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1. Introduction

The 21st century, and the enhancement of globalization and network communities it induced, resulted, inter alia, in the Bologna Process (Tauch, 2005; Ramos, Afonso, Cruchinho, Delgado, Almeida Ramos & Sapeta, 2015). In a series of meetings (beginning in 1988), the European higher education system adopted the Magna Charta Universitatum - a document which acknowledges each university as an autonomous institution (rooted in a specific historical, geographical, societal and cultural context) on the one hand, while aspiring to standardize universities across Europe, stating that they “must be inseparable,” on the other (EUA, 1998, p. 1).

The decision to adopt the Bologna Process was a governmental action which took place in summits attended by the European Ministers of Education (Muche, 2005; Ramos, Afonso, Cruchinho, Delgado, Almeida Ramos & Sapeta, 2015). It was a top-bottom mode of operation. Nonetheless, each institution still maintains academic freedom as to the implementation of the Bologna Process and the fulfillment of the Bologna expectations. The present abstract regards (a) a specific act of meeting the Bologna guidelines and principles, i.e. an institutional conformity to a Bologna designed syllabus, (b) the question of collectivism and individualism in such a transition.

2. Literature review

*2.1 Institutional processes: Collectivism vs. individualism*

The literature debates extensively on the question 'what counts as an institution?' in contrast to 'everyday life' (Foucault, 1975/1995; Lefebvre, 1947/1991; Heritage, 2004). Institutions, as formal bureaucracies, are defined as organized structures with particular purposes, where all members' activities and interactions *follow closely or completely conform* *to* "an official blueprint" (Blau & Scott, 2016, p. 175). The expectation of such conduct is grounded on laws, rules and administrative regulations (Weber, 1922/1978).

Needless to say, control and coercion vary among institutions, as some "are giving way to more decentralized and horizontal systems" (Scott, 2004, p. 12). With the emergence of new institutional forms (such as project-based institutions, and small- and medium-scale Internet companies), imposed administrative demands as well as the regulative nature of institutions are no longer taken for granted. According to Foss (2003) and Mayer-Ahuja and Wolf (2007), the very question of ‘who is considered as management?’ may be doubtful. In institutions which obtain a flexible, egalitarian, family-like structure, anyone can serve as a manager on some occasions and as a subordinate on others. Such institutions do not necessarily follow a clear or indisputable line of dominance. Nonetheless, to some extent all institutions are encompassing environments (Scott, 2004). In this respect, academic institutions are no different.

In their article, Gundlach, Zivnuska and Stoner (2006) relate to team performance in a group, while accepting the perspective which regards the institution as one possible type of group. They differentiate between a collectivist viewpoint (where “group interests [are considered] as more important than individual needs and desires,” p. 1608) and an individualist one, which maintains the exact opposite. Gundlach, Zivnuska and Stoner also note on the fact that a group member may simultaneously display collectivism *and* individualism; “the traits are not mutually exclusive” (p. 1609).

Hence, the individuals operating in institutions may depart from the institutional agenda and its consequential demands (see also the literature on management studies and organizational change; e.g. Barrett, Thomas & Hocevar, 1995; De Cock, 1998; Anderson, 2005). Despite the fact that institutions are centripetal (a term used when indicating a tendency toward unity and agreement; Billig, 1996), and that a reduction in the individual voice is therefore expected, personal diversity nevertheless exists. Members may range from a complete acceptance of the institutional demands (i.e. “the perception of ‘oneness’ with a group;” Gundlach, Zivnuska & Stoner, 2006), to partial disagreement or even bold defiance against them (Mumby, 2005; Fleming & Spicer, 2008). As far as disagreements are being considered, Ikeda (2008) describes the ways that they are verbally built, including the aggregated form “did not - did too” (which indicates a definite opposition), and the “yes, but+ disagreement” (which is more moderated). We adopted these “formulas” in our analysis.[[1]](#footnote-1)

As previously stated, we ask whether an academic staff adhere to a managerial decision to implement a Bologna design syllabus, and if so how. Hence, the next section will review the literature on the Bologna process and the Bologna common core syllabus.

*2.2 The Bologna process and the Bologna designed syllabus*

The Bologna Process, signed in Bologna in 1999 by Education Ministers from 29 European countries, was based on the principles of innovation, which allow individualism in expression of curricular components, and competitiveness and productivity, which can be measured by a set of standards (Van der Wende, 2009). The goals of the Bologna process include improvement of European Higher Education, creating partnerships thereby enriching and empowering European citizenship, and elicitation of competitiveness with other higher education systems worldwide (Araújo, Silva, & Durães, 2018). Another major goal was to increase mobility and employability in Europe and to attract higher education students and faculty in Europe and beyond.

In an attempt to achieve these goals, there was a need to define operative objectives which included academic degrees that allow comparison, e.g. the formation of a comparable credit system (which includes mutual recognition of credentials and course units) and standardization of quality assessment measures (Ramos Afonso, Cruchinho, Delgado, Almeida Ramos & Sapeta, 2015). This standardization is considered contradictory to the notion of institutional diversity, which was always a strong characteristic of European universities (Araújo, Silva, & Durães, 2018).

The Bologna process is part of a general trend in research and practice, forcing on internationalization of higher education, which has emerged as a unique notion during recent decades (Bedenlier, Kondakci & Zawacki-Richter, 2018). It is also the result of worldwide processes of globalization, technological change and competition for excellent workforce. This motivated European higher education institutes to become more attractive and competitive in the global arena, and the European Union to match and compete with the US higher education standards and economy. However, this process is multilayered and rather complex to implement. As a result, attention had been allocated to a great extent to changes in the degree structure and consequently to adaptation of the curricula and the syllabi which compose the curricula; this created disagreements regarding the demands to adapt to Bologna requirements (Cardoso, Portela & Alexandre, 2008).

Indeed, change is complex in any organization, requiring time, efforts and commitment to the process from all parties involved. The institution needs to supply the optimal conditions in order to enable the required change. A curricular change is the result of the Bologna reform, with one of its main foci being the syllabi change. The new syllabi requirements allowed a re-examination of the body of knowledge needed for quality training, as well as the means to achieve the re-defined goals. For example, one means of internationalization of the syllabi is to adapt a universal, multicultural, multilingual and competence-based curriculum through knowledge sharing between faculty, whether the courses are attended by international students or aimed for local students experiencing internationalization at home (King, 2019; Minica & Demyen, 2018; Wihlborg & Robson, 2018).

Faculty is in the front line of the Bologna process, requiring adaptation of syllabi to meet the Bologna process requirements. To this end, efforts have been made to lessen faculty work overload. For example, a 24-month initiative funded by the EU under the Information and Communication Technologies Policy Support Program (ICT PSP) was aimed to create a Bologna Translation Service that provided automatic translation of syllabi for programs that had launched the Bologna process. The essence of this project comprised several machine translation engines offering web-based translation services (Depraetere, Van den Bogaert, & Van de Walle, 2011). These may include standards that are associated with syllabi requirements, teaching and management strategies, links to the curriculum, and assessment activities that diversify assessment techniques according to student skills and required performance level (Masari & Petrovici, 2011).

Teacher education colleges (the institutional context we investigate), being higher education institutes, also undergo iterative, multi-layer processes of change (Ling, 2017). These include processes which are compulsory in the 21st century, characterized by adaptation to the global, complex knowledge society, in which people are trained to work in international contexts. Since they are a part of the academic milieu, these institutes also experience the changes required by the Bologna process. However, they have a unique curriculum that links theory and practice, teaching and research; they also vary in their training programs (Vieira, Flores, Silva, & Almeida, 2019).

Being in the initial stages of adaptation to the bologna process, the goal of our study was to examine the conversion of the college syllabi into the Bologna template. We aimed to examine phrases of collectivism vs. individualism in syllabi pursuant to Bologna requirements. Accordingly, the research question examined is: What expression of individualism and collectivism are evident in syllabi that follow Bologna requirements?

3. Methodology

The study was conducted in an Israeli teacher-training college, which implemented a specific Bologna component, i.e. its syllabus format. Changing the syllabi of the B.Ed. and M.Ed. programs to the Bologna format was a managerial top-down decision and the result of various factors, including recommendations of the Council for Higher Education in Israel. The Council aims at positioning the Israeli universities/colleges at the forefront of *global* science and research, hence the demand to meet academic international standards, including the adoption of the Bologna syllabus format. Notwithstanding, until 2018 the syllabi in that college were unified, albeit they followed a “prototype” which did not fully adhere to the Bologna design.

Drawing on a qualitative paradigm and phenomenology, we analyzed thirty syllabi: fifteen from the department of Mathematics (a B.Ed. program), and fifteen from the M.Ed. program ‘Language Education in a Multicultural Society’ (abbreviated hereafter as LEMS). We aimed to present a range of the phenomenon studied, hence, we focused on a variety of syllabi, those of B.Ed. vs. M.Ed. departments/programs, and of different scientific branches (Mathematics as a formal science and LEMS as a social one).

We asked: (a) where do the academic staff (of both disciplines) ignore/disobey/exceed the rector's guidelines for a Bologna designed syllabus and manifest individualism in the sense of ‘not conforming to the official voice of the institution?’, (b) if the academic staff display collectivism (i.e. indications of “‘oneness’ with a group;” Gundlach, Zivnuska & Stoner, 2006), toward whom/where is it directed? Hence, we conducted a two-part content analysis. First, we focused on Ikeda’s (2008) categories (i.e. the “did not - did too” and the “yes, but” formulas), aiming to see whether there are places of disagreement in the syllabi. Next, we applied Fishel, Tov-li and Asaf’s analysis framework (2009). They found that syllabi disclose the affiliation to a scientific discipline, to the institution and to the course itself. They also argue that a syllabus may include ‘historical residuals,’ i.e. a tradition of writing a syllabus which does not change despite the requirements for the new (Bologna) syllabus template. We identified additional categories that are missing in Fishel, Tov-li and Asaf (ibid): affiliation to the academic program, affiliation to the Israeli educational system, affiliation to the academic world, and a national affiliation.

Before moving on to the next section we would like to relate to ethical issues. Our study was approved by the Ethical Committee of the investigated college. In addition, we sent an informed consent letter to the college academic staff, which specified the purpose of the study, its procedure, and the means to be taken in order to preserve anonymity. Lecturers who did not want their syllabi to be analyzed were asked to notify us about their reluctantly via email. This procedure was taken even though the college syllabi are open online to the general public.

4. Findings

*4.1 Places of individualism*

“Did not - did too”

We found that the syllabi of both the Mathematics department and the LEMS program are missing several components, i.e. *prerequisites* (this part lacks from 13/15 Mathematics syllabi and from all syllabi of the LEMS program); *the degree to which the course is intended* (did not appear in 3/15 of the Mathematics syllabi and in 1/15 of the syllabi of the LEMS program; in an additional LEMS syllabus the degree stated was wrong - B.Ed. instead of M.Ed.); and *the campus where the lessons take place* (one Mathematics syllabus and one of the LEMS syllabi did not relate to this issue). We consider these omissions a “did not-did too” type of opposition, since the management specifically requested these sections and some lecturers did not meet the demand.

When we examine the computerized system to which the lecturers uploaded their syllabi, we discovered that the following remark opens the ‘Prerequisites’: “Please note, if you have not entered any prerequisites, they will also not appear in the syllabus.” This may explain why the lecturers did not fill in this part. However, the system opens a text box for typing the degree of the target population of the course (with the options: B.Ed./M.Ed./Teaching Certification for Academics/Certificate Studies), and the campus where the course is taught. The discrepancy, according to which lecturers ignore the demand to relate to the degree and the campus, is not clear. In comparison with the missing ‘Prerequisites’ it occurred only scantly.

“Yes, but”

This category refers to places where the lecturers did what they were required to do, i.e. followed the Bologna syllabus template. However, they either fulfil the demands partially, or (on the contrary) added to what they were asked to do. We found that lecturers were supposed to write 4-8 ‘Learning Outcomes’ (i.e. statements indicating what the students will be able to do at the end of the course). However, 7/15 of the Mathematics syllabi only specified 3. The discrepancy was smaller regarding the LEMS syllabi, where 1 lecturer (of 15) wrote 3 learning outcomes and an additional syllabus comprised 9.

Another requirement was to write the ‘Course Bibliography’ according to the American Psychology Association (APA) guidelines. However, 12 of the Mathematics syllabi and 8 of the LEMS did not adhere to the APA rules.

In addition, lecturers included various remarks in their syllabus. Some related to the way by which the course will be conducted, for example, the comments: *“The articles presented here are background material for classroom learning. Students will be asked to read some of the articles, according to a schedule given by the lecturer during the course.”*, or *“...Items marked with one asterisk (\*) are mandatory. Each participant will choose from these items one article to present in class during the first semester. Items marked with two asterisks (\*\*) are mandatory reading for everyone, and they will be discussed in class.”* Lecturers also incorporate statements which diminish the extent to which the syllabus should be considered a binding contract, e.g. *“There may be changes in the syllabus;”* *“Additional bibliography items will be provided during the course;”* or *“The division of topics [i.e. course content], pursuant to a calendar/schedule, can be changed according to the progress during the semester.”* In one of the syllabi of the LEMS program, under the title “Course Structure” (which was required in the Bologna designed syllabus) a faculty member added a summary of the structure of the first semester: *“In the first semester the students will be exposed to the research domain… We will focus on choosing a research topic, writing a research question… Till the end of the semester each student will have a research proposal.”* This explanation was followed by a list of 11 topics, then a required table with a detailed plan of the lessons in the first semester was presented; for the second semester, yet another summary focusing on this new semester was given, followed by another table.

An interesting finding, concerning the additions to the syllabi, is the “historical residuals” of the previous syllabus template that was customary in the investigated college prior to the transition to the Bologna syllabus format. One of the mathematicians comprised an entire section, titled ‘Teaching-Learning Methods.’ The section was placed after the ‘Course Content’ and before the ‘Assessment Methods’ - the place where this part was located in the former syllabus template. We found another Mathematician who acted in a similar way, albeit without the explicit title ‘Teaching-Learning Methods.’ She wrote: *“Subjects will be taught via lectures, discussions, group work, online sessions using the [Ministry of Education] curriculum for the preschool education, acquaintance with and the use of multi-sensory teaching aids, and the reading of bibliography; The lessons will be based on what is happening in the field-work teaching practice.”*

Finally, we found redundant information in the LEMS syllabi. In two of them, ‘The Degree the Course is Intended to’ includes additional information that was required in other sections of the syllabus, for example, the name of the program. Another syllabus of the LEMS program consists unnecessary information mistakenly. Under the section ‘The Campus where the Lessons Take Place,’ the lecturer wrote the course name in Hebrew and English, her name, the numeric code of the course, the course type, requirements, prerequisite requirements, the year and semester of the course and the campus where the course is taught - all of which are already mentioned in the digitized template. Again, there is the possibility that a misunderstanding of way the computerized system works created the confusion.

‘I’ statements

Generally, faculty members refrain from self-mentioning in their writing. Most of the syllabi we studied do not include the title word ‘I’ or any other first-person indication (e.g. me, mine, my); the syllabi maintain an impersonal language. Nonetheless, one Math syllabus (of the 15 that we analyzed) comprise the following instruction: “*the students must plan a teaching unit according to the class they are assigned to. The unit will include activities for 3 lessons [...]. Each student will study the activities by himself/herself, after receiving* ***my*** *approval.”* This ‘I’ statement is written in a syllabus of an *online* course. In the LEMS syllabi we did not identify forms of individualism, but rather an impartial phrasing of mediation, e.g. *“Materials collected for the research… can be used for a seminar course or for the final project* ***in coordination with the lecturer*** *[i.e., me] or the advisor in these courses.”*

*4.2 Collectivism*

As previously mentioned, the academic staff display through their syllabi an affiliation with several group/social entities. Most notably was the belongingness to the scientific discipline, i.e. Mathematics, and Language or Multiculturalism (the branches which the LEMS program is based on). All syllabi of the Mathematics departments related to mathematical topics (e.g. algebra, trigonometry) and terms (e.g. complex numbers, functions, angles). Similarly, all LEMS syllabi emphasized an affiliation to either language-related disciplinary foci (e.g., narratives, linguistic policy) or multiculturalism (e.g., social and cultural issues regarding linguistic complexity and multiculturalism in the Israeli society and the educational system).

We also detect a belongingness to the field-work experiences (i.e. the teaching practice). Lecturers indicated that “*The [course] content will be studied in accordance with the curriculum of the Ministry of Education and coordinated with* ***the experience of the students in the schools during the [field-work] experience***” (a Math syllabus). It should be stated that the instructions issued by the college rector, as to how to write a syllabus in keeping with the Bologna format, asked the lecturers to relate to the field-work experience.

Of the 15 LEMS syllabi, 11 emphasized belongingness with regards to the K12 education system, as in the following: *“When the educator identifies and deeply understands the underlying social and emotional processes that students experience, he is able to contribute to their development, to improve learning and teaching processes and to efficiently solve problems that arise in* ***the classroom***.*”* Five Math syllabi also display this type of affiliation.

Like Fishel, Tov-li and Asaf (2009) - whom we mentioned earlier - we notice that the syllabi disclose lecturers’ relatedness with the course they taught, i.e. sentences such as *“****We*** *will use primary websites during* ***the course****”* (a Math syllabus), *“Worksheets are at the* ***course*** *Moodle [an e-learning environment of a course]”* (a repeated remark in the syllabi of the Math department), and *“Items in bold refer to files that exist in a folder of reading materials in the* ***[course] website****”* (a LEMS syllabus), or *“Each group will choose an article from the required reading list and will present it using the instructions and indicators* ***in the Moodle website****”* (LEMS). However, and contrary to Fishel, Tov-li and Asaf (ibid), we did not find in the Math or the LEMS syllabi any indication of the affiliation of the academic staff to the institution. In other words, syllabi are missing phrases such as *“In our college,”* or *“At [the college name] we believe/support/consider…”*. Instead, and on a broader level (which breaches the boundaries of a specific course), we discovered affiliation to the *Israeli* educational system, e.g. “*the [course] themes will be studied in accordance with* ***the curriculum of the Ministry of Education***” (there are 5 references of this sort in the syllabi of the Mathematics department, and 11 references in the LEMS syllabi). Some staff members related to the nation/state context, e.g. the statement *“In the process of teacher training* ***in Israel*** *and abroad, there is usually a separation between the teaching of the theoretical field and the instruction of the pedagogical knowledge”* (two Math lecturers and 5 of the LEMS syllabi include remarks of this sort).

Finally, the syllabi comprise affiliation to the academic world. Three Math lecturers cite references in the ‘Course Description,’ as in: *“****Euclid*** *already knew the basis of geometry systematically [...] In 1899,* ***David Hilbert*** *proposed [...] a system of 20 axioms, as a theoretical basis for Euclidean geometry.”* In the LEMS syllabi, 9/15 included reference to academic characteristics, such as designing and conducting research, connecting theory, research and practice, and complying with academic standards (e.g., ethical rules).

5. Conclusions and discussion

The research reported herewith was aimed to examine institutional conformity to a Bologna designed syllabus, which was a top-down requirement by the management of a college of education. Specifically, we raised the question of collectivism vs. individualism in the transition from a previous syllabus template to the updated Bologna template. The process of adapting to the Bologna syllabus template is aimed to set high academic standards which are comparative nationwide and also internationally (Ramos, Afonso, Cruchinho, Delgado, Almeida Ramos & Sapeta, 2015); by this, academic standards are pursued nationwide and quality assurance is achieved in a centralized manner, led by the Israeli Council for Higher Education and practices by Israeli higher education institutes (Bokek‐Cohen & Davidovich, 2011).

In general, in the investigated college, this top-down process achieved its target, creating a set of unified syllabi according to the Bologna template. Once the decision was made to act according to international standards defined by the Bologna process, this agenda was enforced by position holders (e.g. the rector and then the heads of departments). Personal opinions were supposed to be irrelevant.

No fundamental resistance was evident in our study. However, we found various instances of self-expression in the syllabi, i.e. places of individualization; some of which tie with technical difficulties. There were inconsistencies in the requirements of the offline-document template sent to faculty members, and the online-digital template to which they copy-pasted their data; certain details required in the former are irrelevant to the latter. Another technical issue was the need to fill in all fields in the syllabus format that was in the computerized system, for example – if there are no prior conditions for attending the course, is there a need to state “none”, or simply not to fill in this field.

Except for singularity which is revealed when examining the computerized syllabi, lectures mediated their selfhood by (a) adding remarks/information that the management did not requested, (b) partially adhering to explicit demands (as the one which determines the need to specify 4-8 'Learning Outcomes'), (c) using 'I' statements, (d) indicating their affiliation with various sources (i.e. their scientific discipline, the field-work experiences, the K12 education system, the course they taught, the nation/state, and the academic world). Please note that there is an apparent difference between the Mathematicians and the LEMS faculty members in expressing their belongingness to the K12 education system (5/15 Math lecturers display it vs. 11/15 LEMS lecturers) and to the academic world (3/5 Math lecturers convey it vs. 9/15 LEMS lecturers). Theories regarding the cultural distinctiveness of disciplines may be relevant here.

As individualism emerges, we may ask who is the agenda-setting agent: the institution or the lecturers? Heinze and Knill (2008) suggest additional theories which are relevant to our findings, i.e. theories concerning with consensus vs. opinion formation, and conflict/disagreement resolutions in institutions. Our study is a work-in-progress. In the future, we may want to map the various ways and strategies by which individuals convey separateness from managerial demands, and relate to distance and commonality among "players" and across scientific disciplines. We may propose visual representations of these notions (see, for example, Venturini, Ricci, Mauri, Kimbell & Meunier, 2015, on controversy mapping/"cartography"). The process of the Bologna syllabus template implementation may also associate with the literature on the broader context of change in higher education. We may reconsider the classical models describes by Hargreaves (1994), which pertains to forms of teacher culture in change (ranging from isolation to joint work and collaboration) and offer a model which proceeds from Hargreaves' observations.
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