. Ability to use information and communication technology to compile historical data or facts related to history (for example, statistical and cartographical methods, databases etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ability to use computer and internet resources and techniques elaborating historical or related data (using statistical, cartographic methods, or creating databases, etc.)</td>
<td>12. Ability to recognize, contribute and participate in socio-cultural community activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of native languages, if necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES:** The project Towards a Central Asian Higher Education Area is currently working (October 2014); these competencies should only be seen as an indicator of the final ones. Tuning History EU SAG never published the most important subject specific competencies. These results are from my private notes and working papers and should be cited with caution.
Student and graduate views on history

In this essay only the view of academics on history education has been presented. The Tuning project has been very clear that the process must be led by universities in general and teachers in particular. However, in a fast-changing social and policy environment it was important to consult other actors – employers, graduates and students. Employers were consulted in accordance with the Bologna declaration’s ambition to improve graduate employability. However, most interesting for the subject area were graduate and student perspectives on the competencies. What did the students consulted expect from studying history and what had the graduates found most useful in their education? Below I focus on the outcomes produced by Tuning Latin America, as their findings are published (Beneitone et al., 2007: 196 f.). In my experience these results mirror the European picture.

All three categories, academics, graduates and students, considered the competencies numbered 2, 4 and 23 most important, (see ‘Tuning Latin America’ in Table 1 above). While the academics considered the ‘coherent organisation of information’ (26) and ‘oral and written communication’ (20) very important, these competencies do not appear in the students’ and graduates’ list of most important learning outcomes. Correspondingly the ‘ability to design, organise and develop historical research projects’ (5) is on both the student and graduates lists but not on that of the academics. The students are the only group that has ‘awareness of the social function of the historian’ (1) in their ‘most important’ list. It seems that research abilities are highly desirable qualities for both students and graduates. This fact is particularly interesting since the graduates already had some years of work experience when they answered the questionnaire. The students, on the other hand, also seem keen to engage with the issue of what it is to be a historian.

The academics’ and graduates’ list of least important subject specific competencies are identical. ‘Auxiliary sciences’ (3), ‘foreign and native languages’ (8, 16), ‘local history’ (10), ‘IT’ (7) and ‘socio-cultural activities’ (12) are at the bottom of the list. Four out of six of these competencies appear also on the students’ list (3, 7, 12, 16).
However, instead of ‘local history’ and ‘other languages’, the students give low ratings to ‘interdisciplinary research work’ (11) and ‘didactics’ (21). The presence of the last competence is surprising as many history students become secondary school teachers. The answers in general, however, show that the socialisation process in history education is relatively successful. The graduates’ view on history coincides with the academics to a greater extent than the students. However, the need to strengthen students’ research capabilities is clear, as is the need to early in the education discuss a historian’s social role.

The consultations have been, and can be, used in a variety of ways: to discover how much academics’ views of the subject overlap with those of students and graduates; to unearth competencies that are overlooked or have low esteem among the stake holders; and to compare differences and similarities in the different groups’ perceptions and expectations of history as a subject. The survey method can also be used to unveil aspects of history education that have been overlooked or downplayed and provide impetus for adjustments and changes. The consultations can therefore profitably be used both to (re)define the subject and to adjust it as necessary.

Conclusions

In this short article I have shown how a subject area can be defined and the essence of the subject identified in such a way that it is valid for several national or regional educational systems, at the same time taking into account regional and national differences. I have demonstrated that there is convergence about how the core of history is understood in different regions and consensus about what kind of knowledge, skills and competencies a student can and should accumulate while studying the subject. On the other hand every region has contributed new aspects and insights related to how the subject is perceived institutionally, socially and culturally; and so have the different stake holders consulted.

The fact that Tuning has been adapted more or less on a global level has meant that the process has been fine-tuned in an ongoing
fashion, with new additions and ideas that all can profit from. The list of competencies, generic or subject specific, is not set in stone. Competencies can be added and subtracted depending on the aim of the education, national or regional preferences, and changes over time in the perception of the subject area, and so on. This demonstrates the adaptability of the method in various national and regional settings, and also mirrors the respect for diversity that has been the principal guideline of Tuning from the outset. However, transparency is also obtained by clearly stating competencies and relating them to learning outcomes and teaching methods. With transparency comes comparability and transferability; the method teaches us the language of *republica literaria*.

The initial question can now be answered: No, there is not a ‘history for all’. Various actors see the subject history differently, and diverging institutional, social and cultural settings influence how the subject is perceived. However, the core of history as a subject is largely the same in the Tuning regions and, above all, historians have much in common. It will be particularly interesting to see how the Chinese, Indian and Japanese Tuning processes add to and change our views on the subject and the craft.

---

1 Clioh made an interesting exercise compiling into a table all different national diachronic divisions. Unfortunately, the Periodization Map is not available on-line anymore.

2 I’m here using my own term “overall learning results” as the sum of learning outcomes and the two different types of competencies. The terms *Learning Outcomes* and *Competencies* have created much confusion during the Tuning work in many parts of the world. For a glossary of Tuning terms, see Gonzáles & Wagenaar, 2008.
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